Mr. Brett Lawson
1003 Larkspur Dr
Millbrae, CA 94030-1561

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brett Lawson

Mr. Mike Antuna
1 Holland
Irvine, CA 92618-2506

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Antuna

Mr. Randy Miner
1000 E Katella Ave
Anaheim, CA 92805-6617

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Randy Miner

Mr. Josh Pico
426 N Pacific St
San Marcos, CA 92069-1331

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Josh Pico

Mr. Gary Finn
12529 Woodside Dr
Saratoga, CA 95070-4050

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Finn

Mr. Larry Wolf
243 Ranchitos Del Sol
Aptos, CA 95003-9582
(831) 688-4257

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Wolf

Mr. Erik Swarbrick
26211 Ave Deseo
Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.
The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Erik Swarbrick

Mr. jeff deane
224 Sunridge St
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293-7750

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely
Jeff Deane
224 sunridge st
Playa del Rey CA 90293

Sincerely,
Mr. jeff deane

Mr. Curt Blau
1858 Sutter Ave
Simi Valley, CA 93065-4545

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

I agree that we are called to be good stewards of the planet, but keep in mind that the state of California has a bad record of regulating, instead of educating. Let's change this poor mindset, so that we can continue to be a leader in our heritage, and tradition.

Sincerely,
Mr. Curt Blau

Mr. Ray Haag
2400 El Burlon Cir
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-3116

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I spent 26 years of my life in the United States Air Force fighting for the freedom we enjoy in this country. During those years I lived in 10 states and visited nearly all 50. California is the most over-regulated state of any and now you want to make it even worse. Like so much other legislation and regulation in this state, there is no scientific or factual basis to support the state's position yet they plow ahead anyway with "feel good" rules sponsored by special interests and hidden agendas.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Haag

Mr. James Ferris
3916 Jim Bowie Rd
Agoura Hills, CA 91301-3606
(818) 889-7474

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Ferris

Mr. Jean-Michel Sicaud
1710 Wickham Rd
San Jose, CA 95132-1786

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jean-Michel Sicaud

Mr. bruce marr
poboz321
vacaville, CA 95696
(707) 446-6277

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.If you are going to help the environment get rid of the illegal alien trespassers and their endless piles of trash and garbage

Sincerely,
Mr. bruce marr

Mr. bruce marr
poboz321
vacaville, CA 95696
(707) 446-6277

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.If you are going to help the environment get rid of the illegal alien trespassers and their endless piles of trash and garbage

Sincerely,
Mr. bruce marr

Mr. Bob Ciapponi
142 Benito Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062-2113
(831) 423-4322

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bob Ciapponi

Mr. Steve Ballew
9324 Hillery Dr
San Diego, CA 92126-2876
(858) 610-4169

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Ballew

Mr. Corey Chapeta
4036 Cross Rd
Livermore, CA 94550-9758
(925) 456-5432

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Corey Chapeta

Mr. Bret Meverden
871 Wallis Ave
Gustine, CA 95322-1815
(209) 854-1954

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bret Meverden

Mr. Kin Lee
9157 Leroy St
San Gabriel, CA 91775-2024

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kin Lee

Mr. Tim Lovoy
1719 Ortega Pl
San Pedro, CA 90732-4229
(213) 400-8174

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Lovoy

Mr. John Perez
790 Mendocino Dr
Ukiah, CA 95482-5608

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Perez

Mr. WILLIAM EVANS
709 SOUTH ROOS STREET
SANTA ANA, CA 92701
(714) 836-4320

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. WILLIAM EVANS

Mr. David Morgan
13977 Vista Canon Ct
San Diego, CA 92130-5623
(619) 884-5449

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Morgan

Mr. John Chiarpotti
17572 Scenic Heights Ct
Sonora, CA 95370-8932
(209) 586-0948

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Chiarpotti

Mr. Rod Lewis
2864 W Keys Ln
Anaheim, CA 92804-3247

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Rod Lewis

Mr. Carmel Mifsud
2493 Bess Ave
Livermore, CA 94550
(925) 456-2226

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Carmel Mifsud

Mr. Michael Faught
860 Kristen Ct
Lodi, CA 95242-9554
(209) 327-3828

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Faught

Mr. Robert Pieper
699-271 Beverly Dr
Susanville, CA 96130-5915
(530) 251-3940

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Pieper

Mr. Steve Pazol
5515 Meadows Del Mar
San Diego, CA 92130-4865
(858) 461-0613

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Pazol

Mr. Dan Wolford
16171 Jasmine Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032-3630

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dan Wolford

Mr. james patrick
881 Harbor View Pl
San Diego, CA 92106-3036
(808) 561-2498

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. james patrick

Mr. Robert Nelson
4233 Hedge Ave
Sacramento, CA 95826-6517
(916) 366-8978

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Nelson

Mr. Tye Rommel
8801 Fair Oaks Blvd
Carmichael, CA 95608-2611

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tye Rommel

Mr. TIM HOFF
6746 Jadeite Ave
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701-5022

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. TIM HOFF

Mr. Robert Magargal
1980 Gillespie Way
El Cajon, CA 92020-1096
(619) 599-3714

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Magargal

Mr. Wesley Howle
1311 Linden St
Napa, CA 94559-4343

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wesley Howle

Mr. Wayne White
19761 Estuary Ln
Huntington Beach, CA 92646-3953

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wayne White

Mr. Robert Magargal
1980 Gillespie Way
El Cajon, CA 92020-1096
(619) 599-3714

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Magargal

Mr. Richard Eidsmoe
10008 Anja Pl
Lakeside, CA 92040-2716
(619) 449-3318

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Eidsmoe

Mr. Donald Dennehy
420 Magnolia Ave
Millbrae, CA 94030-1939
(650) 777-0065

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Donald Dennehy

Mr. Bobby Hughes
3060 Porter St Spc 23
Soquel, CA 95073-2229
(831) 600-7161

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bobby Hughes

Mr. Justin Yamasaki
19902 Edgewood Ln
Huntington Beach, CA 92646-3819

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Justin Yamasaki

Mr. Ken Steinbach
1467 Dove Ln
Sunnyvale, CA 94087-3439
(650) 224-0051

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ken Steinbach

Mr. Douglas Thorne
371 Fair Oaks St
San Francisco, CA 94110-3616
(415) 591-0661

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Douglas Thorne

Mr. Ron Fletcher
2716 Cortez Ct
Antioch, CA 94509-4228

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron Fletcher

Mr. Todd Clark
2906 Canto De Los Ciervos
San Clemente, CA 92673-6423

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Todd Clark

Mr. Hal Forsen
204 Avenida Sierra
San Clemente, CA 92672-3947

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Hal Forsen

Mr. David Willems
1838 Exeter Dr
Manteca, CA 95336-7020
(209) 823-4661

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Willems

Mr. Eric Kruger
700 Newport Center Dr
Newport Beach, CA 92660-6307

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Eric Kruger

Mr. Robert Kuwada
207 N Cypress Ave
Santa Clara, CA 95050-6601
(408) 219-5854

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Kuwada

Mr. Mike Nadelman
268 Piedmont Ave
Pacifica, CA 94044-3041
(650) 491-8762

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Nadelman

Mr. tim bartolomei
3047 Frandoras Cir
Oakley, CA 94561-1710
(925) 978-9550

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tim bartolomei

Mr. Fred Hartman
2050 Briarwood Rd
Santa Maria, CA 93455-2832

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Fred Hartman

Mr. Roy Hannah
3 Valley Oaks Ln
Santa Rosa, CA 95409-6233
(707) 537-8316

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roy Hannah

Mr. robert derenard
8614 Mango Ave
Fontana, CA 92335-3914
(909) 829-9688

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. robert derenard

Mr. William Dunmyer
206 Arequipa Ct
San Jose, CA 95119-1702

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. William Dunmyer

Mr. Ray Spencer
1800 Bay Flat
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Spencer

Mr. Kenneth Rosburg
10029 Northrup Pt
San Diego, CA 92126-5120

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kenneth Rosburg

Mr. Brian Fishell
3157 Monroe Rd
Yuba City, CA 95993-8867

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Fishell

Mr. Ray Spencer
1800 Bay Flat
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Spencer

Mr. John Whipple
1317 Orchard Ave
Napa, CA 94558-9796

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Whipple

Mr. John Whipple
1317 Orchard Ave
Napa, CA 94558-9796

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Whipple

Mr. Robert Jozaitis
3270 Montevideo Dr
San Ramon, CA 94583-2632

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Jozaitis

Mr. Gary Rose
4824 Fair St
Pleasanton, CA 94566-5467

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Rose

Mr. Pedro Contreras
503 Old Farm Rd
Danville, CA 94526-4133

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Pedro Contreras

Mr. Jack Kaneoka
524 E Imperial Hwy Ste A
Brea, CA 92821-8513
(714) 674-0064

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jack Kaneoka

Mr. Randy Pridham
7561 Adhford way
Dublin, CA 94568

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Randy Pridham

Mr. Tony Chapman
40480 Foster St
Fremont, CA 94538-2854

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tony Chapman

Mr. John Gerken
9354 Siskin Ave
Fountain Valley, CA 92708-6554
(714) 968-5588

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Gerken

Mr. Robert Filbrun
1116 N Central Ave
Modesto, CA 95351-4807
(209) 537-1817

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Filbrun

Mr. Robert Mark Stirrett
15455 Glenoaks Blvd Spc 380
Sylmar, CA 91342-7997
(661) 388-9246

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Mark Stirrett

Mr. Jeff Saunders
337 Calle De Andalucia
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-6706
(310) 373-5200

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Saunders

Mr. Chris Beeler
141 Abbeywood Ln
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656-2912
(949) 283-0373

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Chris Beeler

Mr. Donald Dambrosio
215 Cuardo Ave
Millbrae, CA 94030-2713
(650) 697-1873

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Donald Dambrosio

Mr. Michael Lejarza
1506 Jackson Ave
Ben Lomond, CA 95005-9317
(831) 345-2208

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Lejarza

Mr. Michael Dummer
23301 Caminito Marcial
Laguna Hills, CA 92653-1619

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Dummer

Mr. Donald Jones
930 Smoketree Dr
El Centro, CA 92243-4360
(760) 353-6761

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Donald Jones

Mr. Chris Halliday
5372 Doverton Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-3664
(714) 822-6446

