October 11, 2000

Pacific Fishery Management Council
2130 S.W. 5th Avenue, Suite 224
Portland, Oregon 97201

RE:  OPPORTION TO THE PROPOSED GROUND FISH REGULATIONS

Dear Council Chairman and Members:

The Del Norte County Board of Supervisors voted at its Tuesday, October 10, 2000 meeting to send a letter of opposition to the proposed ground fishing regulations.

The regulations that were adopted last year compounded the already meager lifestyle of local fisherpersons in Del Norte County and along our coastline. The new regulations would take this problem a step further and hamstring the ground fishing fleet, whom are not able at this time to make a living with current restrictions.

The fisherpersons in our area have approached this Board and requested that the quotas remain the same as last year at the very least. This Board supports that request and would ask that the cuts made to last year’s quotas be fully documented before more drastic cuts are again enforced. The Pacific Fishery Management Council Draft Groundfish Fishery Strategic Plan “Transition To Sustainability” states, “The basis for future management of the groundfish fishery relies to a very large degree on the availability of good science.” We agree. We also feel that the “good science” portion of that plan needs to be refined and implemented before the cuts and quotas are put into place.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the plan.

Very truly yours,

Jack B. Reese, Chairman
Del Norte County Board of Supervisors

BOS/klw

Cc: Kenyon Hensel
    BOS
From: CWoo411848@aol.com
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 7:33 am
To: pfm_comments@noaa.gov
Subject: ROCKFISH CLOSURE

Dear sir:
From the proposals that are in the news of late, you should consider restricting the commercial take of rockfish more so than the sport fish restriction. How can you not put more blame on the commercial take of these resources since they do most of the damage. In all fairness, put the blame on the percentage of those who do the harm.
I know the Council will not bend to the special interest group that lobbies with the most money.
Thank you
Conway Woo, D.D.S.
From Rod Cannon
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 6:24 am
To pfmccomments@noaa.gov
Subject

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologist have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneved interests?

Not too hard to figure out, eh?

Roderic S. Cannon
137 Mainsail Court
Vallejo, CA 94591
From Steve Banks
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 5:59 am
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov, baysportsmen@egroups.com
Subject California rockfish regulations

> Your science and statistics, and subsequent
> conclusions are similar to what your lame duck
> leader William Jefferson Clinton might consider
> weapons of mass destruction. Your proposal to shut
> down the rockfish and lingcod fishery in California
> is unfounded and unsupportable by any of your so
> called statistics, voodoo our otherwise. In
> addition, your scare tactic's to propose widespread
> carnage, then a reduction in legislation in order
> for everyone to "feel good" in an attempt to
> manufacture some sort of "moral victory", is
> becoming tiresome and quite frankly insulting. The
> PFMC should, as I'm sure the agency's credo
> suggests, protect and promote a well balanced
> management plan that promotes the long-term growth
> of fisheries and habitat, while at the same time
> managing the economic interests of the fisherman and
> communities that rely on the fish for their
> livelihood. Afterall, what good would a heathy
> fishery be if there were no one to benefit from it,
> whether that benefit is derived environmentally or
> economically? We would all agree that the
> groundfish populations along the Pacific coast are
> as diverse and complex as any, and require
> regulations that protect and promote that diversity
> with an eye on the future as well as today. Making
> regulatory changes and establishing widespread
> closures in areas where they do not coincide with a
> sound management plan for today and tomorrow, as
> well as your use of poorly acquired statistics and
> inaccurate conclusions is flat out wrong.
>
> My suggestion to the PFMC is to go back to the
> drawing board and design a plan that promotes and
> protects the groundfish populations of Washington,
> Oregon and California on a region by region basis.
> Using a widespread approach as you have done in the
> past without any regard for regional habitat and
> populations will never be successful and, quite
> frankly, embarrassing to the fish. Get it right or
> get out!
>
> Steve Banks

Do You Yahoo!?
Subject: Rockfish Fishing Closures

I object to further closures. You should be limiting gear to "hook and line" for commercials.
From Enjoyfishing@aol.com
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 0:18 am
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject rockfish regulations

Dear Sirs:

I do not agree with your proposal to reduce the rockfish limit or to reduce the months sportfishing for rockfish. Sportfishermens catch only 15% of the rockfish so it appears as if we are being penalized unfairly. If there must be a reduction, then I believe the commercial fishermens should bear the brunt of the reductions since they are responsible for 85% of the loss of rockfish.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
Wallace S. Woo
237 Columbus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
The longliners and drag net boats are the keys to allowing groundfish numbers to grow. You guys have got to curtail the commercial season. Let's face it, exploiting a naturally occurring subspecies for money is wrong. It is obsolete. Go ahead and thin the heard. The salty dogs can come paint for me. Furthermore, this industry should be of the government. (farmed or fished). Non target fish loss is far beyond the statistics posted. Anything coming up fifty feet or more is a goner. Whether or not it ever makes the harbor. The fish are not going to testify on their behalf any time soon. Free enterprise by humans and the well being of a subspecies has never been a good combination or result. Bag the smoke screen and come up with a hardline proposition that limits the cause, free enterprise commercial fishing.

Sincerely, Tailwalker.

http://community.webtv.net//Scottthepainters
From: Steven Peterson
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 11:52 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc: Tom@Stienstra.com
Subject: Fishing:

Dear Sir's;

It's not right to punish sports fishermen for the profits of commercial fishermen.
I urge you to not ban sport fishing or restrict it even more.

Thank You

S.K. Peterson
Roger Jeong wrote:

> The limits proposed for the rockfish and lingcod are absurd. Regardless
> of what the commercial fishery thinks, the only way to rebuild the fish
> stock(s) is to limit the commercial catch or eliminating it totally. The
> commercial fishery takes way more fish of all sizes then recreational
> fisherman, and many of the species that the commercial(s) take are
> wasted. Also when the fish do not meet the size limit, they are
> discarded dead back into the water which doesn't help the fish stock.
> This is what is wiping out most of the fish stocks.
> I propose that the commercial fishery catch be cut up to 3/4 for up
> to three years to let the fish stocks replenish and let the
> recreational angler fish for 10 months as they all combined probably
> would not catch in a 10 month period what the commercial fleet catches
> and wastes in a month.

My reference is Tom@Stienstra.com dated 22 October 2000.

My interest in this matter is that being a member of the General Public
who fishes, these new proposed regulations would effect me to the
point that I would not be able to take any Rockfish or Lingcod(s).

>
From: "Ron Phillips"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 10:40 pm
To:
Subject: Rockfish

Please don't penalize the sport fisherman for 25 years of mismanagement and over fishing by the commercial fishing industry. Who only up to a few years ago could take any size ling cod no matter how small it was and did. Last year you levied new regs. against the sport fisherman and very few on the commercial fisherman. What sense does it make to penalize the sport fisherman any more then you already have when the commercial fishing industry take 95 PERCENT OF THE FISH.
From ernie fisher
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 10:21 pm
To "Comments, Pfmc"
Subject sports fishing

hello:

I have always been anoyed by the "floating slaughter houses" called "drag boats". Many of these drag boat owners are multi millionaires, that very seldom pilot their own vessels! The slaughter goes on and on!

Now, it is my understanding that the sports fishing industry is about to be restricted even more, and the drag boats go on. RIDICULOUS!!!!!

I have a plaque on my living room wall that came from Senator Mike Thompson. It is a tribute to my late brother, Keith Fisher. Senator Thomopson closed a session of the California State Legislature in Keith's honor after his passing in 1996. Keith worked very hard with Senator Thompson to pass legislation to get the long liners off our beaches.

It appears to me, that "party boats" will soon be a thing of the past. Sport fishing will also be a thing of the past. Boat sales in California will drop drastically, insurance companies will lose policies, marinas will lose tenants, bait and tackle shops will be forced out of business, sports and boating shows will cease to operate, and most of all, our children will lose another avenue to keep them off the streets. WHAT A JOKE!!!!

BEFORE A SINGLE SPORTS FISHERMAN IS RESTRICTED, THERE SHOULD NOT BE A SINGLE DRAG BOAT IN OPERATION FROM THE OREGON BORDER TO THE MEXICAN BORDER!!!

It would be nice to know the names of the persons involved in making these ridiculous proposals and laws.
What is the "data" they refer to? Who supplies it?
It sounds like a whole lot of incompetence involved.

Sincerely,

Ernie Fisher
PO Box 275
Gualala, Ca
95445
707-884-1003

Do You Yahoo!? Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE. http://im.yahoo.com/
From Jim Martin
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 9:40 pm
To
Subject Proposed Rockfishing Regulations

Letter to the PFMC Council
re: nearshore rockfishing regulations.

I speak for dozens of local recreational fishermen in the Fort Bragg area who oppose any further reduction of bag limits, area closures, seasonal closures.

The time is now to directly deal with the live rockfish commercial fishery, as in the United Anglers proposal to limit the gear to hook and line.

