I, as a California recreational angler, adamantly oppose any change in recreational lingcod and rockfish regulations for this coming year, as well as the unprecedented lingcod closure this November and December adopted recently by the California Fish and Game position at your urging.

For decades, the federal and state governments and the PFMC have allowed gill nets, trawl nets and long lines to rape the marine environment. The refusal to stop the "clear cutters" of the sea - gill and trawl nets - has resulted in the current rockfish and lingcod crisis on the West Coast.

Recreational anglers are being asked to "share the pain" when they did not cause the decimation of the groundfish fishery in the first place. All available biological data points to trawl and gill nets and long lines as the key factor in the destruction of California's and other West Coast lingcod and rockfish fisheries.

We request the Council to take three major actions! First, maintain the same recreational rockfish and lingcod regulations that were adopted by the PFMC last season, with a limit of two lingcod and 10 rockfish and a two month closure.
Second, request the California Fish and Game Commission to rescind its lingcod closure this November and December.

Third, pass emergency regulations to ban all gill, trammel and trawl nets from the California coast.

Sincerely,
CRAIG STONE

ARTICLE:
Fish & Game Commission Votes For Emergency Lingcod Closure!

By: Dan Bacher 10-24-00
Fishsniffer.com

To the shock of many people in the sportfishing community, the California Fish and Game Commission took emergency action on October 20 to close all ocean-based fishing for lingcod statewide during the final two months of the year. Even more drastic, anglers also face up to a six month closure of rockfish season from January through June this coming year. If the Commission and Pacific Fishery Management Council have their way.

The Commission members present, Inducing Sam Schuchat, Michael Flores and Richard Thieriot, voted unanimously for the lingcod closure, which starts November 1. After the decision was made, the National Marine Fisheries Service (WMFS) announced that they will compliment the state action by restricting fishing for lingcod in federal waters, from three to 200 miles offshore.

This unprecedented emergency regulation, adopted in spite of massive opposition by angling groups, is the direct result of decades of poor management of our marine resources by the Department of Fish and Game, Fish and Game Commission, National Marine Fisheries Service and Pacific Fishery Management Council. Rather than properly manage our resources, these "august bodies" have chosen in the past to bow to political expedience and allow the rape of marine resources by commercial trammel and gill nets to continue. Now anglers have to pay for the destruction caused by over fishing by commercial nets and long lines for decades.
"It was a tough decision to make, as is the entire rule making package," admitted Bob Treanor, executive Secretary of the California Fish and Game Commission. "Things look pretty bleak for rockfish fisheries this coming year. Because of the decline of canary rockfish, we are looking for a drastic reduction in overall bag limits and the lengthening of the rockfish closure from the end of January through April or January through June."

Lingcod and boccaccio have been declared as "overfished" by the National Marine Fisheries Service, and rebuilding plans have been developed by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. The spur for the recent action was a letter to the Commission by Robert Hight, DFG Director, recommending an emergency closure of lingcod coastwide, as well as a closure of the southern California rockfish fishery to protect boccaccio rockfish, because the Optimum Yield (OY) set by the PFMC for both species would be exceeded.

"Recreational fishery data through August 2000 indicate the QY’s for these two species will be exceeded before the end of the year based on recent years’ fishery landing patterns," said Hight. "The optimum yield for lingcod off the West Coast (Washington through California) is 378 metric tons. For lingcod, the projected catch in 2000 for the recreational fishery off California is 271 metric tons. For combined commercial and recreational fisheries, the projected lingcod catch is 522 metric tons."

The Commission decided against closing fishing for rockfish in southern California during the same period as the lingcod closure because "the projected overage in the catch of boccaccio rockfish was not so compelling as it was for lingcod," according to Tresnor.

Fishery conservationists were furious about the lingcod closure, especially when trawlers and gill nets are still allowed to fish, even though all available biological evidence points to them as the main culprit for the destruction of the groundfish fisheries. These nets are the "clear cutters" of the oceans, stripping the bottom of all marine life and resulting in the discard of thousands of tons of "bycatch" non-targeted species.

"I've never been so disillusioned or angry in my entire life!" said Craig Stone, manager of the Emeryville Sportfishing Center. "How can our State and Federal fisheries allow the group most responsible for destroying lingcod and rockfish fisheries, the big commercial trawlers and gill netters, to fish while it closes the recreational fishery, the group that has the least impact, all in the name of saving fish!"