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Chris Halliday

Mr. David Foulger
15374 Apache Rd
Apple Valley, CA 92307-3200

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Foulger

Mr. James Klein
209 W Anapamu St
Santa Barbara, CA 93101-3604

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Klein

Mr. Ray Howell
1686 Beryl Ln
Corona, CA 92882-3850
(951) 278-1619

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Howell

Mr. David Cogdill
4401 Green Ave Apt 2
Los Alamitos, CA 90720-3530

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Cogdill

Mr. Robert Fiske
2212 Albury Ave
Long Beach, CA 90815-2104

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Fiske

Mr. Mark Barbour
148 Tie Gulch Rd
Santa Cruz, CA 95065-9626
(831) 427-9125

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Barbour

Mr. Richard White
1708 Caballero St
Simi Valley, CA 93065-4814
(805) 520-3918

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard White

Mr. Roy Geller
4200 Ridgewood Rd
Willits, CA 95490-9811
(707) 459-4314

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roy Geller

Mr. NED ARDAGNA
571 3rd Ave
Chula Vista, CA 91910-5619
(619) 322-7644

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. NED ARDAGNA

Mr. Harold Friemark
1662 Tamarack Dr
Yuba City, CA 95991-1934
(530) 674-8796

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harold Friemark

Mr. NED ARDAGNA
571 3rd Ave
Chula Vista, CA 91910-5619
(619) 322-7644

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. NED ARDAGNA

Mr. Richard Masaitis
674 Floral Dr
Solvang, CA 93463-2131

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Masaitis

Mr. Hugh M Reynolds
1622 Montrose Way
San Jose, CA 95124-4830
(408) 265-9256

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Hugh M Reynolds

Mr. Jerry Barkley
307 Turnbridge St
Vacaville, CA 95687-8206
(707) 689-5779

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerry Barkley

Mr. David Morris
1331 Colorado Ave
Santa Monica, CA 90404-3312

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Morris

Mr. Ramon Cloud
529 Calle Grande Cir
Santa Maria, CA 93455-1321

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ramon Cloud

Mr. Michael Seewald
835 N Vulcan Ave
Encinitas, CA 92024-2182

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Seewald

Mr. Steve Frazier
2434 Beechwood Ave
San Jose, CA 95128-1501

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Frazier

Mr. Steve Winkley
6342 Clara Lee Ave
San Diego, CA 92120-2612

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Winkley

Mr. Robert Askins
2175 Rainbow Glen Rd
Fallbrook, CA 92028-9765
(951) 526-3208

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Askins

Mr. Neal Spellman
4969 Odessa Ave
Encino, CA 91436-1218

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Neal Spellman

Mr. Jeff Richmond
28016 Panorama Hills Dr
Menifee, CA 92584-7403
(951) 679-5992

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Richmond

Mr. miguel zamora
4943 W 141st St
Hawthorne, CA 90250-6503
(310) 729-4795

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. miguel zamora

Mr. Arlen Hermansen
1Shannon Ct
Chico, CA 95928

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Arlen Hermansen

Mr. ken elie
412 Houser St
Cotati, CA 94931-3039
(707) 237-9584

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. ken elie

Mr. Mike Muche
3231 Pontiac St
La Crescenta, CA 91214-2658

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Muche

Mr. Gale De Los Santos
30 Kazan St
Irvine, CA 92604-2456

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gale De Los Santos

Mr. Jacob Wolfe
11451 Cheshire St
Norwalk, CA 90650-6305

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jacob Wolfe

Mr. Dana Kaplan
PO Box 13453
La Jolla, CA 92039-3453
(858) 452-8103

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dana Kaplan

Mr. Ramiro Alvarez
4716 E Laurite Ave
Fresno, CA 93725-1719
(559) 255-5589

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ramiro Alvarez

Mr. Kent Smith
3349 Karen Ave
Long Beach, CA 90808-4369

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kent Smith

Mr. Dan Ward
3252 Sparkler Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-1902
(714) 421-1883

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dan Ward

Mr. Saverio Simone
27201 Tourney Rd Ste 204
Valencia, CA 91355-1804
(661) 260-1337

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Saverio Simone

Mr. Clark McPherson
99 Kunkle St
Oak View, CA 93022-9551

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clark McPherson

Ms. Paula Hugill
1810 Corbin St
San Diego, CA 92154-4213
(619) 423-7871

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Paula Hugill

Mr. Tim Davis
5878 Felicia Ave
Livermore, CA 94550-8139

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Davis

Mr. Ray Wilkerson
2157 Verona Hills Ct
Vista, CA 92084-7741
(760) 598-6441

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Wilkerson

Ms. Shirley Kirkland
10634 Ramblewood Dr
Stanton, CA 90680-2132

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shirley Kirkland

Mr. Thomas Phillips
5379 Peyton Pl
San Diego, CA 92117-1541
(858) 571-0997

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Phillips

Dr. Vlad Gendelman
11372 Dona Lisa Dr
Studio City, CA 91604-4315
(323) 828-9000

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Vlad Gendelman

Mr. Fred Guibault
237 El Centro Ave
Thermal, CA 92274-8373
(760) 673-8493

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Fred Guibault

Dr. Wilbur Roper Jr
127 U St
Rio Linda, CA 95673-1208
(916) 335-1183

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Wilbur Roper Jr

Mr. lee jordan
1356 1/2 Bowen St
Upland, CA 91786-5547

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. lee jordan

Mr. Tim McNew
8830 Cliffridge Ave
La Jolla, CA 92037-2101
(858) 245-9452

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim McNew

Mr. Mike Friend
936 Christi Ln
Chico, CA 95973-0905

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Friend

Mr. Robert Garcia
1166 Keyes Rd
Ramona, CA 92065-2921

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Garcia

Mr. Mike Ebert
1827 Whitecliff Way
San Mateo, CA 94402-3734
(650) 574-4336

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Ebert

Mr. dean uyeda
472 W 22nd St
San Pedro, CA 90731-5977
(424) 772-6592

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. dean uyeda

Mr. edmunds golts
2445 Rollingwood Dr
San Bruno, CA 94066-2603
(650) 922-7827

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. edmunds golts

Mr. Tad Houston
11260 Dell Ave
Forestville, CA 95436-9492

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tad Houston

Mr. Alfred Shakespeare
1420 Virginia Ave
Glendale, CA 91202-1532
(818) 507-9319

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alfred Shakespeare

Miss Erika Pettite
1235 E Sycamore St
Anaheim, CA 92805-2122

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Miss Erika Pettite

Mr. Paul Venker
3936 Newcastle Rd
Concord, CA 94519-1221
(925) 332-5356

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Venker

Mr. William Vitale
4070 Paducah Dr
San Diego, CA 92117-5320

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. William Vitale

Mr. Daniel Keeler
3127 Camino Calandria
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360-4537
(805) 368-7809

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Keeler

Mr. Ralph Lehotsky
PO Box 2977
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-2977
(760) 934-6518

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ralph Lehotsky

Mr. Sherwood Kingsley
4159 Keystone Ave
Culver City, CA 90232-3432
(310) 836-3934

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sherwood Kingsley

Mr. Brant List
5522 Harold Pl
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-2013
(562) 714-1766

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brant List

Mr. James Roscoe
3312 Serpentine Dr
Antioch, CA 94509-5179

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Roscoe

Mr. Dennis Earley
24381 Cielo
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-2150

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis Earley

Mr. Michael Munn
8051 E Ring St
Long Beach, CA 90808-3226
(619) 517-5695

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Munn

Mr. long Hoang
8430 Onalaska Ave
San Diego, CA 92123-2829

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. long Hoang

Mr. Frank Aragona
355 San Petra Ct Apt 3
Milpitas, CA 95035-8624

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frank Aragona

Mr. Steve Sidell
1319 Loring St
San Diego, CA 92109-1908

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Sidell

Mr. John Regus
31879 Birchwood Dr
Lake Elsinore, CA 92532-2624

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Regus

Mr. Luciano Toninato
299 Shahan Dr
Cloverdale, CA 95425-3031
(707) 894-2494

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Luciano Toninato

Mr. paul Schulz
1107 Currier Ave
Simi Valley, CA 93065-5103
(805) 581-1634

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. paul Schulz

Mr. John Davids
62 Browns Valley Rd
Corralitos, CA 95076-0510

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Davids

Mr. james Rieff
9191 Mallard Ave
Fountain Valley, CA 92708-6421
(714) 981-7774

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. james Rieff

Mr. Tim Hady
859 El Caminito Rd
Fallbrook, CA 92028-3509

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Hady

Mr. Ronald Kirkeeng
18957 Center St
Castro Valley, CA 94546-2503

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald Kirkeeng

Ms. Elisabeth Vernand
378 Cruzero St
Ojai, CA 93023-3526

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elisabeth Vernand

Mr. Joseph Tickey
1804 Garnet Ave # 410
San Diego, CA 92109-3352
(858) 573-0278

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Tickey

Mr. Edward Hauser
9315 10th Ave
Hesperia, CA 92345-3443

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Edward Hauser

Mr. Harry Sillin
1570 Fernside St
Redwood City, CA 94061-2458
(650) 367-1729

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harry Sillin

Mr. paul cunningham
631 Orpheus Ave
Encinitas, CA 92024-2613
(760) 753-2782

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. paul cunningham

Mr. Nicholas Ardagna
547 Otis St
Chula Vista, CA 91910-4309

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Nicholas Ardagna

Mr. Ricky Williams
505 Tunney Pl
Santa Rosa, CA 95403-7764

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ricky Williams

Mrs. Lynda Tickey
1804 Garnet Ave # 410
San Diego, CA 92109-3352
(858) 573-0278

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Lynda Tickey

Mr. Tim Chambers
481 Talbot Ave
Santa Rosa, CA 95405-4536
(707) 490-2508

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Chambers

Mr. Steven Ramon
13531 Lanning Dr
Whittier, CA 90605-2510
(562) 464-7514

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steven Ramon

Mr. Terry McGee
1314 Gerry Way
Roseville, CA 95661-3431
(530) 906-3430

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Terry McGee

Mr. Russell Brand
8826 Chestnut Roan Way
Alpine, CA 91901-2784

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Russell Brand

Mr. Don Furber
1945 Golf Course Rd
Bayside, CA 95524-9022

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Don Furber

Mr. Chad Lapes
37 Dawnwood
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694-0302

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Chad Lapes

Mr. kelly bailiff
5337 hwy 116 n
sebastopol, CA 95472

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. kelly bailiff

Mr. Denny Kaneoka
1424 W 173rd St
Gardena, CA 90247-5714
(310) 951-7670

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Denny Kaneoka

Mr. Joseph Bricker
1469 Majestic Ln
Brentwood, CA 94513-6546

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Bricker

Mr. michael cortese
3028 Marston Way
San Jose, CA 95148-3118
(408) 723-4209

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. michael cortese

Mr. samuel popescu
13231 Foxley Dr
Whittier, CA 90602-3505
(562) 900-7457

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. samuel popescu

Mr. Dan Osgood
4873 Algonquin Ct
San Diego, CA 92130-2757
(858) 481-6284

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dan Osgood

Mr. Geoffrey Graves
1439 Terrace Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651-2813

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Geoffrey Graves

Mr. HOWARD REED
2014 Teodoro St
Placentia, CA 92870-2036
(714) 926-3266

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. HOWARD REED

Mr. Kevin Mowery
19201 Sonoma Hwy #213
Sonoma, CA 95476
(707) 321-3986

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kevin Mowery

Mr. Page Stieringer Sr.
12684 Galaxy St
Victorville, CA 92392-9733
(760) 951-9300

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Page Stieringer Sr.