I am shocked that nothing in the PFMC's proposed regulations speaks directly to the commercial live fishery, beyond a seasonal closure applying equally to sport and commercial access.

I oppose limiting entry into the commercial fishery, which by closing out competition would only reward the boats that caused the crisis in the first place.

The simple, enforceable gear restrictions will create natural "closed reserves" in the kelp beds that are currently being swept by traps.

Sincerely,

-Jim Martin
POB 2420, Ft. Bragg, CA 95437
(707) 964-8326
From Roger Jeong
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 9:35 pm
To pfmcomments@noaa.gov
Subject Rockfish and Lingcod Fishing Limits

The limits proposed for the rockfish and lingcod are absurd. Regardless of what the commercial fishery thinks, the only way to rebuild the fish stock(s) is to limit the commercial catch or eliminating it totally. The commercial fishery takes way more fish of all sizes than recreational fisherman, and many of the species that the commercial(s) take are wasted. Also when the fish do not meet the size limit, they are discarded dead back into the water which doesn't help the fish stock. This is what is wiping out most of the fish stocks.

I propose that the commercial fishery catch be cut up to 3/4 for up to three years to let the fish stocks replenish and let the recreational angler fish for 10 months as they all combined probably would not catch in a 10 month period what the commercial fleet catches and wastes in a month.

Sincerely,
Roger Jeong
4056 Park Blvd.
Palo Alto, CA 94306
jeong@ix.netcom.com
From: Ron Pimentel
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 9:23 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: ROCKFISH CLOSURE

stop the dragnetting

stop the commercial netters

stop the longliners

stop the screwing the sportfisherman

commercial boats do 90 percent of the damage, they should be shut down 90 percent of the time.

the first people who should be pulled off the water are the netters, who have the ability to kill everything in their path

if this shutdown occurs "Boycott of all hunting and fishing in California"

HAVE SOME COURAGE AND DO THE RIGHT THING
From "James Pendergast"
Date  Monday, October 23, 2000 9:05 pm
To "Pacific FisheriesManagement Council"
Subject  Forwarded story from eXaminer.com - Monday 10/23/00

This story from http://eXaminer.com was forwarded to you by James Pendergast (jependergast@vom.com):

I am not a sport fisherman, but I do believe in the logic expressed in Tom Stienstra's column: that those who do the most damage to fish populations should be the most restricted. We have passed the point where we can go on with "business as usual." Businesses that do great harm must be restrained.

Sports anglers may soon be cast adrift

Remember the Wizard of Oz? Remember how the Wizard hid behind a curtain and then created illusion, smoke and bellowing speeches to fool Dorothy and Co. into meek obedience?

Well, just like the Wizard, a few government spin doctors are doing the same thing right now to the people of California.

* Read the rest of the article at:  
  <http://www.eXaminer.com/001022/1022stienstra.html>

Catch full coverage of Bay Area news, sports, entertainment, technology and more at:  
<http://eXaminer.com>
From: ABRYFEN@aol.com
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 9:03 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Rockcod fishery

I wish to register my protest to your proposed groundfish management measures in the San Francisco Bay area. You, and the California Dept. of Fish and Game seem to let the drag boats and long liners do anything they want with no limitations. How about protecting our fishery for a change? Why punish the sport fishermen? It is the draggers and long liners that are destroying the fishery. Austin B Fenger
Tiburon Ca 94920
From: "Wruck, Jim D"
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 8:36 pm
To "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov"
Cc "Tom@Stienstra.com"
Subject Proposed Regs

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my strong concern about your proposed groundfish management measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. This is where the problem exists. Please turn your attention there.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). The two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, which offer residents the chance to pursue their hobby, will be put out of business.

The rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Please do not make our sportfishery a distant memory - turn your attention to the problem.

THX

Jim Wruck
Jim.D.Wruck@icn.siemens.com
Greetings,
I understand that there is a proposal that you are considering that would severely limit sport fishing of rockfish, while allowing commercial netting. I am extremely opposed to this action. For years the commercial interests have depleted fishing stocks in massive numbers, having been allowed to remove virtually all of the fish in an area. Sport fishers have always removed far fewer numbers of fish, leaving most to grow and reproduce. In almost every instance of fish depletion it has been caused by commercial fishing.

Now you want to severely limit sport fishing, which has low impact on fish, but allow commercial netting to continue. This makes no sense to me.

Please make the logical choice and severely limit the commercial take of rockfish. Control the most damaging methods of fishing. Then, if you must, restrict sport fishing until the species can recover.

Thank you for your consideration.
Will Risseeuw
817 Seminole Way
Redwood City, CA 94062
From: JamSpnnr@aol.com
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 7:36 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: ling cod closure

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed
measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay
Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock
depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game
has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and
long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight
of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught
by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished
bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in
certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private
boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate
adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea
bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of
groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen
or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a
chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod
and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own
biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the
Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone
who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say
that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample
catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the
Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from
the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for
many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of
large moneymed interests?

Not too hard to figure out, eh?

Sincerely,
James Kennedy
2353 Joanne circle
Napa, Ca. 94958
EMAIL JamSpnnr@aol.com

P.S. I personally take about 8 ling cod a year.
From KeikiLani98@aol.com
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 7:47 pm
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc Tom@Sienstra.com
Subject Re: Sport Fishing Regulations

PFMC
1230 SW. 5th Ave.
Suite224
Portland, Or.
97201

To Whom It May Concern:

Dear Sirs,

In regard to your proposal to limit sport fishing along the northern California coast, please understand that it is the commercial drag boats, not the sports fishermen, who destroy the sea beds and reek havoc on the coastal ecology.

A case in point, I, several times a year, climb down a cliff in Marin and fish off my favorite rock. I have been doing this since 1970. In the beginning, myself and friends caught good size sacks (10-14) of fish including Red Snapper, Ling Cod, Cabazone, Greenling (sea trout) and various rock cod. Al the years have gone by the sacks have gotten smaller and the variety of fish has decreased. (No red snapper, and few cabazone). Also, One fog-shrouded morning a drag boat was working extremely close to shore (less than 400yrds). If this is the case on the one occasion I happened to be out there, how many other times was a boat or boats working drag nets in so close? In any case, in my own casual estimation, since the advent of drag boat fishing, the fish populations have decreased.

I find it appalling that my fishing license was $6.00 in 1970 now costs over $20.00, I am charging extra for abalone and now my infrequent, but dear, visits to the Marin coast is going to be government regulated. No, Thank You.

Respectfully,
John Olson
(Brisbane, CA.)
To Whom It May Concern:

Having been a fishing and camping enthusiast along the California coast for the past 20 years, I was shocked to learn of your agency's decision to ban sport fishing. I really can't believe that sport fishing has been a major factor in the depletion of the fish population.

I hope that the industry responsible for this crisis is held accountable and is required to make any possible restitution. I also wonder if this situation could have been foreseen given our experience in the Grand Banks and other former fishing grounds.

Couldn't commercial fishing have been regulated or banned before we reached this critical stage?
Thank You,
Drew Olson
(Brisbane, CA.)
From "Kent"
Date Sunday, October 22, 2000 11:30 pm
To
Subject wake up and get rid of the long liner

----- Original Message -----
From:
To:
Sent: Sunday, October 22, 2000 6:02 PM
Subject: Weekend Report