Bob Strickland, president of United Anglers, concurred. "The recreational fishery shouldn't be held accountable for the destruction of the lingcod and rockfish fisheries by commercial trawl nets, gill nets and longlines," he stated. "We need to take them off the water now!"

This emergency lingcod closure is now a fact and the impending rockfish regulations could kick anglers off the water for six months of the year. Anglers must protest this insanity. There are two things we can do to protect the groundfish fishery and the right of the public to access coastal fishery resources.

First, we can still defeat the proposed fishing restrictions for next year by flooding the Pacific Fishery Management Council with letters. After holding hearings in Vancouver, Washington from October 31 to November 3, they will review the data and options and make their final decisions. Send your letter to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224, Portland, OR. 97201, fax (503) 326-6831. You can also access their Website at www.pcouncil.org, where an e-mail link is available at pfmc.comments@noaa.gov. Or do it here the easy way!

Second, we must begin a massive campaign throughout the state, enlisting the support of all fishery conservation and environmental groups, to permanently ban all gill nets and trammel nets to stop the plunder of lingcod and rockfish populations.
to stop the plunder of lingcod and rockfish populations.

We must constantly and relentlessly hold the State and Federal governments accountable for presiding over the destruction of groundfish populations. It's not fair for these agencies to "share the pain" when recreational anglers are not responsible for the decline of our lingcod and rockfish fisheries.

The Council office received identical copies of this message from more than 200 individuals as of the time this packet was photocopied on 10/26/00.
From DaRoldSign@aol.com
Date Wednesday, October 25, 2000 5:30 pm
To sandra.krause@noaa.gov
Subject Please pass this on to the Council

Dear PFMC,

<<I just read in the Sacramento Bee this morning about the big Pacific Fisheries Mgmt. Council meeting in Vancouver, WA Oct 31-Nov 3. I was particularly disturbed to find out the powers-that-be may be putting even more restrictions on the sport fishermen regarding the taking of rockfish and lingcod. I know I speak for a lot of recreational saltwater fishermen when I say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! You don't have to be a marine biologist or even a mathematician to figure out the decline in rockfish populations over the past 25 years has almost nothing to do with us little pole fishermen. It's been proven time and time again that the gillnetters and longliners are the culprits - so PLEASE leave us sport fishermen the hell alone. It was a big enough blow to us last year with the 30% reduction in catch limits not to mention the charter boat operators, coastal service businesses, etc. Just give us a break and do the right thing. Put a few more restrictions on the commercial guys if you have to - they're the bad guys here.

I've been going on charter boats for quite a few years now and I've noticed the vast majority of patrons are old retired guys who absolutely live for their little fishing trips out to Cordell Banks or wherever. To tell these old gents that they can only fish 6 months out of the year and keep even less fish a day than last year would be a travesty! These guys have no way to afford their own boats and would be S.O.L. if the restrictions get any worse on the sportfishermen. It would probably kill the entire business of Charter Boat Fishing altogether.

Please pass this message along to the folks who are making these decisions (many of whom probably have never been rockfishing, I'd bet) to let them know what a huge mistake it would be to penalize us sportfishermen any further. We promise to throw back the little ones.

Thanks,
Dave DaRold & lots of his fishin' buddies
247 Baja Ave, Davis, CA 95616 >>>

----- Original Message ----- 
From "Robert Treanor" <Rtreanor@dfg.ca.gov>
To <DaRoldSign@aol.com>
Subject Re: The Big Meeting in Vancouver

Dear Mr. DaRold:
Thank you for your comments. The "big" meeting you refer to is the Pacific Fishery Management Council meeting (Oct. 31 - Nov. 3), not a Fish and Game Commission meeting. You can access the Council's web page at pcouncil.org for more information and provide you comments.
Robert R. Treanor

>>> <DaRoldSign@aol.com> 10/25/00 11:15AM >>>
I just read in the Sac. Bee this morning about the big fisheries meeting in Vancouver, WA later this month and next. I was particularly disturbed to find out the powers-that-be may be putting even more restrictions on the sport fishermen regarding the taking of rockfish and lingcod. I know I speak for a lot of recreational saltwater fishermen when I say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! You don’t have to be a marine biologist or even a mathematician to figure out the decline in rockfish populations over the past 25 years has almost nothing to do with us little pole fishermen. It’s been proven time and time again that the gillnetters and longliners are the culprits—so PLEASE leave us sport fishermen the hell alone. It was a big enough blow to us last year with the 30% reduction in catch limits not to mention the charter boat operators, coastal service businesses, etc. Just give us a break and do the right thing. Put a few more restrictions on the commercial guys if you have to— they’re the bad guys here.