Mr. Larry Isenberg
15217 Folger St
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745-2138
(626) 968-8049

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Isenberg

Mr. mike daley
1332 Piland Dr
San Jose, CA 95130-1339
(408) 985-4357

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. mike daley

Mr. Ron Semenza
287 Esteban Way
San Jose, CA 95119-1516

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron Semenza

Mr. Garry Conner
31241 Silverset Rd
Acton, CA 93510-2152
(661) 803-1696

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Garry Conner

Mr. Marc Schmidt
2173 Ridgewood Dr
Eureka, CA 95503-6671

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marc Schmidt

Mr. Steven Green
3070 W Del Monte Dr Apt 33
Anaheim, CA 92804-1704

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steven Green

Mr. Sean Barnett
717 Hanley Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1926

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sean Barnett

Mr. Richard Tippett
100 Zils Rd
Watsonville, CA 95076-1901
(831) 768-4994

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Tippett

Mr. Brian Kibler
11278 Los Alamitos Blvd
176
Los Alamitos, CA 90720-3958

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Kibler

Mr. Tracy Ueda
3608 W Haack Ct
Elk Grove, CA 95758-4512
(916) 683-1030

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tracy Ueda

Mr. David Pedreira
17525 Langton Way
Hayward, CA 94541-1413

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Pedreira

Mr. Cathal McPeake
1033 Holly St
Alameda, CA 94502-7037
(510) 710-3074

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Cathal McPeake

Ms. Elisabeth Vernand
378 Cruzero St
Ojai, CA 93023-3526

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elisabeth Vernand

Mr. marvin chow
6895 Joshua Dr
Prunedale, CA 93907-8942

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. marvin chow

Mr. Alex Meguerditchian
28202 Tamarack Ln
Santa Clarita, CA 91390-4222

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alex Meguerditchian

Mr. Matt Richards
869 Glenwood Dr
Sonoma, CA 95476-3221

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Richards

Mr. Neal Smith
846 Maria Ave
Spring Valley, CA 91977-5114
(619) 962-2250

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Neal Smith

Mrs. Laura Anadon
PO Box 32
556 Foxen Lane
Los Alamos, CA 93440-0032
(805) 714-2582

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Laura Anadon

Mr. Tom Bailey
9353 Rolling Acres Ct
Orangevale, CA 95662-2800

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tom Bailey

Mr. Joseph Juane
2829 White Acres Dr
San Jose, CA 95148-3697
(408) 223-1807

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Juane

Mr. Joseph Ryan Juane
2829 White Acres Dr
San Jose, CA 95148-3697
(408) 223-1807

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Ryan Juane

Mr. Gary Louie
4941 Gentian Ct
San Jose, CA 95111-3918

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Louie

Mr. Mark Whipple
4164 N Dante Ave
Fresno, CA 93722-9127
(559) 275-6868

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Whipple

Mrs. Domenica Juane
2829 White Acres Dr
San Jose, CA 95148-3697
(408) 223-1807

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Domenica Juane

Mr. Robert Ramos
PO Box 293
Pinole, CA 94564-0293

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Ramos

Mr. Robert Smith
23809 Victory Blvd
West Hills, CA 91307-3153

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Smith

Mrs. Lena Smith
23809 Victory Blvd
West Hills, CA 91307-3153

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Lena Smith

Mrs. Erin Smith
1190 Royal Ave
Simi Valley, CA 93065-3328
(805) 210-1472

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Erin Smith

Mr. Tom Roberts
542 Leafhaven Ln
Windsor, CA 95492-8158

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tom Roberts

Mr. John Futch
17655 Cinquez Park Rd E
Jupiter, FL 33458-3961
(561) 714-0578

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Futch

Ms. Elisabeth Vernand
378 Cruzero St
Ojai, CA 93023-3526

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elisabeth Vernand

Mr. Jeff Parks
4935 3rd St
Rocklin, CA 95677-2311
(916) 583-4783

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Parks

Mr. Larry Hagerman
PO Box 638
400 Wald CT
Crestline, CA 92325-0638
(909) 890-6496

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Hagerman

Mr. Aaron Inouye
506 Marble Arch Ave
San Jose, CA 95136-3745
(408) 261-0617

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Aaron Inouye

Mr. Aaron Inouye
506 Marble Arch Ave
San Jose, CA 95136-3745
(408) 261-0617

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Aaron Inouye

Mr. Tim Muzio
238 Lisbon St
San Francisco, CA 94112-2019

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Muzio

Mr. Dave Holsonback
45 Gilbert St
San Francisco, CA 94103-4713

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dave Holsonback

Mr. Paul Pulley
12257 Holly Ct
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670-3883
(801) 230-0892

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Pulley

Mr. Thomas MacKinney
115 Blakeslee Way
Folsom, CA 95630-4619
(916) 983-6119

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas MacKinney

Mr. David Zerga
5687 N 1st St
Apt C
Fresno, CA 93710-6246
(559) 226-1463

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Zerga

Mr. Ace Carter
PO Box 821
Pearblossom, CA 93553-0821

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ace Carter

Ms. Doris Cook
9240 Lovell Ln
La Mesa, CA 91941-4126
(619) 462-4708

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Doris Cook

Ms. Elisabeth Vernand
378 Cruzero St
Ojai, CA 93023-3526

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elisabeth Vernand

Mr. Richard Smith
13218 Monarch Palm Ave
Bakersfield, CA 93314-6520

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Smith

Mr. MICHAEL RAYCE
2071 Montauk Ct
Discovery Bay, CA 94505-9119

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. MICHAEL RAYCE

Mr. Steve Ducolon
6534 E Smokey Ave
Orange, CA 92867-2456

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Ducolon

Mr. gary pomplin
272 Chambers St
El Cajon, CA 92020-3306
N/A

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gary pomplin

Mr. Arthur Morgan
11386 Avern Way
Grass Valley, CA 95949-6579

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Arthur Morgan

Mr. MICHAEL BOWLING
10112 Paul Ave
Bakersfield, CA 93312-2337

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. MICHAEL BOWLING

Mr. Donald Homen
5304 Ashbourne Ct
Newark, CA 94560-1305
(510) 792-6946

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Donald Homen

Mr. Jim Putney
9240 Lovell Ln
La Mesa, CA 91941-4126
(619) 462-4708

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jim Putney

Mr. Daniel Westcott
1509 W E St
Ontario, CA 91762-2407
(909) 988-2202

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Westcott

Mr. Don Moffett
3076 Middleton St
Oakland, CA 94605-5828
(510) 388-6851

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Don Moffett

Mr. Nick Modesti
23339 Dalbey Dr
Valencia, CA 91355-3034

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Nick Modesti

Mr. gerardo rigor
5711 W Sunnyside Dr
Visalia, CA 93277-9269

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gerardo rigor

Mr. Larry Morris
17700 Avalon Blvd Spc 180
Carson, CA 90746-0336
(310) 818-9463

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Morris

Mr. Nick Modesti
23339 Dalbey Dr
Valencia, CA 91355-3034

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Nick Modesti

Mr. Robert Jones
6302 Lake Kathleen Ave
San Diego, CA 92119-3131

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Jones

Mr. Jim Roberson
8145 Walnut Hills Way
Fair Oaks, CA 95628-2745

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jim Roberson

Mr. Duane Winter
3400 Glendora Dr
San Mateo, CA 94403-3905
(650) 888-5125

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Duane Winter

Mr. Richard Longacre
612 Coralwood Rd
Modesto, CA 95356-1792
(209) 495-0311

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Longacre

Mr. Jim Putney
9240 Lovell Ln
La Mesa, CA 91941-4126
(619) 462-4708

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jim Putney

Mr. Raymond De Jesus
15628 Index St
Granada Hills, CA 91344-4331
(818) 271-7169

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Raymond De Jesus

Mr. Robert Hetzler
6388 Royal Grove Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-6605
(714) 969-2570

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Hetzler

Mr. Thomas Lynn
6132 Chapman Ave
Garden Grove, CA 92845-1716
(714) 893-4663

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Lynn

Mr. casey potenzone
1010 Buena Vista
Apt A
San Clemente, CA 92672-5051
(949) 468-9636

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. casey potenzone

Mr. christopher switzer
5427 Thunderbird Ln
La Jolla, CA 92037-7057

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. christopher switzer

Mr. Lamar Laub
803 Cliffside Ct
Oakdale, CA 95361-2667
(209) 848-4509

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lamar Laub

Mr. Ernest Davis
301 N Idaho St
San Mateo, CA 94401-1867

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ernest Davis

Mr. Jeff Long
1300 Bristol St N Ste 240
Newport Beach, CA 92660-2953

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Long

Mr. James Hull
7835 Tanglerod Ln
La Mesa, CA 91942-2240

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Hull

Mr. John Thompson
1224 Villaverde Ln
Davis, CA 95618-6525
(530) 757-6067

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Thompson

Mr. Terry Tifft
1589 Our Hill Lane
Woodside, CA 94062
(650) 851-4844

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Terry Tifft

Mr. william steinkamp
33795 Captains Ln
Dana Point, CA 92629-2163

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. william steinkamp

Mr. Patrick Mayer
1601 W 184th St
Gardena, CA 90248-3802
(310) 324-4559

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Patrick Mayer

Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy
1469 Sycamore Canyon Rd
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-1708
(805) 451-2212

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy

Mr. butch haynes
195 Judy Dr
Sutter Creek, CA 95685-4021

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. butch haynes

Ms. Kathy Weevie
4741Sequoia Place
Oceanside, CA 92057
(760) 941-4850

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kathy Weevie

Mr. Paul Varin
9211 Cockatoo Ave
Fountain Valley, CA 92708-6513
(714) 900-2440

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Varin

Mr. Jeff Ploshay
22586 Silver Oak Way
Cupertino, CA 95014-5621

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Ploshay

Mr. Robert Dyer
13982 Azalea Ave
Poway, CA 92064-4006

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Dyer

Ms. Kathy Weevie
4741Sequoia Place
Oceanside, CA 92057
(760) 941-4850

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kathy Weevie

Mr. Robert Ennes
1745 Fawn Glen Cir
Fairfield, CA 94534-3966
(707) 344-6600

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Ennes

Mr. victor henneken
5413 Burford St
San Diego, CA 92111-4603
(858) 373-7395

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. victor henneken

Mr. william kiehl
6171 Shawnee Rd
Westminster, CA 92683-1981
(714) 893-5231

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. william kiehl

Mr. Frederick Bennett
3713 Antelope Way
Rocklin, CA 95677-1940

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frederick Bennett

Dr. Joseph Levingston
385 N Coast Hwy
Ste B
Laguna Beach, CA 92651-0911

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Joseph Levingston

Mr. Jilber Jamgochyan
2835 Townsgate Rd Ste 102
Westlake Village, CA 91361-3041

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jilber Jamgochyan

Mr. Colin Hunt
26 Santolina
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688-5441

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Colin Hunt

Mr. tim baker
2361 Morgan Dr
Norco, CA 92860-2273

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tim baker

Mr. Michael Mark Brady
639 N Oak Ave
Pasadena, CA 91107-2432
(626) 793-9707

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Mark Brady

Mr. H. Wayne Wilkerson
19348 Siesta Ln
Valley Center, CA 92082-6838

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. H. Wayne Wilkerson

Mr. steve risk
176 Alamo Sq
Alamo, CA 94507-1931
(925) 820-4727

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. steve risk

Mr. Matthew Groff
131 Virginia St Apt A
El Segundo, CA 90245-3602
(310) 908-6051

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matthew Groff

Mr. Armando Castillo
730 Sara Dr
Oxnard, CA 93030-7680

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Armando Castillo

Mr. Ron Martin
4425 Clares St Spc 25
Capitola, CA 95010-2069

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron Martin

Mr. doug olander
7665 Clementine Ct
Orlando, FL 32819-4606
(407) 571-4576

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. doug olander

Mr. JOHN KOLSTAD
13600 Westover Dr
Saratoga, CA 95070-5136

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. JOHN KOLSTAD

Mr. Chris Wheaton
2009 Raymer Ave
Fullerton, CA 92833-2664

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Chris Wheaton

Mr. Jeff Balint
2931 McCall St
San Diego, CA 92106-3575

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Balint

Mr. John Perrine
225 Southern Rd
El Cajon, CA 92020-2742

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Perrine

Mr. Michael Price
2958 Villa Ave
Clovis, CA 93612-5019
(559) 240-6057

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Price

Mr. Richard Takacs
427 Avenida Vaquero
San Clemente, CA 92672-3612

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Takacs

Mr. Richard Stein
3200 Soscol Ave
Apt 225
Napa, CA 94558-6539

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Stein

Mr. Wayne Broadbent
70 Berkeley Ave
San Anselmo, CA 94960-1449

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wayne Broadbent

Mr. Barry Chew
16977 Grand Triassic Ln
Victorville, CA 92394-7716

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Barry Chew

Mr. Joey engel
26462 Paseo Toscana
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675-7104