> The Summary:
> The Pacific Marine Fisheries Council has decided to close the taking of
> lingcod from Pt. Conception to the Oregon border as of November First. We
> were expecting to get kicked in the teeth at this outfit's meeting the
> last
> day of this month and the first few days of November but the PMFC is
> seemingly poised to kill off all sport fishing for all species of rockcod
> unless your outcry is heard.
> >
> > Many of you may have read Tom Stienstra's column in today's Examiner. For
> > those who have not, here it is. I urge you to email and/or fax these folks
> as
> > per the directions at the end of Tom's article below. Updated information
> to
> > Tom's piece have the taking of lingcod shut down on the first of November,
> > and then a six-month closed season on rockfish and lingcod from the first
> of
> > the year to June 30. The details of a limited season for the rest of the
> year
> > will be decided at the meeting next week. Mike Aughney is writing his take
> on
> > this travesty that will be up on USAFishing. com in an hour or two this
> > evening.
> > >
> > "Sports anglers may soon be cast adrift
> > by
> > TOM STIENSTRA EXAMINER OUTDOORS COLUMNIST
> > Oct. 22, 2000
> > >
> > REMEMBER the Wizard of Oz? Remember how the Wizard hid behind a curtain
> and
> > then created illusion, smoke and bellowing speeches to fool Dorothy
> > and Co. into meek obedience?
> > >
> > Well, just like the Wizard, a few government spin doctors are doing the
> same
> > thing right now to the people of California
> > >
> > When you clear away the smoke, this is what is going on: The biggest
> fishing
> > shutdown in history along the California coast is about to be rammed down
> your throat in order to cover up 25 years of failure to restrict commercial
> > netters and long-liners.
> > >
> The government is proposing to close sportfishing for rockfish for four to
> six months a year along the central and northern California Coast, and to
> reduce the limit to as low as three rockfish per person (and no higher
> than nine) and one lingcod.
> >
> > For 25 years now, fishermen, wildlife lovers and hard-core enviros alike
> have
> > protested how commercial fishermen have tried to clean out the ocean. The
> > commercial boats often drag nets that are like vacuum cleaners, hang
> > gillnets
> > that are miles long, and set miles-long lines with thousands of hooks. In the
> > process, they have killed marine birds, sea otters, marine mammals, juvenile
> > fish, and non-target fish species in their mission to kill every rockfish
> > they can get their mitts on.
> > >
> > Each year, commercial fishermen take 85 to 90 percent of catch, leaving
> sport
> > anglers for the rest. Though fast-growing rockfish are flourishing, others
> > that are slow-growing, such as canary rockfish, cow cod, and bocaccio, are
> > being fished out by the netters and long-liners.
> > >
> > This is what is logical: Since the commercial boats do 90 of the damage, they
> > should be shut down 90 percent of the time. And if sport anglers are
> > responsible for 10 percent of the catch, they could stand being reduced 10
> > percent of the time. From last year’s sport limit of 15 and year-round
> > season, that would mean a 13-fish limit and 11-month season.
> > >
> > And doesn’t it make sense that the first people who should be pulled off the
> > water are the netters, who have the ability to kill everything in their path?
> > That’s not how the Wizard sees it. Under the proposal, while the sport
> > anglers get shut down, the drag netters would be allowed to continue to try
> > to clean out our coast. The Wizard argues that new commercial quotas will
> > reduce the harvest by 50 percent, and that severe sportfishing cutbacks are
> > necessary in order to “share the pain,” the mantra of the Pacific Fisheries
> > Management Council.
> > >
> > Share the pain? Your worst enemy has caused a train wreck, and yet you -
> the
> > healthy one - are scheduled to have your legs amputated. And remember the
> > line from the Wizard of Oz: “Pay no attention to that man behind the
> > curtain.”
> > >
> > You have one chance to defeat this. At the end of this month, Oct. 31 to
> Nov.
> > 3, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council will hold a hearing in
> Vancouver,
> > Wash., then review data and options, and make their decision - a landmark
> moment.
> To make the deadline for public comment, write by Tuesday to: PFMC, 2130 SW
> Fifth Avenue, Suite 224, Portland, Oregon 97201, fax them at (503)
> 326-6831,
> or access their Web site at www.pccouncil.org, where an e-mail link is
> available at pfmc.comments@noaa.gov. You can copy me at Tom@Stienstra.com.
> As for more mundane matters, the winds that have raked the East Bay
> Hill's,
> the Bays and most of the rest of this end of California the last two days
> had
> surprisingly little effect on Big Briny. A couple of boats from Emeryville
> made it up to Drake's Bay yesterday for limits of rockcod and a few lings
> while four boats from Berkeley fished inside Duxbury Buoy for near limits
> of
> salmon. Much the same today. The wind on the Bay is a torment to all that
> fish there but those on the coast are getting by in breezes to 15 knots and
> seas that have fallen to about eight feet by this afternoon. Tomorrow the
> coastal waters will be fishable for most everybody and Tuesday looks even
> better.
> Boats from Half Moon Bay and Santa Cruz have stayed off the water all
> weekend
> and nothing is planned until a tuna tip on Wednesday aboard the Wild Wave
> from Santa Cruz. Yesterday was too scary for the Bodega Bay boats and their
> clients but the New Sea Angler went out today for 25 limits of rockfish from
> a fairly mellow sea and will be running lingcod specials every day for the
> rest of the month. The Golden Gate fleet sailed a relatively sheltered sea
> today in the lea of Bolinas and other Marin Coast obstacles. Way up North,
> the Rumblefish from Fort Bragg went up to Shelter Cove yesterday for and
> got
> nine rockfish per rod and a dozen or so lingcod in shallow water.
> Trollers had limits today and moochers got better than a fish to the rod.
> This extraordinary salmon fishing is making up somewhat, for the tribulations
> suffered in July and August. Striped bass were hitting like gangbusters on
> the Bay yesterday. The Happy Hooker from Berkeley had 25 bass and several
> halibut at red Rock and South Hampton Shoals. The wind turned the bay into
> a
> bucket of brown during the night and folks fished the Raccoon Straits for
> a
> few bass or gave it up to go outside for salmon today.
> Western Boat & Tackle reported a few salmon were caught this morning at
> California City but most anglers chose to get rocked off the Marin Coast
> rather than getting their asses kicked big time on the shoreline of Tiburon.
> Shoreline fishers we doing pretty well with bullheads and grass shrimp at the
> Loch Lomond Jetty and at China Camp today and did even better along the
Napa
> River and around the corner in Suisun Bay. Yesterday this writer saw a
couple
> of dozen keeper bass taken on the incoming tide at U.C. Maritime including
a
> 36" semi-hawg.
>
> Mitten crabs have been plaguing both those in boats in Suisun Bay and
> plunkers along the Vallejo waterfront. One way of getting away from the
angst
> and angry words prompted by interface with these beasties, is to use a
bobber
> from a boat. Keep your bullhead a foot or so from the bottom and let him
move
> around to avoid the crabs. From shore, hook up a small bobber half way up
> your 3 foot leader leave your line slack, again -- to allow your bait to
> avoid being gutted by crabs, mitten or otherwise.
>
> So, please take the time to send a message to the Pacific Marine Fishery
> Commission and tomorrow well be back with a check on those who sell bait
> around the North State and other fishy reportage.
>

> Bet Bets for the Tomorrow:
> Salmon outside the Golden Gate near Duxbury Buoy
> Salmon on the Sacramento River just south of Sacramento and in the lower
> American River
> Striped bass in Northern San Pablo Bay, along the Shoreline of the Napa
River
> and Suisun Bay up past Rio Vista on the Sacramento River
> Trout at Eagle Lake and Lake Davis
>

> Today's Reports:
> Bodega Bay
> The New Sea Angler had 25 limits of rockfish today.

> The Golden Gate Fleet:
> > From Emeryville: The New Salmon Queen had 15 salmon to 25 for 14 folks
while
> > the pounds while the C-Gull II got 20 salmon to 23 pounds for 16 people.
The
> > Captain Hook began fishing a muddy Bay before getting 14 salmon to 10
pounds
> > and 16 rockfish for 20 folks. The New Huck Finn had 25 limits of rockfish
and
> > 10 lings to 15 pounds at Drake's Bay. The Eldorado, the New Easy Rider and
> > the Eldorado 3 from Berkeley combined for 40 limits of salmon to 36 pounds
> > today. The Sausalito boats stayed home.

> The Bays:
> The Happy Hooker managed 8 bass today.

> The Lake Camanche Fishing Report
> October 22:
> Overall rating: Good
From Fishtalegale@aol.com
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 9:58 am
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject re: rockfish/lingcod

Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
Portland, Oregon 97201

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The longliners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Banks and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneyed interests?

Not too hard to figure out, eh?

Sincerely,

Kim Gale
From: Leon Ross  
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 10:09 am  
To: pfmccomments@noaa.gov  
Cc: Tom@Stienstra.com  
Subject: rockfish sport fishing

PFMC:

Gentlemen:

I consider it to be completely illogical for you to restrict the sports fisherman as proposed to less than 4 to 6 months/year and a limit of 3 fish/person while at the same time allowing those who are primarily responsible for the problem, the commercial fishermen, to continue to over fish the waters. Please reconsider your proposals as the sports fisherman is being hit a disproportionate amount.