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joey engel

Mr. Robert Crupper
20885 Todd Valley Rd
Forersthill, CA 96531
(530) 367-3546

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Crupper

Mr. Jerold Gansch
1470 Woodhill St
El Cajon, CA 92019-2507
(619) 579-9868

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerold Gansch

Mr. william Smith
25025 Brook St
Los Molinos, CA 96055-9609

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. william Smith

Mr. Stanley Fors
4201 Black Mountain Rd
La Mesa, CA 91941-7944
(619) 698-2116

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Stanley Fors

Mr. Robert Crupper
20885 Todd Valley Rd
Forersthill, CA 96531
(530) 367-3546

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Crupper

Dr. Robert Grissom
1911 Alice St
Santa Cruz, CA 95062-4128

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Robert Grissom

Mr. john sudac
3601 Saviers Rd Apt 2
Oxnard, CA 93033-6243
(805) 212-6706

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. john sudac

Mr. tim pike
2832 E Saint Andrews St
Ontario, CA 91761-7453
(909) 938-8712

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tim pike

Mr. Kevan Urquhart
PO Box 2612
Carmel By The Sea, CA 93921-2612

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kevan Urquhart

Mr. Gregory Chun
2845 Baker St
San Francisco, CA 94123-3207

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gregory Chun

Mr. Glenn Fukumoto
1860 10th St
Los Osos, CA 93402-2732
(650) 796-2689

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Glenn Fukumoto

Ms. Susan Wergles
48 Brisa Fresca
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688-3325

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Susan Wergles

Mr. Dennis Puccetti
632 Fairview Dr
Woodland, CA 95695-3677

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis Puccetti

Ms. Kathy Weevie
4741Sequoia Place
Oceanside, CA 92057
(760) 941-4850

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kathy Weevie

Mr. Mordy Kay
7761 Airport Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1670

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mordy Kay

Mr. Ralph Carrasco
1413 El Dorado Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062-2831

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ralph Carrasco

Mr. Craig Froley
24672 San Juan Ave
Dana Point, CA 92629-2845

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Craig Froley

Mr. MICHAEL MCINTIRE
1299 Deer Springs Rd
Sp25
San Marcos, CA 92069-9784

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. MICHAEL MCINTIRE

Mr. Michael Michalak
3344 Benton Ave
La Verne, CA 91750-3907

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Michalak

Mr. Alex Innes
2042 Angelico Cir
Stockton, CA 95207-7869
(209) 430-6163

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alex Innes

Mr. Marv Shappi
5377 Paseo Tortuga
Yorba Linda, CA 92887-2441
(714) 401-1949

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marv Shappi

Mr. gil MUNZ
99 Loch Lomond Dr
San Rafael, CA 94901-2503

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gil MUNZ

Mr. Jeff Rowland
7300 Suncreek Way
Orangevale, CA 95662-2400

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeff Rowland

Mr. Jerry O'Malley
3937 Baja Vista Dr
Oceanside, CA 92058-7975

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerry O'Malley

Mr. Jon Coley
3702 Hackett Ave
Long Beach, CA 90808-2416

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jon Coley

Mr. Christopher Serles
3860 Locust St
Chino, CA 91710-1522
(626) 806-5414

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Christopher Serles

Mr. Derek Ngayan
3540 E Dixon Ave
Orange, CA 92869-5236
(714) 334-4923

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Derek Ngayan

Mr. ARTHUR ZIMMERMAN
3721 Thornbury Way
Modesto, CA 95356-1012

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. ARTHUR ZIMMERMAN

Mr. terry chenowth
8530 Matterhorn Dr
Santee, CA 92071-3409
(619) 448-1520

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. terry chenowth

Mr. Robert Galyean
19692 Kingsley Cove Pl
Cottonwood, CA 96022-7710

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Galyean

Mr. Gary Grube
6807 Singletree Ct
Pleasanton, CA 94588-4461
(925) 484-0274

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Grube

Mr. Mike Jones
14472 Spa Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-2046

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Jones

Mr. austin morlas
1882 Montgomery Ave
Ventura, CA 93004-3141
(805) 825-9545

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. austin morlas

Mr. robert boucke
298 Garden Hwy
Yuba City, CA 95991-5564
(530) 674-1912

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. robert boucke

Mr. John Walthew
1446 Kansas St
San Francisco, CA 94107-3244

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Walthew

Mr. Jack Lightsey
10032 Connecticut Ave
Live Oak, CA 95953-2002
(209) 595-9686

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jack Lightsey

Mr. Michael Russell
19612 Feather Falls Pl
Cottonwood, CA 96022-7733

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Russell

Mr. walter wall
PO Box 2528
Santa Cruz, CA 95063-2528

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. walter wall

Mr. Charles Swann
891 Monticello Ln
Manteca, CA 95336-3768

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Charles Swann

Mr. Mike Berecochea
5750 Eberle St
Lakewood, CA 90713-1839

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Berecochea

Mr. michael regan
1268 Alicante Dr
Pacifica, CA 94044-4305

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. michael regan

Mr. Shane Hawkins
20590 Morgan Dr
Groveland, CA 95321-9605
(209) 352-7134

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Shane Hawkins

Mr. james amato
2146 W 236th Pl
Torrance, CA 90501-6050

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. james amato

Mr. Dale Kayser
2938 Quinter Way
Sacramento, CA 95835-1801
(916) 873-6588

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dale Kayser

Mr. Brian Griley
3862 Sirius Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-3061

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Griley

Mr. rob valantine
730 Owen Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-2516

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. rob valantine

Mr. Jerry Ford
6241 Warner Ave
Spc 149
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-8016
(714) 334-7548

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerry Ford

Mr. Leroy Kammerer
7075 Waterview Way
Sacramento, CA 95831-2505
(916) 424-5566

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Leroy Kammerer

Mr. Thomas Parchman
3316 Tournament Dr
Palmdale, CA 93551-5629

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Parchman

Mr. Nick Nichols
1612 Poinciana Dr
El Cajon, CA 92021-1143
(619) 258-9833

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Nick Nichols

Mrs. Laura Cuellar
7206 Mesa Cir
Ventura, CA 93003-1425

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Laura Cuellar

Mr. Douglas Grote
12030 Rockcrest Rd
Lakeside, CA 92040-4534
(619) 247-7778

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Douglas Grote

Mr. Charles Barnett
250 Boardman Rd
Ojai, CA 93023-9641
(805) 701-6317

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Charles Barnett

Mr. Anthony Wells
5809 Mark Twain Ave
Sacramento, CA 95820-3127
(916) 456-1997

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Anthony Wells

Mr. salvador lopez
373 Verdugo Ave
Pomona, CA 91767-1717

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. salvador lopez

Mr. William Cashman
420 W Bennett Ave
Glendora, CA 91741-2549
(626) 963-8862

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. William Cashman

Mr. Mike McKee
1878 Polk St
Concord, CA 94521-1314
(925) 326-5499

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike McKee

Mr. Will Ebersman
PO Box 86025
Los Angeles, CA 90086-0025
(323) 839-8349

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Will Ebersman

Mr. noel joynt
10422 Plaza Paseo Dr
Lakeside, CA 92040-2334
(619) 270-7956

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. noel joynt

Mr. Albert Wong
15208 Folger St
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745-2137

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Albert Wong

Mr. Jerry Buhlert
4825 Willowbrook Dr
Sacramento, CA 95842-2935
(916) 334-2767

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerry Buhlert

Mr. John Kaczmarek
10834 Sylvia Ave
Northridge, CA 91326-2640
(818) 621-9339

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Kaczmarek

Mrs. LESLIE MCCANN
8812 Canarsie Ave
Orangevale, CA 95662-4530

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. LESLIE MCCANN

Mr. James Long
512 N Lupine St
Lompoc, CA 93436-4854
(805) 736-6826

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Long

Ms. jenny rivas
17700 Avalon Blvd Spc 384
Carson, CA 90746-0140
(310) 944-2941

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. jenny rivas

Mr. James Long
512 N Lupine St
Lompoc, CA 93436-4854
(805) 736-6826

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Long

Mr. Richard Nyquist
3913 Tanager Dr
Denair, CA 95316-9563

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Nyquist

Mr. Mark Zimmerman
181818 Teller Ave
Irvine, CA 92612
(714) 612-0002

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Zimmerman

Mr. Edward Paul
830 Misty Hills Ln
Sebastopol, CA 95472-5029
(707) 823-8916

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Edward Paul

Mr. Lance Knaak
7562 Ellis Ave
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-1666

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lance Knaak

Mr. Charles Nelson
16321 Magellan Ln
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-3526

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Charles Nelson

Mr. craig wood
328 Grove St
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-2006
(650) 726-9014

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. craig wood

Mr. Lou Mencuccini
10 Corniche Dr Unit H
Monarch Beach, CA 92629-4034
(949) 842-2344

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lou Mencuccini

Mr. Lou Mencuccini
10 Corniche Dr Unit H
Monarch Beach, CA 92629-4034
(949) 842-2344

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lou Mencuccini

Mr. william etson
195 Graves Ave
Sacramento, CA 95838-4123
(916) 649-2180

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. william etson

Mr. William Cody
PO Box 64
West Sacramento, CA 95691-0064
(530) 219-3211

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. William Cody

Mr. Patrick Elie
412 Houser St
Cotati, CA 94931-3039
(707) 588-8033

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Patrick Elie

Mr. Julian Lee
1630 N Fuller Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90046-3560

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Julian Lee

Mr. Richard Clement
5404 Vineyard Dr
Paso Robles, CA 93446-9684
(805) 423-6048

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Clement

Mr. Rick Chalmers
21462 Andorra
Mission Viejo, CA 92692-5919

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Rick Chalmers

Mr. Ted James
2394 Shreve Ave
Simi Valley, CA 93063-3856
(805) 218-4890

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ted James

Mr. Brian Hale
11936 Lemon Crest Dr
Lakeside, CA 92040-3710

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Hale

Mr. Norm Plott
230 Boardman Rd
Ojai, CA 93023-9641
(805) 646-0341

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Norm Plott

Mr. Mark Lopez
4683 Cameo Dr
Santa Maria, CA 93455-4576
(805) 264-3325

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Lopez

Mr. Ken Carpenter
692 Oakmont Ave
Porterville, CA 93257-2049

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ken Carpenter

Mr. charles swift
5042 Sutherland Dr
Concord, CA 94521-3054
(925) 493-0982

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. charles swift

Mr. Jeffrey Plecque
9595 Winegar Rd
Redding, CA 96003-8207
(408) 921-7982

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeffrey Plecque

Mr. Kenneth Richardson
855 Manzanita St
Portola, CA 96122-9542
(530) 832-0513

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kenneth Richardson

Dr. ross rickard
1003 N 12th St
Grover Beach, CA 93433-1425
(805) 748-4410

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. ross rickard

Mr. Stephen Seeger
152 Fairway Ln
Ojai, CA 93023-3002
(805) 646-2395

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Stephen Seeger

Mr. Vernon Stroppel
25532 Senator Ave
Harbor City, CA 90710-2730
(310) 530-9804

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Vernon Stroppel

Mr. George Grochol
PO Box 273
Dunsmuir, CA 96025-0273

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. George Grochol

Mr. George Parker
3355 Clairemont Mesa Blvd
San Diego, CA 92117-1711
(707) 592-2587

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. George Parker

Mr. Donald Greer
17075 Uvas Rd
Morgan Hill, CA 95037-9139

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Donald Greer

Mr. kyle brown
22865 Alviso Dr
Perris, CA 92570-9720
(951) 207-9741

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. kyle brown

Mr. kyle brown
22865 Alviso Dr
Perris, CA 92570-9720
(951) 207-9741

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. kyle brown

Mr. James Davis
381 Vale Dr
San Jose, CA 95123-4428
(408) 281-9611

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Davis

Mr. Jack Voss
31172 Boca Raton Pl
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-2483
(949) 633-8650

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jack Voss

Mr. kevin ochsner
PO Box 356
Angelus Oaks, CA 92305-0356

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. kevin ochsner

Mr. Mike Bolton
1892 Avenida Aragon
Oceanside, CA 92056-6203

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Bolton

Mr. GEORGE wight
1800 Athens Ln
Antioch, CA 94509-6821
(925) 757-0292

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. GEORGE wight

Mr. Roger Mammon
4720 Oak Forest Ave
Oakley, CA 94561-2022
(925) 625-0590

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roger Mammon

Mr. Daniel Wheeler
3088 E Forest Lake Rd
Acampo, CA 95220-9397

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Wheeler

Mr. Charles Snell
PO Box 7114
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315-7114
(909) 866-3906

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Charles Snell

Mr. Brent Banford
231 Anita Way
Yuba City, CA 95993-7117

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brent Banford

Mr. william McAbee
663 Harrow Ave
San Mateo, CA 94402-1956
(650) 349-6855

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. william McAbee

Mr. Tyler Ingram
2055 Fox Way Apt 12
Concord, CA 94518-2975
(925) 726-5572

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tyler Ingram

Mr. Bill Bernard
21676 E Copperopolis Rd
Linden, CA 95236-9795

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bill Bernard

Mr. jeffrey puccetti
715 Revenna Way
Brentwood, CA 94513-1940
(925) 584-5333

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. jeffrey puccetti

Mr. EIICHI TAKAHASHI
6707 Trudy Way
Sacramento, CA 95831-1923
(916) 428-6209

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. EIICHI TAKAHASHI

Mr. dale michael
4712 Cameron Ranch Dr
Carmichael, CA 95608-8014

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. dale michael

Mr. John Batts
58748 Campanula St
Yucca Valley, CA 92284-9106
(760) 831-5465

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Batts

Mr. Jim Horan
PO Box 342
Sunland, CA 91041-0342

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jim Horan

Mr. robert powell
1934 Bottle Hill Ct
Cool, CA 95614-2310

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. robert powell

Mr. austin bowling
10112 Paul Ave
Bakersfield, CA 93312-2337

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. austin bowling

Mr. Edward Means
1703 Countryside Dr
Vista, CA 92081-8727
(760) 809-9639

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Edward Means

Mr. Arthur Wagner
700 Shasta Meadow Vue
Weed, CA 96094-9778
(530) 938-2646

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Arthur Wagner

Mr. David & Betty Scatena
2226 Segarini Way
Stockton, CA 95209-2331

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David & Betty Scatena

Mr. Clayton Lindsey
419 Main St
270
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-5199
(714) 809-5431

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clayton Lindsey

Mr. Clayton Lindsey
419 Main St
270
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-5199
(714) 809-5431

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clayton Lindsey

Dr. Thomas Hansen
10282 Kristen St
Cypress, CA 90630-4624

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Thomas Hansen

Mr. Pete Marino
370 Azalea Way
Vacaville, CA 95688-4305

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Pete Marino

Mr. Harold Reeser
1001 Genie Ln
Cardiff, CA 92007-1420
(760) 519-3538

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harold Reeser

Mr. Kerry Peeler
1534 Clanton Pl
San Diego, CA 92154-4800

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kerry Peeler

Mr. John Carroll
1007 Pepper Tree Ln
Fallbrook, CA 92028-4247
(760) 630-2234

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Carroll

Mr. gordon keck
37228 10th St E
Palmdale, CA 93550-6135
565-5372

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gordon keck

Mr. RON LOFTUS
3330 Ager Rd
Montague, CA 96064-9519

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. RON LOFTUS

Mr. Matt Crochet
12684 Hoover St
Garden Grove, CA 92841-4166

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Crochet

Mr. Matt Crochet
12684 Hoover St
Garden Grove, CA 92841-4166

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Crochet

Mr. Matt Crochet
12684 Hoover St
Garden Grove, CA 92841-4166

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Crochet

Mr. Glenn Foster
309 Glenwood Ct
Martinez, CA 94553-4134

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Glenn Foster

Mr. Morgan Hall
11121 Claire Ave
Porter Ranch, CA 91326-2332

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Morgan Hall

Mr. Mark Lassagne
2500 Shadow Mountain Ct
San Ramon, CA 94583-1823

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Lassagne

Mr. Ronald Barnes
705-330 Susan Dr
Susanville, CA 96130-8793
(530) 252-1717

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald Barnes

Mr. Joseph Klaker
2404 Covillaud St
Marysville, CA 95901-3216
(530) 743-6054

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Klaker

Mr. James Lakeman
4733 Tahoe Cir
Martinez, CA 94553-4427

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Lakeman

Mr. gene gembarowski
7104 Island Village Dr
Long Beach, CA 90803-4305
(562) 594-9394

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gene gembarowski

Mr. Gary Ehrlich
522 Northbrook Ct
Antioch, CA 94509-5669
(925) 754-7741

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Ehrlich

Mr. John Guerini
1172 McVeigh Way
Ripon, CA 95366-9496
(707) 696-8607

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Guerini

Mr. Joe Kuester
2198 Fawn Pl
Ventura, CA 93003-7040

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joe Kuester

Mr. Kirk McCoy
1338 E Cartagena St
Long Beach, CA 90807-3063
(562) 221-0912

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kirk McCoy

Mr. Mark Whyte
1906 Cheyenne Cir
Oceanside, CA 92056-2905

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Whyte

Mr. Trevor Blann
11103 Madrigal St
San Diego, CA 92129-1213

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Trevor Blann

Mr. Bruce Campbell
10036 Anja Pl
Lakeside, CA 92040-2730

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bruce Campbell

Mr. Ralph Hamabe
1540 Elmsford Ave
La Habra, CA 90631-6420

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ralph Hamabe

Mr. John Schmitz
39583 Pardee Ct
Fremont, CA 94538-1250

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Schmitz

Mr. Kenneth Lester
16821 Bolero Ln
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-3027

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kenneth Lester

Mr. David Highfill
3122 E Forest Lake Rd
Acampo, CA 95220-9397
(209) 329-7000

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Highfill

Mr. Dennis O'Conner
35745 Calle Nopal
Temecula, CA 92592-9436

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis O'Conner

Mr. Dennis O'Conner
35745 Calle Nopal
Temecula, CA 92592-9436

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis O'Conner

Mr. Mark Savalla
709 Pacific Cove Dr
Port Hueneme, CA 93041-2172
(805) 984-3484

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Savalla

Mr. Kenneth Mulholland
730 Durham St
La Habra, CA 90631-6717

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kenneth Mulholland

Mr. Russell Harris
6830 Middleton Ave
Hesperia, CA 92345-5766
(626) 678-5564

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Russell Harris

Mr. Homer Dieterich
4315 N Shadydale Ave
Covina, CA 91722-3331
(626) 482-9246

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Homer Dieterich

Mr. Don Myers
3769 Bookdale Blvd.
Castro Valley, CA 94546
(510) 728-8084

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Don Myers

Mr. Mark Godman
1973 Butcher Ave
Modesto, CA 95351-4501
(209) 602-3139

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Godman

Mr. Keith Moerk
1570 Hawes Ct
Redwood City, CA 94061-2764

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Keith Moerk

Mr. Joseph Pereue
4592 Hidalgo Ave
San Diego, CA 92117-2501

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Pereue

Mr. James Wiens
1482 Ridgewood Dr
San Jose, CA 95118-2940

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Wiens

Mr. frank bruder
1221 W Balboa Blvd
Newport Beach, CA 92661-1007
(949) 675-1694

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. frank bruder

Mr. Bobby Bronson
259 Longbranch Rd
Simi Valley, CA 93065-5326
(805) 581-0045

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bobby Bronson

Mr. Bobby Bronson
259 Longbranch Rd
Simi Valley, CA 93065-5326
(805) 581-0045

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bobby Bronson

Mr. Thomas Lane
8694 Beauxart Cir
Sacramento, CA 95828-4661

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Lane

Mr. charles almada
6656 Rexford Dr
Riverside, CA 92504-2132
(951) 354-6812

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. charles almada

Mr. Bobby Bronson
259 Longbranch Rd
Simi Valley, CA 93065-5326
(805) 581-0045

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bobby Bronson

Mr. Robert Lehman
8715 Big Rock Rd
Santee, CA 92071-3554
(619) 200-7528

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Lehman

Mr. Ronald A Modrall
45 Los Robles St
Napa, CA 94559-4266
(707) 815-2872

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald A Modrall

Mr. Lowell Ellis
4321 Seven Hills Rd
Castro Valley, CA 94546-2201
(510) 886-8136

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lowell Ellis

Mr. Ronald A Modrall
45 Los Robles St
Napa, CA 94559-4266
(707) 815-2872

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald A Modrall

Ms. Jennifer Arnett
324 Fordham Ave
Ventura, CA 93003-3939

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jennifer Arnett

Mr. Alex Cruz
7875 Whitewood Dr
Fontana, CA 92336-8726

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alex Cruz

Mr. Rod Powers
12883 Via Caballo Rojo
San Diego, CA 92129-3052
(858) 243-3699

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Rod Powers

Mr. David Hetherington
16643 Bernardo Oaks Dr
San Diego, CA 92128-2836

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Hetherington

Mr. Matthew White
4532 Dana Dr
La Mesa, CA 91942-8746
(619) 463-1325

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matthew White

Mr. mike isaacs
155541 lorraine way
irvine, CA 92604

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. mike isaacs

Mr. Robert Filbrun
1116 N Central Ave
Modesto, CA 95351-4807
(209) 537-1817

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Filbrun

Mr. AL FERNANDEZ
14396 Cypress St
San Leandro, CA 94579-1021
(510) 352-0441

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. AL FERNANDEZ

Mr. Harry James
2628 Nevada St
Union City, CA 94587-4315
(510) 471-1112

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harry James

Mr. keith hutchison
14210 Racine Cir
Magalia, CA 95954-9478
(530) 519-7884

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. keith hutchison

Mr. thomas burrows
3496 Windspun Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-2029

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. thomas burrows

Mr. jon christensen
109 James Burke Ave
Patterson, CA 95363-9069

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. jon christensen

Mr. Gregory Valencia
10681 Orange Blossom Dr
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730-6313
(909) 921-5168