L. D. Pete Ross  
138 White Chapel Drive  
Benicia, CA 94510  
707-745-0155  
peterross@earthlink.net
From: jkronert@pacbell.net
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 10:52 am
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: cod

since com. fishing is taking 90% of the catch, they should have 90% of the restriction of the catch. thank you. jack kronert
From Leonard Jagelski
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 11:25 am
To "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov"
Subject groundfish strategic plan

Gentlemen,
It has come to my attention that a proposal is under consideration to reduce the Sports fishing quota for Groundfish at a level equal to the reduction proposed for Commercial fishermen and I would like to say this strategy is flawed and unacceptable in many ways. Not only is there great disparity in the volume of catch, and the ability to target species between the sports/commercial groups, but changing the quota will also make this type of fishing unfeasible from a sportfishing perspective and there is too much industry at stake around sportfishing to allow this change. I have fished on Party boats out of ports in Monterey, Santa Cruz, Half Moon Bay, Emeryville, San Francisco, Sausalito, Bodega Bay and others, and I think this gives me a good background to comment on what a day on a party boat is like. There is a great deal of effort involved in getting up at 4 - 5am, being on the boat by 6:00am, staying out until 2:00 or 4:00pm and then coming home. And to do so for 3 or 5 fish, it just doesn't make sense. The whole nature of the trip has changed from getting enough fish to last for a few months to a few meals. Besides that you lose the opportunity to spend a day out on the water with your family. I have spent enough time going out that I am partners with a friend on a boat that we can take our family's out on now. Fishing rockfish in deep water means that whatever you pull up will die because of the pressure change, so catch and release fishing is out of the question. That means you can't throw back select Boccacio or Cow cod, it's too late when you get them to the surface.
The point I'm trying to make is further reductions in sportfishing will change the nature of a trip in a way that makes it totally unfeasible. The impact will be felt in areas around it including tackle shops, boat/engine manufacturers, Party Boat skippers, and it will take away another form of recreation for families. Compared to the damage from incidental catch from long liners, the sheer volume of commercial - which only measures legal take vs sport catch, and the reasons I mentioned earlier, it just doesn't make sense to penalize the sport fisherman for a problem that commercial fishermen do the most damage in. If you are talking about fish stocks, focus on the impact on fish stocks. That means look at the take from the commercial and apply the remedy based on the take.
Sincerely,

Len Jagelski
From "Philip Havlcek"
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 12:33 pm
To
Subject proposed rock cod closure

Dear Sirs, Why does the sport angler constantly have to pay for regulations that allow a select few, (commercial interests), to abuse stocks of fish along the pacific coast? As with most species of fish, the commercial harvest of rock fish accounts for approx. 80% of the take and also targets slow growing fish while not allowing for the rejuvenation of the stocks. We see smaller and smaller fish. The sport anglers on the other hand, account for a relatively small percentage of the annual take, yet always bear the brunt of the regulations. These same anglers pump millions of dollars into the local economies where they live in boat sales, gas, tackle, tax and other expenditures. Why target the many when it is the few who exploit the resource.
I am a homeowner, boatowner and tax payer living in San Francisco.
Sincerely, Philip Havlcek
Your science and statistics, and subsequent conclusions are similar to what your lame duck leader William Jefferson Clinton might consider weapons of mass destruction. Your proposal to shut down the rockfish and lingcod fishery in California is unfounded and unsupportable by any of your so called statistics, voodoo our otherwise. In addition, your scare tactic's to propose widespread carnage, then a reduction in legislation in order for everyone to “fell good” in an attempt to manufacture some sort of “moral victory”, is becoming tiresome and quite frankly insulting. The PFMC should, as I'm sure the agency's credo suggests, protect and promote a well balanced management plan that promotes the long-term growth of fisheries and habitat, while at the same time managing the economic interests of the fisherman and communities that rely on the fish for their livelihood. Afterall, what good would a heathy fishery be if there were no one to benefit from it, whether that benefit is derived environmentally or economically? We would all agree that the groundfish populations along the Pacific coast are as diverse and complex as any, and require regulations that protect and promote that diversity with an eye on the future as well as today. Making regulatory changes and establishing widespread closures in areas where they do not coincide with a sound management plan for today and tomorrow,as well as your use of poorly acquired statistics and inaccurate conclusions is flat out wrong.

My suggestion to the PFMC is to go back to the drawing board and design a plan that promotes and protects the groundfish populations of Washington, Oregon and California on a region by region basis. Using a widespread approach as you have done in the past without any regard for regional habitat and populations will never be successful and, quite frankly, embarrassing to the fish. Get it right or get out!

Andy Guiliano
To whom it may concern, I've been fishing in local waters on party boats since I was twelve yrs old. I agree that the fishing isn't like "the good ole days" but I never have had a complaint about the increase in fishing license fees and reduced bag limits until now. Time after time the sport fisherman has paid the price for the commercial fishing fleet. Everyone needs to make a living including the owners of sport fishing boats who take far less than a commercial fleet. Why can't the commercial fishery make a sacrifice this time? We've seen halibut, crab, rockfish, salmon, lingcod limits reduced over the years and who knows what's next. I feel more $$ and effort should be spent on research and law enforcement before we deny the sportsmen and his or her children the opportunity to enjoy our beautiful coast line. Thank you John Katich
From: "John Berry"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 1:20 pm
To:
Cc: "RickyBerry",
Subject: Rockfishing

I understand the Pacific Fisheries Mgmt Council is proposing to close sport fishing for rockfish for four to six months along the central and northern California coast, and to reduce the limit to as low as three rockfish per person (and no higher than nine) and one lingcod.

I further understand that commercial rock fishermen will not be affected.

Can you make these changes more fair so that both sport fishermen and commercial fishermen will be equally affected. Do you have figures to show rockfish taken by each group, and wouldn't this be a fair way to set limits.

Thank you,

John F. Berry
Hi Folks,

This is my vote that YES the restrictions for rock fish fishing should be on the commercial fishing industry and not the sport fishers! And YES, I certainly do mean it should be on the commercial fishers. It is obvious beyond words that the commercial fishers cause the vast bulk of the damage and so regulating them would do the most good the fastest.

Regulating the sport fishers in this case is like putting out a forest fire by spitting on it. It would be a total waste of time and effort.

Thank you for listening.

Regards,

Mike Jagelski
56 Lucky Dr.
Greenbrae, CA 94904
415-924-6280
From "Bob Alvarado, District Mgr."

Date Monday, October 23, 2000 2:25 pm

To

Subject rockfish closers in northern california

dear sirs,

once again a proposal is being put forth by this council that completely
defies any logic, or just plain common sense, at all. to penalize
sportfisherman with a closed season and lower limits yet continue the
commercial netting in the same waters is foolish at best and only reinforces
the idea that government doesn't have a clue. please reconsider this
decision and come up with an alternative that makes some kind of sense,
something that doesn't make this process look as inept and biased as it now
seems. thank you.

bob alvarado
3797 pinole valley road
pinole, california 94564
510-758-8968 home
510-758-0755 fax
Hi Folks,

This is my vote that YES the restrictions for rock fish fishing should be on the commercial fishing industry and not the sport fishers! And YES, I certainly do mean it should be on the commercial fishers. It is obvious beyond words that the commercial fishers cause the vast bulk of the damage and so regulating them would do the most good the fastest.

Regulating the sport fishers in this case is like putting out a forest fire by spitting on it. It would be a total waste of time and effort.

Thank you for listening.

Regards,

Mike Jagelski
56 Lucky Dr.
Greenbrae, CA 94904
415-924-6280
Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I do not fish for rock cod and similar species I want to register my disapproval at the draconian measures you are possibly about to undertake directed at the sport fisherman by drastically cutting back on the allowable limit of rock fish. I believe that since it is the commercial fishing industry that causes the majority of the damage to the fish stocks and they should bear the brunt of the cutback in proportion to the percentage of the total catch that they take.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon Dunn

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at http://www.hotmail.com.

From Titan Truck Racks
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 2:35 pm
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc rtreanor@dfg.ca.gov, jduffy@dfg.ca.gov
Subject nearshore fishery/UA proposal

Dear PFMC and others,

I've been diving the California coast for 31 years, sometimes spearfishing and often with hunting with just a camera. I stopped spearfishing, pole fishing and buying fish altogether about 3 years ago, due to the amazing reduction in all species normally hunted. I just can't bring myself to kill something that needs desperately to live and breed to sustain an existence. Therefore I'm very much in favor of the commercial gear restriction proposal submitted by the United Anglers of Southern California. This proposal was submitted by USAC's Legislative Committee Chairman Mike Malone.

Thank you,

Steve Howe, Mendocino, Ca.
As has been the case in the past, the sports angler takes it on the chin for the numerous sins of the long-liners and seiners scouring the ocean's bottoms. Enough already. If there is a shortage of certain species of fish - and I don't doubt that there is - blame it on - and initiate legislation to thwart - the culprits. Not the easy scapegoats!!!!!!!
Dave Reichel
avid ocean/bay sports fisherman for forty years
From BeeVolson@aol.com
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 3:47 pm
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc Tom@Stienstra.com
Subject RE: Sportfishing closes

How can you possibly think of closing sportfishing for rockfish. You all must have fallen off the branch of the tree in the recent wind storm. This is idiotic, especially when you allow drag nets and gillnets to continue being dropped into the waters.

Penalize commercial fishing habits, not those of us who continually fish just for ourselves and never take all that we are able to. We only take what we can use in a short time and I am sure that many other do the same. NO on your closings!!!

Bobbie and Ed Volson
P O Box 1033
North Highlands, Ca 95660
beevolson@AOL.com
From: "Jim Hamrick"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 4:26 pm
To: 
Subject: Rock fishing

I am against further restrictions imposed on sport anglers fishing for rock fish. Commercial fisherman are responsible for the decline and should be restricted accordingly to bring the population back to appropriate levels. Please leave the sport fisherman alone and focus your efforts on the Commercial fisherman as they are the ones responsible for the decline!
From "wed"

Date Monday, October 23, 2000 4:30 pm

To

Cc "Andy Guilliano" , "Steve Risk"

Subject Rockfish/Lingcod closures and limits

Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am writing in protest of your proposal to reduce the season and bag limit of rockfish and lingcod for sport anglers. I am deeply concerned that your proposed changes unfairly impact sportfishermen while allowing the continued overharvest of these species by the commercial sector.

Recent studies suggest that the sportfishing sector (all factions included) generates exponentially higher economic benefit per fish than that provided by the commercial sector, while only harvesting 10% of the take for the species in question. In addition, fishing methods used by sportfishermen are clean and species specific, creating virtually no extraneous environmental impact or bycatch. Use of trawling equipment, gill nets and longlines by the commercial industry create substantial negative impacts to non targeted species and the marine environment. Regardless of the pressures placed upon you by the commercial fishing lobby, it is irresponsible and negligent to allow them to continue the overharvest of this resource in such a manner. It is, in my opinion, ludicrous to even consider effecting the changes you are suggesting.

Please base your proposals on accurate scientific data, DIRECTED AT SPECIFIC POPULATIONS (rather than the broad brush you are using for "West Coast Fisheries") with the ultimate goal of preserving and protecting the species and marine habitat. Punishing sportfishermen for the crimes perpetuated by the commercial industry over the past several decades is unacceptable.

Sincerely,

William E. Dutra
1800 Glenhaven Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA  94595
From: "Al Piszczatowski"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 4:40 pm
To: 
Subject: Longlining

After what has happened to the pelagic fisheries in the Atlantic Ocean how can any responsible advisory council even think about allowing longlining in their jurisdiction.

The Pacific Fishery Management Council should call the councils on the east coast and request a report about the state of the pelagic fishes and how badly these councils have managed these waters.

Longlining should be outlawed, and eventually will be outlawed.

Al Piszczatowski
11 Sheppard Street
Glen Head, NY 11545-1815
Email: PluginFool@NetZero.net
From: Jyhiro@aol.com
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 5:08 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc: tom@stienstra.com

Subject: Closure of rockfish season

The proposed closing to sportfishing of the rockfish season for four to six months and the lowering of the catch limit will not be a positive step in the management of that fishery. Penalizing the sportfisherman and the sportfishing industry will not increase the rockfish population. Sportfishing only accounts for a small percentage of the total catch.

Commercial fishing by drag nets and long liners are the real culprits that need to be controlled.

Please make reasonable and considerate decisions with regard to the sportfisherman.

Thank you.

Jerry Yahirso
From  Fishtalegale@aol.com
Date  Monday, October 23, 2000 6:33 pm
To    pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject rockfish proposals

Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
Portland, Oregon 97201

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneyed interests?

Not too hard to figure out, eh?

Kim Gale
920 B Yrk St.
Vallejo, CA 94590
From  DaBelch@aol.com  
Date  Monday, October 23, 2000 7:11 pm  
To  pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
Subject  Pacific Fishery Management Council  
To whom it may concern:  

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.  

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.  

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.  

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?  

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.  

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneyed interests?  

GLEN BELCHER  
617 Foothill Drive  
Pacifica, CA 94044
From "Bill Asbell"
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 7:24 pm
To
Subject Sport Fishing

Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
Portland, Oregon 97201

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneymed interests?

Not too hard to figure out, eh?

Bill Asbell
135 Tarry Rd.
San Anselmo, Ca.
From: "Jane M. Mathis"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 7:24 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Public Vs. Commercial Fishermen

I am very much against your plan for rockfish and lingcod. I think it is very unfair to the general fishing public and biased toward the commercial fishermen. Please don't go through with it.
From: "Dick Slavens"
Date: Monday, October 23, 2000 7:51 pm
To:
Subject: Ground Fish Management

Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
Portland, Oregon 97201

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish & Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area and private sportfishing boats, that regularly offer folks a chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catches taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneymed interests?

Richard G. Slavens
1939 Wilkins Ct.
Napa, CA
94559
From Curt Degler  
Date Monday, October 23, 2000 10:20 pm  
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
Subject Comments on Fishing regulation changes  

Dear Council,

I am a sportsmen, tax payer and conservationist and am outraged at your proposal. I say "Shut down the commercial fishing industry until they learn to control their activities and place them in harmony with nature"

Curt Degler  
POB 784  
Santa Rosa CA 95402  

> REMEMBER the Wizard of Oz? Remember how the Wizard  
> hid behind a curtain and then  
>  
> created illusion, smoke and bellowing speeches to fool  
> Dorothy and Co. into meek obedience?  
>  
> Well, just like the Wizard, a few government spin doctors  
> are doing the same thing right now to the people of  
> California.  
>  
> When you clear away the smoke, this is what is going on:  
> The biggest fishing shutdown in history along the  
> California coast is about to be rammed down your throat in  
> order to cover up 25 years of failure to restrict commercial  
> netters and long-liners.  
>  
> The government is proposing to close sportfishing for  
> rockfish for four to six months a year along the central and  
> northern California coast, and to reduce the limit to as low  
> as three rockfish per person (and no higher than nine) and  
> one lingcod.  
>  
> For 25 years now, fishermen, wildlife lovers and hard-core  
> enviros alike have protested how commercial fishermen  
> have tried to clean out the ocean. The commercial boats  
> often drag nets that are like vacuum cleaners, hang gillnets  
> that are miles long, and set miles-long lines with  
> thousands of hooks. In the process, they have killed  
> marine birds, sea otters, marine mammals, juvenile fish, and  
> non-target fish species in their mission to kill every  
> rockfish they can get their mitts on.  
>  
> Each year, commercial fishermen take 85 to 90 percent of  
> the catch, leaving sport anglers for the rest. Though  
> fast-growing rockfish are flourishing, others that are  
> slow-growing, such as canary rockfish, cow cod, and  
> bocaccio, are being fished out by the netters and  
> long-liners.  
>  
> This is what is logical: Since the commercial boats do 90  
> percent of the damage, they should be shut down 90  
> percent of the time. And if sport anglers are responsible
> for 10 percent of the
> catch, they could stand being reduced 10 percent of the
> time. From last year's sport limit of 15 and year-round
> season, that would mean a 13-fish limit and 11-month
> season.
> 
> And doesn't it make sense that the first people who should
> be pulled off the water are the netters, who have the ability
> to kill everything in their path? That's not how the Wizard
> sees it.
> 
> Under the proposal, while the sport anglers get shut down,
> the drag netters would be allowed to continue to try to
> clean out our coast. The Wizard argues that new
> commercial quotas will reduce the harvest by 50 percent,
> and that severe sportfishing cutbacks are necessary in
> order to "share the pain," the mantra of the Pacific
> Fisheries Management Council.
> 
> Share the pain? Your worst enemy has caused a train
> wreck, and yet you - the healthy one - are scheduled to
> have your legs amputated. And remember the line from the
> Wizard of Oz: "Pay no attention to that man behind the
> curtain."
> 
> You have one chance to defeat this. At the end of this
> month, Oct. 31 to Nov. 3, the Pacific Fisheries
> Management Council will hold a hearing in Vancouver,
> Wash., then review data and options, and make their
> decision - a landmark moment.
> 
> To make the deadline for public comment, write by
> Tuesday to: PFMC, 2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
> Portland, Oregon 97201, fax them at (503) 326-6831, or
> access their Web site at www.pcouncil.org, where an
> e-mail link is available at pfmc.comments@noaa.gov. You
> can copy me at Tom@Stienstra.com.

--

The Plight of California's Reef Fish

From  Travis Seaton
Date      Tuesday, October 24, 2000 8:08 am
To        "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov"
Subject   Fishery Management Council
Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224,
Portland, Oregon 97201

To whom it may concern:

I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposed
measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco Bay
Area. Your proposals are punitive to the sector that has least affected
stock depletions of several varieties of rockfishes along the coast of California.

For years now, your organization and the California Department of Fish &
Game has turned a blind eye to the operating methods of commercial drag boats and
long liners. These operations have shoveled more than three times the weight
of dead rockfish back into the ocean as incidental catch than has been caught
by sport vessels, made up of private and party boats.

The long liners and drag boats have targeted and consequently over-fished
bottom dwelling species such as bocaccio, canary rockfish and cow cod in
certain areas along the Northern California Coast. Party boats and private
boats fishing in the Gulf of the Farallons, Cordell Bank and immediate
adjacent areas have mostly targeted school fish, (olive, blue & black sea
bass) as well as lingcod and the more common bottom fish.

These sport boats annually catch less than 15% of the commercial catch of
groundfish, (not counting the incidental catch). Why then, are the two dozen
or so sportfishing party boats in the Bay Area, that regularly offer folks a
chance to supplement their diet and pursue their hobby, being shut down?

It would seem that your body has paid no heed to the fact that the rockcod
and lingcod fishery is healthier now than it has been in many years. Your
own biologists have conceded that the lingcod fishery at Cordell Bank and the
Farallon Islands is healthier now than ten or even twenty years ago. Anyone
who has been fishing rockfish in the last couple of years can truthfully say
that the school fish are larger and more plentiful now than in recent
memory.