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gregory Valencia

Mr. larry cadd
3650 Highway 128
Geyserville, CA 95441-9432

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. larry cadd

Mr. Jacob Lore
15161 Monticello Way
Morgan Hill, CA 95037-5845

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jacob Lore

Mr. Larry Chin
3761 Calle Linda Vista
Newbury Park, CA 91320-1920
(805) 390-1315

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Chin

Mr. Steve Arendt
4041 Spectrum Way
Shingle Springs, CA 95682-9362

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Arendt

Mr. Gary McNaught
914 S Gilbert St
Fullerton, CA 92833-3617

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary McNaught

Mr. Patrick Howard
5059 1/2 Del Monte Ave
San Diego, CA 92107-3280
(619) 222-8316

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Patrick Howard

Mr. Bill Takakuwa
1118 W 186th St
Gardena, CA 90248-4115

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bill Takakuwa

Mr. Brent Kearney
388 Al Bahr Dr
El Cajon, CA 92021-3801
(619) 729-7564

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brent Kearney

Mr. Thomas Coss
2707 Cathedral Cir
Brentwood, CA 94513-5154
(925) 699-1699

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Coss

Mr. Wayne Berg
8616 Comanche Ave
Winnetka, CA 91306-1113
(818) 700-8770

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wayne Berg

Mr. James Burmeister
973 Vale Terrace Dr Ste 106
Vista, CA 92084-5253
(760) 630-3052

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Burmeister

Mr. Mark kutlik
8 blvd. terr.
novato, CA 94947

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark kutlik

Mr. Philip Keyser
12101 Cherry Dr
Waterford, CA 95386-9468

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Philip Keyser

Mr. Paul Graham
190 N 5th Ave
Monrovia, CA 91016-1912
(626) 226-7231

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Graham

Mr. Christopher Hudson
1736 N Hacienda Dr
Ontario, CA 91764-1652

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Christopher Hudson

Ms. john molla
15016 Avenida Venusto Unit 167
San Diego, CA 92128-3852

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. john molla

Mr. Hal Dewalt
1907 Winding Oak St
Lodi, CA 95242-4466
(209) 333-7807

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Hal Dewalt

Mr. Hal Dewalt
1907 Winding Oak St
Lodi, CA 95242-4466
(209) 333-7807

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Hal Dewalt

Ms. Diane Shoff
4580 French Creek Rd
Shingle Springs, CA 95682-9708

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Diane Shoff

Mr. David Canclini
5288 Holman Rd
Stockton, CA 95212-2709

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Canclini

Mr. Dave Aspacio
10757 Glendover Ln
San Diego, CA 92126-5924

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dave Aspacio

Mr. Ronald J. Giachello
1507 Juanita St
Napa, CA 94559-4351
(707) 252-6540

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald J. Giachello

Mr. Michael Doyle
1939 E Shamwood St
West Covina, CA 91791-1420
(626) 331-7119

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Doyle

Mr. Michael Souza
14345 Acacia St
San Leandro, CA 94579-1001

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Souza

Mr. Michael Souza
14345 Acacia St
San Leandro, CA 94579-1001

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Souza

Mr. Richard Storms
8248 Santiago Cir
Riverside, CA 92509-7113
(951) 322-6344

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Storms

Mr. Kort Orbach
5931 Ghent Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-4641

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kort Orbach

Mr. Ron Penix Jr
2075 Incline Dr
Lodi, CA 95242-4765

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron Penix Jr

Mr. Ronald Zwemmer
173 Coral Bell Way
Oakley, CA 94561-1876

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald Zwemmer

Mr. Mike McKenzie
6597 Cane Ln
Valley Springs, CA 95252-9547

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike McKenzie

Mr. David Stockton
4730 Eucalyptus Ave
Chino, CA 91710-9255

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Stockton

Ms. Libby Yranski
1001 N Fairfax St
Alexandria, VA 22314-1797

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time and put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Libby Yranski

Mr. Gary Lum
33 W Bonita Dr
Simi Valley, CA 93065-2904

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

The DTSC has provided NO scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

STOP KICKING THE PEOPLE THAT ARE PAYING FOR THE CONSERVATION OF OUR FISH AND WILDLIFE. IF NOT FOR THE HUNTERS AND ANGLERS FOOTING THE BILL FOR THE PAST 100 YEARS IN THE FORM OF EXCISE TAXES AND LICENSE FEES THERE WOULD BE NOTHING LEFT TO PROTECT.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Lum

Mr. James S. Miller II
16455 Ladona Cir
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-2133
(626) 824-1033

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,

James S. Miller II, CPA

Mr. Luke Lum
1633 Kitchener Dr
Sunnyvale, CA 94087-4133

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to over-regulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Luke Lum

Mr. Bria Bravo
3621 N Palm Ave
Fresno, CA 93704-4721
(559) 801-8304

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

California has among the highest cost of annual sport fishing licenses, additionally the cost to enter lakes and parks add up which doesn't include provisions, gasoline the state mandated sales tax on all the fishing equipment bought and used. CA is on the verge of completely removing fishing from it's offering of outdoor activities not to mention the current taxation to reintroduce the now diminished salmon due to farming it's a well know fact to locals that the San Joaquin River.CA's second longest fresh body of water is polluted with DDT the chemical pesticide that is very likely going to stimey the efforts and we can all watch our tax dollars die in vain while I'll have to go back and shop for new state regulated tackle.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bria Bravo

Mr. Alan Breininger
10225 Los Nopalitos
Lakeside, CA 92040-2201

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not been shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest pastimes. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alan Breininger

Mr. Dan Curtis
3321 Antoinnette Ct
Arcata, CA 95521-4854

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past times. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dan Curtis

Mr. Randl Rivera
PO Box 41103
San Jose, CA 95160-1103

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sport fishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to over regulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainable enjoy our sport.

Please carefully consider the above and use discretion!

Sincerely,
Mr. Randl Rivera

Mr. Jack Van Nest
14468 Corte Lampara
San Diego, CA 92129-3818

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport. It amazes me that people like you have nothing better to do to justify your existence than make up problems. Stop wasting the taxpayer's money with this nonsense.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jack Van Nest

Mr. Mark Alexander
!3 Camino alto
Millbrae, CA 94030

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I feel very strongly against the proposed attempt to ban lead in fishing gear. Being that 99.999% of ALL households in the United States have lead used to solder their copper pipes that supply their drinking & household water, then this should/would be the FIRST place to eliminate lead. I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Alexander

Mr. Stephen Lorack
307 Correas St
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-1808

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

I fish both in fresh water and in salt water. When fishing in fresh water, I already use tin weights to limit lost lead in fly fishing waters. However, in the ocean, lead is an important tool for fishing, and has less impact in a salt water environment.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Stephen Lorack

Mr. Jim Locke
511 Willow Glen Dr
Lodi, CA 95240-0511

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing au nd either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jim Locke

Mr. Dennis Schwander
5042 Nighthawk Way
Oceanside, CA 92056-5450

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to over-regulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

This is another case of one size regulation does not fit all. If scientific research shows lead particles accumulating on fresh-water stream beds of spawning Salmon and Steelhead in some of the "wild rivers and streams," this may indicate some need to regulate the use of lead for tackle utilized in these specific areas. This new rule could be included in the fishing regulations, much in the same way as barb-less hooks are required for anglers in some of the waters of the State of California. However, I fish in the Pacific Ocean, from a sport fishing boat, where it's close to mile deep. I do not believe that use of lead or cadmium sinkers in the Pacific Ocean while fishing in this massive pool of salt water has any identifiable effect on lead increase in the natural environment.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis Schwander

Mr. Robert Smentkowski
9351 Asbury Cir
Westminster, CA 92683-6508

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear Sirs and madams;

This is not about 'lead'--it is an inroad into banning fishing. The ultimate goal is to ban all fishing, commercial and recreational. This is a first step on that path.

While lead in its elemental form is harmful, lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or to animal populations. The EPA recently denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts. Do know where most tin & tungsten are mined? Do you know the environmental effects of ten-fold increases in the use of each? Be careful what one wishes for.

On top of my family's pastime quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs. Who is going to make up the revenue lost from licenses and the taxes on gear? We know it won't be the 'freeloaders' who do not currently contribute any revenue although they wish to limit fishing.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted, extra legal ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We must put an end to attempts to regulate recreational fishing out of existence and protect the rights of citizens who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Best regards,
Mr. Robert Smentkowski

Mr. Tom Reeve
11680 Wills Creek Rd
San Diego, CA 92131-3702
(858) 695-2597

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

With what justification do you seek to raise the cost of my efforts to provide my family with healthy fresh food by fishing? Every regulation costs money. but this proposed set is just inexcusably expensive with no proven benefit. STOP NOW!!!

Additionally your efforts will COST California money as people with stop buying licenses and excise tax sales will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment.

This unwarranted ban needs to STOP!! One of our greatest freedoms -- the right of common people to fish in their waters is threatened by this proposed action. These proposed regulations encourage and advance a return to a situation when only the rich nobles were able to harvest wild food --- we don't need a regressive return to feudal Europe. Support freedom for common people like me, and STOP these regulations!!!

PLEASE, in the public interest put an end to attempts to overregulate
recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably
enjoy providing food for our families and recreation for ourselves.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tom Reeve

Mr. Wolfgang Gielisch
1832 Berry Ct
Fremont, CA 94539-5161
(510) 651-6506

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

You have enough problems in this state to concern yourself with - this is NOT one of them.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wolfgang Gielisch

Ms. Wendy Tochihara
5921 Par Cir
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-2735

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that DTSC's Work Plan was based on chemistry, toxicology & ecology, wouldn't it make sense to prioritize by high volume users like the auto industry, beauty industry & the electronics industry? Most everyone I know owns a vehicle, cell phone and computer, that is what should be at the top of the list, not lead fishing tackle. Why is fishing gear one of the top 7 on DTSC's priority product work plan? Compared to the auto, beauty and electronics industry fishing should be at the bottom of their list.

Also DTSC's own CalEPA has determined that the use of lead fishing tackle does not constitute "An unreasonable risk of injury to health or environment". Lead fishing products should be a non issue!

What research has been done in the state of California? Where is the science, where is the proof that lead sinkers are killing our waterfowl in California? If loons, ducks, geese, coots etc are dying of lead sinkers there should be evidence from the toxicology reports. Our rights are being violated once again. The evidence and science should not be the burden of the fishing community. Lead fishing products should be a non issue!

What is the real reason behind listing lead sinkers and lead fishing gear on DTSC's priority work plan?

This is just another attempt by the the Center for Biological Diversity and other non fishing and hunting organizations to stop fishing and hunting in California. Lead sinkers do not pose an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. Lead fishing products should be a non issue!

Today California businesses are highly regulated, lead manufacturers test their employees every six months for lead poisoning and due to the regulations it is safe to work with. If you shut down our manufacturers you will create an unintended consequence. Kids and adults will make

their own sinkers in their homes, melting lead tire weights and any other lead they can find, inhaling toxic fumes and causing more harm to humans and the environment.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Ms. Wendy Tochihara

Mr. Terry Wood
1801 Blossom Crest St
Bakersfield, CA 93314-9286

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to over regulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

P.S. I also prospect and remove more lead from rivers streams. Allow suction dredges and we will clean the rivers for you

Sincerely,
Mr. Terry Wood

Mr. Joseph Trupiano
729 Muirfield Ave
Simi Valley, CA 93065-5636

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Trupiano

Mr. Douglas Corrigan
2591 Elk Valley Rd
Crescent City, CA 95531-9328
(707) 460-0166

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.
This law if passed is unenforceable. I Will continue to use lead to ocean fish. Nothing's else will work at a reasonable cost. I KNEW this was next after lead was banned from hunting. I know you beuracrats don't give a damn but you are forcing me to leave this state along with my spending power and tax dollars.