It would appear that your figures and proposals are coming from sample catch
es taken from areas that are not fished by sport boats and that the Council
is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest, only to that from the large
commercial operations. The sportfishers have policed themselves for many
years. Why should they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneyed interests?

Travis Seaton
25 Wildwood Lane
Novato, CA 94947
Subject: Fwd: Rockfish/Lingcod Sport Fishing Regulations
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:34:06 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rockfish/Lingcod Sport Fishing Regulations
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 01:38:52 EDT
From: Wilnormac@aol.com
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: tom@stienstra.com

TO: Pacific Marine Council

I am sending you this E-mail to voice my strong opposition to recent proposed changes to the rockfish regulations for the Pacific Coast.

While I applaud your efforts to stop overharvesting by the commercial industry, I feel strongly that these changes, as proposed, unfairly lump the sport fisherman together with the commercial industry.

The decline of the rockfishery has been known for some time, and has been brought about by a lack of oversight of the commercial industry. And now there's just too many licensed boat and too many harmful methods, drag nets, long lines.

The sportfishermen's toll on the population has been and remains insignificant as compared to the commercial industry.

So I think the restrictions applied on these two groups, the commercial industry and the sport fishing community, should reflect their proportion of total fish taken.

However your proposals will not allow me to catch a couple of fish, while I watch the commercial boats drag a death net along the coast.

Please don't make the weekend fisherman pay the price of Big Fish Inc. !

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

William McAbee
663 Harrow Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94402
E-mail wilnormac@aol.com
To the Pacific Fishery Management Council,

I don't know much about who you are, but here's a bit about who I am. My number 1 hobby, when I'm not working or trying to raise my 3 year old daughter, is fishing. I have an old Boston Whaler and I fish whenever I have some time and enough money. Sometimes I even take a few fish. I hope to someday take my daughter with me to enjoy the kinds of experiences I've been lucky enough to be a part of. So if you are really trying to improve our fisheries I appreciate your efforts. But it sounds like you are putting the brunt of your restrictions on the sport-fisherman. I'm no scientist, but even I can see who's killing most of the fish. And it certainly isn't people fishing with rod and reel. If the take needs to be restricted, reduce the draggers. Most everything in their net (regardless of size or specie) dies either in the net, on the boat, or after it's tossed back.

I need to hit the bed now so I am able to get up for work and pay taxes and buy fishing licenses. Oh yeah, and pay people like you to look after our resources.

****************************************************************************************

***************

PLEASE don't close sportfishing for rockfish while the draggers continue to rape the ocean!

***********************************************************************

***************

Eldon Cutlip
2421 Deer Ravine Trail
Cool, CA 95614
530-889-0863
To the PFMC,

This letter is to protest your proposal to use the Sport fishing fleet to do some "Feel Good" rules that will NOT do anything to help the fish populations. Commercial fishing accounts for OVER 85% of the take, so it makes sense to put the restrictions on the commercial, NOT the Sport fishing. Your failed policies have killed the tourist business here in the North Coast of California (Eureka, Trinidad, Crescent City) We have gone from over 25000 sport boats that used to come up here for the summer, and 12 to 15 charter boats, to less than 5000 sport boats, and 2 charter boats. If you reduce the sport take to the proposed 4 to 9 fish for the Sport fisherman, and don't do anything for the commercial fishing you will clearly be continuing your failed course of management, and discredit yourselves completely.

Don't punish the Sport fisherman for YOUR and the Commercial fishermans mismanagement.

W. H. Breen III
2940 Spears Rd.
Eureka, CA 95503
707-445-2114
breen@inreach.com
Dear Sirs and Madames,

I wish to strongly protest the severe limitations that are being considered by your council regarding sportfishing. I think it fair that, if sportfishing accounts for 10% of the catch and commercial the rest, then the cutbacks should be apportioned exactly as such.

Does this seem too simplistic? The simple is the only course that can lead to fairness and sanity. If you don't believe this, consider asking the fish.

Respectfully,  Michael Smith MD
Subject: Fwd: Lingcod closure
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:38:13 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Lingcod closure
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:26:27 -0700
From: Jim Paddor <jpaddor@home.com>
Organization: @Home Network
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov., TomStienstra.com@home.com

I urge you to consider the commercial take of rockfish and lingcod. Their effect on the total numbers of fish taken far outweigh the ten to fifteen percent caught by the sportfishermen. If the sportfishing for these species is to be closed, then do the same for the commercials. Thank you, James Paddor, DDS.
Subject: Fwd: Proposed rock fish closing.
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:37:55 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Proposed rock fish closing.
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:21:09 -0700
From: JAMoreau <JAMoreau@lbl.gov>
Organization: lbl
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: Tom@Stienstra.com

I am against the proposed closing of sport fishing for 4 to 6 months a year and reducing the limits on rock fish along the central and northern coast of California.
I am in favor of limiting the commercial fisherman from using drag nets, gillnets and long lines. I feel that the commercial boats do 90% of the damage so they should be reduced by 90%.
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Limiting Sportfishing for Rockfish by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:37:36 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Comments on Limiting Sportfishing for Rockfish by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:20:37 -0700  
From: <lukea@attglobal.net>  
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
CC: <tom@stienstra.com>, <NMineta@doc.gov>

Dear PFMC:

I am extremely concerned to hear that the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) is considering limiting sportfishing for rockfish on the Pacific coast. Having been a sport fisher for the past 50 years, I have never seen any serious damage done to a fish population by sportfishing. However, time and again, I have seen entire populations of fish wiped out by commercial fisherman using destructive commercial techniques.

I am deeply disturbed that the PFMC would target the sportfishing industry, which is made up of hundreds of thousands of individual fishermen, in order to benefit several hundred corporations that own the commercial boats. Your proposed action is not about helping the fish as much as it is about trying to hide the damage that the PFMC has allowed to be done by the commercial fisherman.

As a resident of San Jose, California, I will contact our former mayor, Norm Mineta, who is now the U.S. Secretary of Commerce. I want to be sure that he is personally aware of what the PFMC is doing and exactly what brought this situation about. The commercial fisherman take over 85% of the rockfish catch from the Pacific. They are the ones who are doing the damage and they are the ones on whom the PFMC should place the most stringent restrictions.

Sincerely,

Luke Alexander  
7214 Golf Course Lane  
San Jose, CA 95139  
lukea@attglobal.net  
408-578-8505
Subject: Fwd: Rock Fish Regs.
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:37:18 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rock Fish Regs.
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 11:36:18 EDT
From: KStone6779@aol.com
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: Tom@Stinestra.com

PFMC,
I have read, in Tom Stienstra column of the San Francisco Examiner that you are planning to limit even further the sport fishing take of rock cod and lingcod. I believe what I read in the paper that the commercial fisherman takes 90% of the fish and sport fisherman take 10%. Even if these numbers are off, the commercial take is much more than the sport takes. Yet you put the burden on the sport fisherman.
It is governmental acts like this that really upset me. If you are really interested in saving the rock cod limit the draggers, limit the netters and stop the inshore live rock cod commercial fishing. Limit the sport and limit the commercials by the percentage they take. Put the burden where it belongs.
Sincerely,
Ken Stone
Subject: Fwd: Rock Cod Closures
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:36:15 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rock Cod Closures
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:10:11 -0700
From: "Jim Galey" <jgaley@299e.net>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
CC: <PESIEFER@aol.com>, <Tom@Stienstra.com>, "capjak" <capjak1@jps.net>,
    <DN4BLACK@aol.com>, <F1shn2@aol.com>, "Paul Eckerman" <PEcker@ecis.com>,
    "Reid, Paul J" <paul.j.reid@intel.com>, "Robert Deslauriers" <fuzbob@yahoo.com>,
    "Scott and AMWAY" <towieds729@aol.com>, <WEBFT@Excite.com>

Dear Sirs:

I recently read of the proposed closures and reduced limits for rock cod and ling cod off the California Coast. This problem has been caused by the drag netters, and long liners. Commercial fishermen take at least 85% more fish than sport fishermen do. How about directing your efforts towards the Commercial industry where the problem resides and leave the sport fishermen alone. It will take courage to put severe restrictions on the commercial fishing industry but it MUST be done to correct the over fishing and depletion of this coastal treasury. Sport fishers with rod and reel are not the cause. They should not have to suffer further from bad commercial practices.

Respectfully,

Jim Galey
jgaley@299e.net
October 23, 2000

Pacific Fisheries Management Council

2130 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 224

Portland, OR 97201

Dear PFMC,

Re the proposed sport rockfishing restrictions: I strongly object to any more restrictions placed on sportfishermen. We are not negatively impacting these fisheries the way gillnetters and longliners do.

How you can even entertain impacting hook and line sportfishers and crippling the party boat fleet, landings, and tackle shops while the gillnetters and longliners would continue to strip mine rockfish populations?

You call yourself a "management council" so let me suggest that you "manage", that is, "restrict", those responsible for rockfish declines and leave the sportfishermen alone.