Sincerely,
Mr. Douglas Corrigan

Mr. Thomas Jordan
8234 Saint Clair Ave
N Hollywood, CA 91605-1327
(818) 767-0299

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in
fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Lead has been used for over a century and yet now all of a sudden there is a threat. Again, where is the science.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Jordan

Mr. Thomas Jordan
8234 Saint Clair Ave
N Hollywood, CA 91605-1327
(818) 767-0299

Oct 10, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in
fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Lead has been used for over a century and yet now all of a sudden there is a threat. Again, where is the science.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Jordan

Mr. steve conklin
22751 El Prado Apt 6210
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688-3836

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S.Ok Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. steve conklin

Mr. Mark Navas
3458 Hazelnut Ct
Simi Valley, CA 93065-7206

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

THIS IS ANOTHER UNNECESSARY ATTACK BY ENVIRO'S AND THE EPA WHO ARE OVER REGULATING THINGS THAT HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

THERE IS NO PROOF THAT BANNING LEAD, EVEN IN HUNTING AMMO, HAS HELPED THE ENVIRONMENT. IT HAS HOWEVER FORCED INDUSTRY AND PRIVATE BUSINESS TO SPEND MILLIONS TO COMPLY AND PUT MANY OUT OF BUSINESS, AND FOR WHAT???

STOP THIS CONSTANT ABUSE AND OVER REGULATION NOW!!!!

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications insportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Navas

Mrs. L C Horan
PO Box 342
Sunland, CA 91041-0342

Oct 11, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I've retired now and can finally spend as much time fishing as I want to. I'm teaching my grandkids how to fish too. Who knows, someday they may NEED to know this skill to feed themselves.

This plan to ban metal fishing equipment is ridiculous! Will you next ban using worms for bait because they will be an endangered species?

It is time that California's Department of Toxic Substance Control started paying attention to the facts before they go off half-cocked again. I'd like to see some credible reports on the causes and effects of fishing on California water resources. And not some one-time, spot checks on one or two waterways either. Just the facts, M'am.

Before you rule on this matter and take away one of the great joys of leisure time, not to mention destroying the related industries, use your heads and stop trying to sell us another line like the one that said if we do away with incinerators, the smog would go away.

Sincerely,
Mrs. L C Horan

Mr. Jose Salazar
586 Elvis Dr
San Jose, CA 95123-4834

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Now that it's been made more expensive to hunt by banning lead ammunition with no scientific evidence, not do the same with our fishing gear.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jose Salazar

Mr. James Kunkle
1900 Beechwood Ave
Fullerton, CA 92835-2225

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to over regulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Kunkle

Mr. Richard Burnett
15739 Whispering Woods Trl
Redding, CA 96001-9781

Oct 12, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will drastically reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs. Without these funds programs such as habitat restoration will be greatly reduced.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past times. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Burnett

Mr. David Collins
1068 Arden Dr
Encinitas, CA 92024-5102

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

The proposed regulations smack of a political ploy foisted by anti-fishing advocates to slowly but gradually eliminate the sport of fishing in California. I have no proof of this, but apparently, it is equal to the amount of proof that exists supporting the notion that lead from fishing products is detrimental to the environment. Responsible regulation in this case must be based on science that is accepted by a majority of professional experts in the special areas effected by the regulation.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past times. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Collins

Mr. John Havemann
PO Box 308
Calpella, CA 95418-0308

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

At this time, we all know that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not been shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations.

In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment.

This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Havemann

Mr. ThunderBear Ochoa
4721 Oakfield Ave
Santa Ana, CA 92703-1508

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

It is beyond comprehension that big government allows fluoride in
our drinking water and tooth paste when it has already been established
(by the EPA) that it does little to nothing for teeth but can be deadly
on human beings. Now you are proposing banning many items in our tackle
boxes! When will this all end?
I haven't complained much as license fees soar through the ceiling
since I feel the moneys go for programs that promote fish habitats and
management yet you continue to attack fishermen at their very core.
Shouldn't you be focusing on poaching of all wildlife besides fish? I
would venture to guess that more fish and birds have been lost to
poaching than what little items we have in our tackle boxes.
Get your act together and begin doing your job!
The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or
materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the
environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect
one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to
attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of
anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.
ThunderBear Ochoa

Sincerely,
Mr. ThunderBear Ochoa

Mr. Frank S
1650 Cerra Vista Dr
Hollister, CA 95023-6524

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frank S

Mr. David Tietz
6620 Madison Ct
Rocklin, CA 95765-5863

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

I do not believe a ban on lead material is warranted without scientific evidence that is harmful to our health and the environment.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Tietz

Mr. Brad Montgomey
445 Elm St
Woodland, CA 95695-3917

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sport fishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brad Montgomey

Mr. jay koo
11002 Ivy Hill Dr
San Diego, CA 92131-3902
(858) 547-8704

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. jay koo

Mr. Michael Hinch
168 Pheasant Ln
Newcastle, CA 95658-9416

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Hinch

Mr. Thomas Carlisle
24 Sycamore Ln
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274-3422

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Carlisle

Mr. Stan Wilson
1508 W College Ave
Visalia, CA 93277-2306

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Stan Wilson

Mr. Larry Rogers
5187 College Ave
Riverside, CA 92505-3147
(951) 359-4041

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Rogers

Mr. Bill Hays
18750 Vasquez Ct
Salinas, CA 93908-9603
(831) 455-8464

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bill Hays

Mr. Mark Strumwasser
8033 Paseo Arrayan
Carlsbad, CA 92009-6962
(760) 594-1452

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Strumwasser

Mr. Thomas Current
277 Redwood Way
Goleta, CA 93117-1022

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Thomas Current

Mr. John Zicari
7013 Claire Ave
Reseda, CA 91335-3822

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Zicari

Mr. brian sasahara
27273 Camp Plenty Rd Apt 95
Canyon Country, CA 91351-2638

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. brian sasahara

Mr. Frank Ledesma
1380 Sawtooth Dr
Hollister, CA 95023-5178

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frank Ledesma

Mr. Christopher Jones
726 B St
Taft, CA 93268-3716
(661) 765-2367

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Christopher Jones

Mr. Gregory Corrigan
1509 S Center St
Redlands, CA 92373-7008

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gregory Corrigan

Mr. Raymond Weiss
!537 Bonnie Bluff Ct.
Encinitas, CA 92024

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Raymond Weiss

Mrs. Carolyn Weiss
!537 Bonnie Bluff Ct.
Encinitas, CA 92024

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carolyn Weiss

Mr. Michael Mulvehil
8061 Paseo Arrayan
Carlsbad, CA 92009-6963

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Mulvehil

Mr. Francis Dodd
3289 Sweet Dr
Lafayette, CA 94549-5368

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Francis Dodd

Mr. mike hall
58 Cloverleaf Cir
Brentwood, CA 94513-1437

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. mike hall

Mr. Andrew Gonzales
15617 Sylvanwood Ave
Norwalk, CA 90650-6322
(562) 868-3172

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Andrew Gonzales

Mr. James Labbe
2207 Shoshone Cir
Danville, CA 94526-5549

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Labbe

Mr. Gary Higgins
3090 Northcross St
Yuba City, CA 95993-8532

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Higgins

Mr. Ronald Shikashio
301 Sirena Del Mar Rd
Marina, CA 93933-4307

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ronald Shikashio

Mr. Rick Wood
3662 Seascape Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92649-2520

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Rick Wood

Mr. Mike Preston
582Wendy Lane
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(949) 646-1742

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Preston

Mr. Mike Preston
582Wendy Lane
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(949) 646-1742

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Preston

Mr. Mike Preston
582Wendy Lane
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(949) 646-1742

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Preston

Mr. Mike Preston
582Wendy Lane
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(949) 646-1742

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Preston

Mr. Mike Preston
582Wendy Lane
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(949) 646-1742

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Preston

Mr. Trevor Oudin
PO Box 5069
Avalon, CA 90704-5069

Oct 13, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Trevor Oudin

Mr. Jeffery Horton
36W 12 Street
36W 12 Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
(805) 238-5312

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeffery Horton

Mr. Sonny Nguyen
962 Kiely Blvd
Santa Clara, CA 95051-5091

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Sonny Nguyen

Mr. Andrew OBrien
4807 Kenneth Ave
Santa Maria, CA 93455-4419

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Andrew OBrien

Mr. josh mull
3641 Grape Way
Chico, CA 95973-9636
(530) 519-1089

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. josh mull

Mr. Bory Hou
564 Arrowood Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95407-7575

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bory Hou

Mr. Brian Nakamua
1805 14th St
Los Osos, CA 93402-2809
(805) 234-4766

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Nakamua

Mr. Daniel Roloff
1233 Westwood Dr
Hanford, CA 93230-2628
(559) 998-4268

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Roloff

Mr. ken lovelady
1664 Maplewood St
La Verne, CA 91750-3929

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. ken lovelady

Mr. George Jercich
2191 Lariat Dr
Los Osos, CA 93402-3405
(805) 704-4425

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. George Jercich

Mr. Brian Knott
31562 Catalina Ave
Laguna Beach, CA 92651-6901
(949) 422-2090

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Knott

Mr. Benjamin Hart
2020 Bush Dr
Los Osos, CA 93402-3221

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Benjamin Hart

Mr. D R
701 Gibson Dr
Roseville, CA 95678-5719

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. D R

Mr. JAMES DREW
10305 Jimenez St
Lake View Terrace, CA 91342-6927
(323) 793-3485

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. JAMES DREW

Mr. Matt Florentino
13910 Lemoli Ave
Hawthorne, CA 90250-8213

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Florentino

Mr. Tim Lucchesi
2775 Swallowview Dr
Lincoln, CA 95648-2471

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tim Lucchesi

Mr. Wolfgang Quillin
PO Box 1238
Grover Beach, CA 93483-1238
(805) 202-8828

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wolfgang Quillin

Mr. Ryan Howell
3604 Constellation Rd
Lompoc, CA 93436-1816

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ryan Howell

Mr. Eric Tebbets
597 Los Osos Valley Rd
Los Osos, CA 93402-3123
(805) 748-6002

Oct 14, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Eric Tebbets

Mr. rex barrios
4496 Upland St
La Mesa, CA 91941-6517

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. rex barrios

Mr. Chris Barrick
3069 Bonita Woods Dr
Bonita, CA 91902-2020

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Chris Barrick

Mr. steven mcbane
2450 Shawn Dr
San Pablo, CA 94806-1665

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. steven mcbane

Mr. Michael Sabelhaus
2757 Campbell Ranch Dr
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762-8203
(916) 356-9891

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Sabelhaus

Mr. Harold Lustig
29555 Poppy Meadow St
Canyon Country, CA 91387-4423
(818) 906-8778

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harold Lustig

Mr. Mike Sorrell
14430 Searspoint Ave
Bakersfield, CA 93314-8345

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Sorrell

Mr. Jesse Poquette
821 Diamond Cir
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420-4402
(805) 481-5276