Sincerely,

Ed Migale

5 Premier Court

Chico, CA 95928
I would like to express my resentment at the proposed Rockfish closure for California. I think it is highly unfair that Long liners and Gill netters are allowed to wipe out our fisheries and that the Sport fishers are being made to pay dearly for it. I believe we all have a stake in preserving our fishery resources for the future, but allowing the wholesale take of Rockfish by commercial interests is not in the best interest of the resource. I understand that Commercial fishing takes 90% of the Rockfish and that Sportfishing takes 10%. To cut the take of Sportfishing drastically while not reducing the take of Commercial interests drastically is unfair to the sport fishing industry, sport fisherpersons, and the Fish and Game commission which will undoubtedly lose revenue due to lost license sales. Please reconsider how you are going to allocate our Rockfish. Ronald D. Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Rockfish debacle  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:34:53 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rockfish debacle  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:30:14 GMT  
From: "michael Larocco" <salmon4ever@hotmail.com>  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear sirs,
I'm not usually a very strong letter writer, but I feel I do need to make a few points clear on this, The Commercial take of Rockfish needs to be drastically curtailed along the pacific coast.. Rememember the Red Abalone down in SoCAI! Why don't we just open the North coast to abalone fishing? eh?! Fisheries are being impacted around the globe! Orange Roughie, chilean sea bass, ect.. I'M a sport fisherman, and I'm mad has hell and frankly, none of of us are going to take this shit anymore! WE spend alot of $$$$$$ to pursue the few fish WE ARE ALLOWED TO cATCH.. and this with minimum bycatch... This shit needs to stop...If people can't catch thier own they just do not to eat fish... or you as a regulatory agency...needs to protect the resource... I feel you are just a bunch of incompetent BOOObS>>> Who must shop at safeway for your daily hamburger.... MOOOO MOOO MOOOO............. I CATCH WHAT I EAT ! DO YOU? Michael a La Roccoo..........Gonzo Fisherman

P.S. I know a few people, and will encourage a no salt water fee for next fishing season! as it is a total ripp off for sport fishers! make the commercials pay! that is until all the fish to be caught are gone! your a bunch of people totally disillusioned.. from the real world..... Michael a LaRocco ( Forgat my fishing #)

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at http://www.hotmail.com.

Subject: Fwd: Equity in rockfishing  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:26:59 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov  

Subject: Equity in rockfishing  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 12:18:30 EDT  
From: Scottyaf@aol.com  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
CC: Tom@stienstra.com, JMKOK88@aol.com  

Dear folks, I am a local sportfisherman in the Bay Area of SF. Let's show  
some fairness and equity in the lowering of limits and seasonal fishing  
restrictions between the commercial long liners and the sportfisherman. I am  
certain that the few sportfishing boats that do make it out to the outer  
banks of this area cannot do much damage to a species. Certainly not the  
decimation that miles of commercial nets and longlines would do. Thank you  
for listening.  
Sincerely, Scotty Forman of Pacifica, Ca
Subject: Fwd: California Rock Cod Sportfishing  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:25:55 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov  
CC: john.coon@noaa.gov

Subject: California Rock Cod Sportfishing  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 11:49:23 EDT  
From: Scottyaf@aol.com  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
CC: Tom@Stienstra.com, jmkok88@aol.com

Dear folks, I am a local sportfisherman in the SF Bay Area. I feel the restrictions put on the sportfisherman are unreasonable and more should be placed on the commercial netters and longliners. I don't feel that I need to go into long detail but I can guarantee that there are many others out there feeling the way I do. If we are going to restrict the catch, let's do it fairly and equally.

Sincerely, Scotty Forman

Pacifica, Ca
Hi,

What in the world are you thinking of?? Why punish the sport fishermen who take only ten percent of the fish? How about limiting the commercials (especially the methods of take) instead if you want to see stocks rebound?

Please don't mess this one up.

Thanks,

Hugh S. Stickney
Oakland
Subject: Fwd: Rock Fishing
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:33:25 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rock Fishing
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 18:50:33 -0700
From: "Lyle & Julie Childers" <lyle.childers2@gte.net>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Why is it you do not stop or slow down the gill netting, and long lining first? The sports fishers are not the problem. Thank You Lyle
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Rockfish Closure  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:32:39 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Proposed Rockfish Closure  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 17:13:28 -0700  
From: "Pedro A. Contreras" <petjan@pacbell.net>  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov, Tom@Stienstra.com

Gentlemen:

I have read there is a proposal to close sportfishing for rockfish for a period of four to six months due to a decline in the rockfish population. This is unfair to sportfishermen since commercial fisherman catch much larger volumes of rockfish using nets and set lines which cover huge areas, and thus are more responsible for the decline of rockfish.

It makes more sense to enact some type of limit for the commercial fisherman since sportfisherman are already limited to 10 rockfish per person.

Sincerely,

Janet Contreras  
503 Old Farm Road  
Danville, CA 94526
Subject: Fwd: Groundfish Management Measures 2001  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:30:59 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Groundfish Management Measures 2001  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 17:06:38 -0700  
From: Byron Won <byron@california.com>  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Sirs:

It has come to my attention of plans to curtail fishing, both sport and commercial, in order to promote and save threatened fisheries of groundfish. Including, but not limited to, cow cod, canary rockfish, black-blotched rockfish, boccacio, cabezone, ling cod, etc.

It is my fervent opinion that the fisheries indeed require drastic measures to ensure their recovery and survival. However, that any diminishment of the take be performed on a percentage basis equally distributed between the sportsman take and the commercial take. In other words, let the fish trawler, drag-netters and gill-netters suffer the same percentage drop in their take as is asked of the sportsfisherman. That is the most equitable means of spreading the sacrifice to all concerned parties.

Do not allow money and commercial interests to exempt anyone from equally participating in the sacrifices necessary to save a vital resource!

Sincerely,

Byron Won
527 Grizzly Peak Blvd.
Berkeley, CA 94708-1212
byronwon@mail.com
Subject: Fwd: rockfish  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:30:42 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: rockfish  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 16:59:49 -800  
From: hmit@vom.com  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Sirs,
I have been a California sportfisherman for fifty years and have witnessed the marked decline in our sportfishing in most recent years. I believe it is poor management to allow commercial netters, long-liners and gillnets to continue without restrictions. It is most unfair to close sportfishing for 4-6 months a year to reduce the limit.
Sincerely,
Ralph T. Mitarai, M.D.
http://www.vom.com
Subject: Fwd: BOTTOMFISH
   Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:30:21 -0700
   From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
   To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: BOTTOMFISH
   Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 19:33:32 EDT
   From: Biglead@aol.com
   To: PFMC.comments@noaa.gov
   CC: Tom@stienstra.com

Not fair to the recreational fisherman, your plan on almost if not completely to cut out the fishing for bottomfish. Myself and hundreds of other fisherman who are retired and enjoy a day out on the ocean will not be able to afford the cost to go get "3" fish! The long liners are out all the time cleanig out the rock fishing areas. They take undersize fish and anything else they can kill. It is only fair to cut back on ALL commercial bottom fishing at least 90% and to the recreational group 10% to be fair!!

THANK YOU   DON MANNIS
             1582 daily ct San Leandro. Ca  94577
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Fishing Ban
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:29:59 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Comments on Fishing Ban
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 15:09:10 -0700
From: "Chantal Krey" <cpkrey@Home.com>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
CC: "Tom Stienstra" <Tom@Stienstra.com>, "Chantal Krey" <chantal1@mindspring.com>

Dear PFMC:

I would like to comment about closing the fishing for the public along the coast.

Please be reminded that fish of all types are being threatened to extinction on this Pacific coast as well as around the world due almost exclusively to commercial fishing and their "grab all you can" approach.

I urge you to reconsider and take a stand for the future by showing the world that we want the trend reversed. By putting restrictions on the commercial fleets, you can really put your mark on creating a sustainable future for both sportfishing and harvesting.

Sincerely,

Rick Krey
415-652-6631
globalrick@yahoo.com
I have been sport fishing the waters off half moon bay, ca for twenty years. I can not believe you are considering closing my fishing season for 4 to 6 months. Sport fisherman catch 10% or the bottom fish, while long liners and netters(commerical) take 90% of this catch. You say "share the pain", well I willing to share my 10%(13- fish limit & 11 month season). Commercial can share the other 90%. Why do sport fisherman always get the shaft for years of bad management on you part. Maybe we don't contribute to the political hacks that appoint you to this commission, what else can justify this ill logical behavior.