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jesse Poquette

Mr. Howard Suzuki
180 Leveland Ln Ste 4
Modesto, CA 95350-2254
(209) 402-7484

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Howard Suzuki

Mr. Richard Barnes jr
PO Box 607
Aptos, CA 95001-0607

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Barnes jr

Mr. Garet Emmerson
509 Antoinette Ct
Red Bluff, CA 96080-2270

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Garet Emmerson

Mr. Jonathan Webb
36805 Avenue 17 1/2
Madera, CA 93636-8260
(559) 579-9027

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jonathan Webb

Mr. Neil Stalnaker
6275 Lake Leven Dr
San Diego, CA 92119-3025

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Neil Stalnaker

Mr. Pedro Barajas
4091 Constellation Rd
Lompoc, CA 93436-1412
(805) 478-3200

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Pedro Barajas

Mr. Herman Robinson
721 Richmind Ct
Santa Maria, CA 93455-7133

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Herman Robinson

Mr. David Koppel
8161 Jefferson St
Lemon Grove, CA 91945-3002

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Koppel

Mrs. elizabeth wight
1800 Athens Ln
Antioch, CA 94509-6821

Oct 15, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mrs. elizabeth wight

Mr. Brian Jagger
639 Johnson Ave
Apt C
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-2407
(805) 674-2915

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Jagger

Mr. Brian Jagger
639 Johnson Ave
Apt C
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-2407
(805) 674-2915

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Jagger

Mr. MARTIN GARCIA
PO Box 552
Selma, CA 93662-0552
(559) 704-2314

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. MARTIN GARCIA

Mr. Raymond Mansolino
519 Stratford Ct
Unit I
Del Mar, CA 92014-2742
(858) 414-3590

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Raymond Mansolino

Mr. Daniel Kutner
5482 Wilshire Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90036-4218

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Kutner

Mr. Cesar teran
1636 Calle Diamonte
Newbury Park, CA 91320-2608

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Cesar teran

Mr. Ryan Putney
494 E 7th St
Chico, CA 95928-5643
(805) 909-7589

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ryan Putney

Mr. Roy Garner
9320 Maduro Ln
Atascadero, CA 93422-6801

Oct 16, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roy Garner

Mr. Michael Grzenia
2655 Grove Ave
San Diego, CA 92154-3263

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Grzenia

Mr. Kevin Ridout
7900 Cortez Ave
Atascadero, CA 93422-5237
(805) 400-9137

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Kevin Ridout

Mr. James Melillo
1405 Palm Ave
National City, CA 91950-4911
(619) 477-0385

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Melillo

Mr. James Melillo
1405 Palm Ave
National City, CA 91950-4911
(619) 477-0385

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Melillo

Mr. tim mc nicholas
339 Sumner Ave
Whitehall, PA 18052-7219

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tim mc nicholas

Mr. Alan Welch
619 Chana Way
Wheatland, CA 95692-9797
95692

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alan Welch

Mr. Mark Mason
1027 California Ave
Collinsville, IL 62234-4204
(618) 406-6194

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Mason

Mr. Paul Tiffany
225 E Douglas Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-3510
(218) 736-0274

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Tiffany

Mr. Jarrod Walton
250 Yupon St
Kountze, TX 77625-8068

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jarrod Walton

Mr. Nicholas Fitzsimmons
PO Box 553
Lyle, WA 98635-0012

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Nicholas Fitzsimmons

Mr. Daniel Walker
1711 NW 93rd Ter
Kansas City, MO 64155-7822
(816) 225-9511

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Walker

Mr. David LeVene
4520 Country Ln
Manitowoc, WI 54220-0901

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David LeVene

Mr. dick hulcher
8348 Bengalin Ave
Jacksonville, FL 32211-5116
(904) 721-3286

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. dick hulcher

Mr. Marc Gallion
4230 Amelia Ave
Lyons, IL 60534-1328

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marc Gallion

Dr. Brian Mason
220 Cumberland Dr
Morehead, KY 40351-7674

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Brian Mason

Mr. erick fuller
728 Scott Rd
Richmond, VA 23227-1136

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. erick fuller

Mr. Ross Anderson
125 W Olive Ave
Apt 220
Monrovia, CA 91016-3404
(626) 599-9610

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ross Anderson

Mr. Larry Lee
PO Box 361
Yantis, TX 75497-0361
(559) 288-2383

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Lee

Mr. David Pickell
8632 Thorngrove Pike
Knoxville, TN 37914-9392

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Pickell

Dr. Dennis Runyan
990 A St Ste K
San Rafael, CA 94901-3000

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Dennis Runyan

Mr. Jason Fookes
4055 Aspen Springs Ct
Redding, CA 96002-5151
(530) 355-7837

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jason Fookes

Mr. jim renfree
7121 Baranga Dr
Citrus Heights, CA 95621-3608

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. jim renfree

Mr. Randy Sherrick
19789 Kip Ct
Apple Valley, CA 92308-4556
(760) 617-9460

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Randy Sherrick

Mr. Clinton Long
1609 Tyler Dr
Raymore, MO 64083-8144

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clinton Long

Mr. Joseph Rotter
2214 El Dorado
Vallejo, CA 94590-3240
(510) 334-1883

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joseph Rotter

Mr. gary whitener
913 Kisker Rd
Weldon Spring, MO 63304-7345

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. gary whitener

Mr. rodney martin
1311 E Chestnut Ave
Duncan, OK 73533-6913
(580) 736-4281

Oct 17, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. rodney martin

Mr. Glenn Morey
3550 Trinas Way
Jamul, CA 91935-1644

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Glenn Morey

Mr. Cory Schell
183 Leisure Way
Vacaville, CA 95687-3417
(707) 410-7280

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Cory Schell

Mr. GEORGE MARTIN
9466 Route 242
Little Valley, NY 14755-9743
(716) 860-0445

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. GEORGE MARTIN

Mr. Robert Blecha
13509 S 33rd St
Bellevue, NE 68123-5304
(402) 292-5571

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Blecha

Mr. James Melillo
1405 Palm Ave
National City, CA 91950-4911
(619) 477-0385

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Melillo

Mr. James Melillo
1405 Palm Ave
National City, CA 91950-4911
(619) 477-0385

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Melillo

Mr. James Melillo
1405 Palm Ave
National City, CA 91950-4911
(619) 477-0385

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Melillo

Mr. john stouwie
1894 Main St
Morro Bay, CA 93442-1631
(805) 464-8173

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. john stouwie

Mr. Daniel Vance
6771 Gardenia Ave
Long Beach, CA 90805-1656
(562) 500-5188

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Vance

Mr. Corey Hamblin
1429 Longbranch Ave Apt G
Grover Beach, CA 93433-2572
(805) 720-6590

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Corey Hamblin

Mr. Joe Poms
563 Forest Ave
Paramus, NJ 07652-4741

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joe Poms

Mr. John Kenny
1526 Spring St
Paso Robles, CA 93446-2146

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Kenny

Mr. DON WORCESTER
234 Windsor Dr
Bartlett, IL 60103-5181
(630) 567-3038

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. DON WORCESTER

Mr. David Brown
886 Lagasca Pl
Chula Vista, CA 91910-8048
(619) 425-5796

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Brown

Mr. Leroy Bostick
1512 Concord Ave
Carlsbad, NM 88220-9635

Oct 18, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Leroy Bostick

Mr. Joe Kressler
663 State Route 23
Cincinnatus, NY 13040-9675
(607) 745-6721

Oct 19, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joe Kressler

Mr. John Conrado
228 Elinor St
Capitola, CA 95010-2364

Oct 19, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Conrado

Mr. Frederick Thrasher
3464 W 48th St
View Park, CA 90043-1203

Oct 19, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Frederick Thrasher

Mr. Danny Ritchea
11223 Sparrow Rd
Oak Hills, CA 92344-8960
(760) 244-4876

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Danny Ritchea

Mr. Danny Ritchea
11223 Sparrow Rd
Oak Hills, CA 92344-8960
(760) 244-4876

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Danny Ritchea

Mr. michael shafer
13986 Dobbs Ct
Magalia, CA 95954-9425
(530) 762-0209

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. michael shafer

Mr. Jamel Johnson
4800 Kokomo Dr Apt 2515
Sacramento, CA 95835-1830
(408) 832-2578

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jamel Johnson

Mr. John Stillwagon
16 E Rosemont Ave
Alexandria, VA 22301-2325
(703) 548-0759

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Stillwagon

Mr. Brian Chance
1135 W Evans Ave
Visalia, CA 93277-6328
(559) 730-7621

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brian Chance

Mr. tom brunet
2790 Freebridge St
Redding, CA 96001-3627

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tom brunet

Mr. tom brunet
2790 Freebridge St
Redding, CA 96001-3627

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tom brunet

Mr. tom brunet
2790 Freebridge St
Redding, CA 96001-3627

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. tom brunet

Mr. Paul Vertullo
4881 Avedon Rd
Moorpark, CA 93021-2420

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul Vertullo

Dr. Gary Edwards
3312 Loire Ct
San Jose, CA 95135-1067
(408) 204-7109

Oct 20, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Dr. Gary Edwards

Mr. Mark Smolak
4733 Torrance Blvd # 589
Torrance, CA 90503-4100
(424) 236-1467

Oct 21, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Smolak

Mr. Mark Smolak
4733 Torrance Blvd # 589
Torrance, CA 90503-4100
(424) 236-1467

Oct 21, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Smolak

Mr. don obradovich
15191 Willow St
Hesperia, CA 92345-2820

Oct 21, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. don obradovich

Mr. Barry Lloyd
118 Redondo Ave
Long Beach, CA 90803-2667
(562) 987-4193

Oct 21, 2014

California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Subject: Don't Ban Lead Fishing Gear

Dear California Department of Toxic Substances Control,

As an angler, I am strongly opposed to any attempts to regulate fishing equipment without any scientific justification. Fishing is more than a hobby to nearly 1.7 million people in California; it's an important economic driver, bringing $4.6 billion annually to the state. In fact, California ranks fifth in the country for the most money spent by anglers on things like fishing equipment - a boon for state and local taxes. Unfortunately, the proposed ban on lead in fishing gear and sinkers by California's Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) would negatively impact recreational fishing in the state, harm the economy and diminish funding for aquatic resource conservation. I therefore urge you to remove fishing equipment from the DTSC's list of hazardous substances.

I understand that lead in its elemental form is harmful to people and the environment, but lead in fishing gear and sinkers has a different chemical behavior and has not shown to be deleterious to public health or the productivity of animal populations. In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) denied petitions to ban lead weights, stating that lead in fishing gear did not pose unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The EPA has repeatedly turned down such proposals, citing that a national ban is scientifically unjustified and outside the agency's jurisdiction.

Additionally, while there have been several alternative materials introduced by the fishing industry, each has limited applications in sportfishing and either does not perform as well as lead or significantly increases the price of recreational fishing equipment, or both. Tin and tungsten, which are two of the most highly touted alternatives, can cost from ten to twenty times more than their lead counterparts.

On top of my hobby quickly becoming more expensive, less revenue from fishing license sales and the excise tax on fishing equipment will reduce critical funding for fisheries conservation and management programs.

The DTSC has provided no scientific evidence demonstrating that lead or materials in fishing tackle are posing a threat to public health or the environment. This unwarranted ban is a reminder that we need to protect one of our nation's greatest past time. We need to put an end to attempts to overregulate recreational fishing and protect the rights of anglers who sustainably enjoy our sport.

Sincerely,
Mr. Barry Lloyd