Sam English
Subject: Fwd: Rockfish Conservation
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:29:21 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Rockfish Conservation
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 12:22:26 -0700
From: John Clark <juancho@sohumm.net>
To: Pacific Fisheries Management Council <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Please consider severely limiting commercial fishing harest limits for
groundfish. Since commercial fisherman Take 85% to 90% of the harvest
annually please limit them IN an equitable way to permit sportfishermen
to continue at a reasonable rate. Note Tom Stienstra's comments as
published in the San Francisco Examiner on October 22, 2000. Thank You
John Clark PO Box 2340 Redway CA 95560  Area Code 707 923-9009
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Sport Fishing Shutdown
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:29:01 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Proposed Sport Fishing Shutdown
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 11:45:19 -0700
From: "Howard Huenergardt" <howardh@sonic.net>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
CC: <Tom@Stienstra.com>

A brief comment on the proposed shutdown. Commercial fishermen take about 90% of the fish and leave the remaining 10% to sport fishermen. I think that commercial fishermen should be shutdown in the same ratio. That is 90% and sport fishermen 10%. If commercial fishing was managed better, we wouldn't be having this problem now. Please don't shutdown sport fishing!

Howard Huenergardt
3603 Wallace Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-539-2799
howardh@sonic.net
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:28:32 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject:
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 11:38:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: jeff hoffman <jdh lax@yahoo.com>
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: Tom@Stienstra.com

Dear PFMC:

I have just read about your plan to only restrict commercial fisherman to a 50% reduction in rockfish along the California coast, while shutting down sport fishing entirely. Sport fisherman cause a very small amount of the problem. Since commercial fishing is responsible for 90% of the catch -- and therefore, the problem -- commercial fishing needs to be restricted by at least 90%. Commercial fisherman have been stripmining the oceans for decades and need to be stopped! Drag netting, gillnets, and long lines should be outlawed, as they kill non-target fish and mammals, who then die for no reason. Please save our oceans by shutting down commercial fisherman, or at least restricting them to sustainable catches that do not kill non-target species. Shut down commercial fisherman before restricting sport fishing.

Sincerely,

=====
Jeff Hoffman

132 B Coleridge

San Francisco, CA 94110

Do You Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.
http://im.yahoo.com/
so while commercial "harvesters" vacuum the sea floor and take 80%+ of all the rockfish on the coast, catching and killing secondary species on long lines and in gill nets, PFMC proposes to limit the sport anglers who take home less than 20% of the catch? let's see -- with the virtual collapse of cod and other bottom fish around New England's Georges Bank, the New England Fisheries Management Council decided to virtually close the grounds to commercial fishing factories. could this perhaps be because they were cleaning out everything in sight? surely there can be some parallel drawn to the situation off of california's coast. i urge PFMC to take a long hard look at the inherent folly of limiting sport anglers while continuing to allow commercial fishermen virtually unlimited access to our valuable coastal resources. sincerely, ken herschfield
Subject: Fwd: Upcoming Hearings: Restrict Commercial Fisherman
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:27:50 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Upcoming Hearings: Restrict Commercial Fisherman
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 10:31:46 -0700
From: Cris Wendt <ckwendt@home.com>
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: tom@stienstra.com

Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I would like to provide you with some feedback on your upcoming decision to close some of the Pacific Coast to rockfish for sport fisherman and reduce limits.

I applaud your decision to improve the Pacific Coast fisheries, but believe that any success is contingent upon CLOSING THE FISHING SEASON FOR AT LEAST 75% OF THE TIME FOR COMMERCIAL LONG-LINER AND GILLNET FISHING OPERATIONS.

Reduced quotas for commercial fisherman are insufficient. In order to sufficiently share the pain, both commercial and sport fisherman must have shutdowns, somewhat in equal proportion to their catch.

Let's also save the other victims of indiscriminate long line and gillnet commercial fisherman: birds, seals, otters, and other non-targetted fish.

Let's fix the problem now, before even more drastic actions are required later.

Regards,

Cris Wendt
Cupertino, CA

**************************************************************************

Cris Wendt
Ph: (408) 252-5143
ckwendt@home.com
Subject: Fwd: California Rockfish Closure: proposed
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 08:27:20 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: California Rockfish Closure: proposed
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 12:50:12 -0400
From: owenevan@yosemite.net
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear PFMC:

I strongly object to any proposed closures and/or restrictions regarding SPORTFISHING rockfishing in California. However, I do strongly support strict closures on COMMERCIAL rockfish fishing.

Commercial fishing accounts for at least 85% of the depletion of rockfish resources with sportfishing accounting for the remaining 15%. Since sportfishing was restricted/closed last year, it is time that commercial fishing do "its fair share".

I have observed the rather pro-commercial "bent" of the Council over the years and hope that this year's decisions will be more balanced between sport and commercial interests.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

James F. Evans
5545 Gunther Rd
Mariposa CA  95338

cc: Vice President Al Gore and Members of Congress.
Subject: Fwd: Allocation of fish stocks between recreational and commercial fishers
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:30:43 -0700
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

Subject: Allocation of fish stocks between recreational and commercial fishers
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 19:35:04 -0700
From: "Aaron Lewis" <AGRES@home.com>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
CC: <tom@Stienstra.com>

Dear Sirs:

The traditional concept of managing fisheries for maximum short term production of low cost protein has brought us to the point where even a layman can tell that the oceans have been over fished and are in trouble. We need a new paradigm for fisheries management - that of managing the oceans for maximum sustainable economic good. We need to be smarter about the economic measures of value that we use, and we need to think long term.

Commercial fisheries create most of the impact on fisheries stocks, and by traditional measures create most of the economic value from fishing. However, if we look at tourism and recreational fishing, we see that sport fishing creates much more economic value per pound of fish harvested than does commercial fishing. Recent studies put the economic value of sport fishing at on the order of $50 per pound of fish harvested. (Considering expenditures on gear, travel, food & lodging, and etc.) Looking at wholesale fish prices, it is clear that commercial fishing values fish at on the order of $1 to $5 per pound. If fish as a resource are worth on the order of $50/lb, why allocate that resource to commercial fishermen that are only able to realize an economic value that is a small fraction of the real economic value of the good? The majority of the fish should be allocated to the people that are willing to generate the most economic value from those fish; and, at this time the people that generate the most economic value from fish are the recreational fishermen. Recreational fish quotas should remain intact, and all reductions in fish quotas should come from commercial fisheries.

Commercial fishers got greedy, commercial fishing caused most of the over fishing and commercial fishermen should have their quotas entirely removed before any reductions (if, and only if, still necessary) in sport fishing quotas are made. Fish should go to the high bidder(s) which are the recreational fishermen - that is good economics.

Reducing commercial catch would reduce the amount of fish on the market, but since this fish is the product of non-sustainable practice, this food supply is going to be lost eventually. We should start now and replace it. There is a way.
We produce large quantities of hog waste in the US. This material has become a major pollutant and may be responsible damage to major fisheries. However, it is 30% protein. With the addition of oxygen and some minor nutrients, hog waste can be used to grow plankton, and krill which can be used to grow high fish quality. Three pounds of dry hog waste contain enough protein and energy to produce 1 pound (wet weight) of fish. The technology is not easy, but when it works, the process can produce high quality fish for human consumption very cheaply. Good system design requires that the nitrogenous waste from the fish be captured and use to fertilize the plankton. In this design, the effluent from the system is clean, and meets US EPA drinking water standards. The other byproduct from the process is fuel gas that can be used to run a generator.

Aaron Lewis
101 Cedar Ct.
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

(415) 713-0091
Gentlemen,

As a longtime California sportfisherman I am sick and tired of watching our local groundfish populations be decimated by commercial fishing methods. Commercials catch 90% of the fish, place 90% of the restrictions on them. I would then gladly accept a 10% reduction on sportfishermen.

Ron Bernhardt
447 Malibu court
Livermore, Ca. 94550
I understand that at an upcoming meeting (10/31-11/3), the Council will be considering changing the limits for sportfishing of rockfish and the length of the season.
I want to state I oppose the proposed closing of the season (for sportfishing) for 4 to 6 months and new proposed limits of as little as 3 fish.
I think the bulk of new limits should be placed on the commercial fishing sector, as they have down the most damage to the fishery.

sincerely, Alan Watt
Subject: Fwd: Sportfishing shutdown  
Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2000 09:31:04 -0700  
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
To: jim.glock@noaa.gov

---

Subject: Sportfishing shutdown  
Date: Sun, 22 Oct 2000 19:58:02 -0700  
From: Susan Meyer <semeyer@pacbell.net>  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov, Tom@Stienstra.com

Sirs:

Regarding your proposal to close sport fishing for rockfish along the central and northern California coast -

You are proposing to continue to allow the drag netters to clean out our seas of every living thing that gets caught in it's nets, even though only a small percentage of the catch is the fish they are keeping to sell to the public. The rest of the ocean creatures are killed and thrown out as trash. This decimates ocean creatures and wipes out many species in the process.

Instead, you want to limit the catch for sport fishermen who only take a few specific fish, and leave all other ocean creatures alone to go on living in their environment.

ARE YOU CRAZY????????? Those damn nets that vacuum all species out of the ocean should be banned for life. How can anyone in good conscience allow the strip-mining of the seas to continue.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Susan Meyer
26550 Alder Ct
Fremont, CA 94536