I’ve been going on charter boats for quite a few years now and I’ve noticed the vast majority of patrons are old retired guys who absolutely live for thier little fishing trips out to Cordell Banks or wherever. To tell these old gents that they can only fish 6 months out of the year and keep even less fish a day than last year would be a travesty! These guys have no way to afford their own boats and would be S.O.L. if the restrictions get any worse on the sportfishermen. It would probably kill the entire business of Charter Boat Fishing altogether.

Please pass this message along to the folks who are making these decisions (many of whom probably have never been rockfishing, I’d bet) to let them know what a huge mistake it would be to penalize us sportfishermen any further. We promise to throw back the little ones.
Thanks,
Dave DaRold
247 Baja Ave, Davis, CA 95616
I would like to comment on the possible closure of sportfishing for rockfish on the California coast. I see the catches from commercial boats that come into Channel Island harbor and they far out weigh the take from charter boats and private sportfishermen. I have seen commercial dragnetters clean the bottom in an area I like to fish for rockfish so thoroughly that it is very difficult to catch one or two little rockfish let alone the limit. I think that the commercial fishermen catching the larger amounts of rockfish should be the ones limited to less fishing time than sportfishermen. I feel that taking away months of fishing for the group that catches the least fish would be economically disastrous to many that depend on this income to get through the winter months. Bait providers, fuel dealers, boat maintenance people, tackle shops and various other people in the business of providing for sportfishermen would be affected. Thank you for considering my comment.

N. Spangler
cptnick@earthlink.net
I guess the commercial guys are going to love this since they will have more fish to jump in their nets. The fishing is so depleted as it is, I wish we would put strong limitations on commercial fishing. If it raises the price of fish in the market so be it! When I fish I practice catch and release, I take it seriously. Only in the mountains or in the ocean I will cook a few trout or take home a nice tuna to eat for the next few days but never to stock my freezer for the winter. We have a responsibility to keep things in balance and not to destroy are environment. I worked on a sport fishing boat for a couple years, I am not apposed to limits on the sport fishing boats either. It was a nasty business where I saw sea lions being shot, people going way over their limits, and a total abuse of our ocean. I wish this letter enabled me to cast a vote but at least I can say that I spoke up.

Thank you

Tyler Trammell
From: "Marcia D'Perrigo"
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 10:40 am
To:
Cc:
Subject: PFMC Groundfish

Dear Mr. Treanor, Mr. Schuchat, Mr. Boydstrun and the Distinguished Members of the Commission and Council,

Thank you all for the opportunity to join the meeting held in Sacramento regarding the ground and nearshore fisheries and their management future. This letter is written with both sincerity and respect to all of the panel members as well as to the speakers and attendees.

We were all dazzled and impressed with astronomical figures for both ground and nearshore fisheries depletions and metric ton catches. We also heard that these figures are only hypothetical - that no one really knows what the actual numbers are. Additionally, these figures by the admission of some speakers, are based on data that is unreliable and some are made up.

If it is in fact, the goal of both the Commission and Council to rebuild the fishery, I submit the following be done: (This is based on Fort Bragg as it is my area of residence and the area for which I have knowledge.)

1. Effective immediately, impose a moratorium on all commercial fishing vessels, including charter vessels. Allow no new licenses for at least 3 years for additional vessels. In other, keep the number of vessels at the current count. No new commercial permits issued. (What we have is what we get for 3 more years) For example, it would mean that whatever charter boats are currently operating out of Fort Bragg are all that can operate there for the next 3 years. To date, there is the Lady Irma II, Trek II, Telstar, Rumblefish, Seahawk, Patty-C and the Theresa Jean. Fort Bragg would be limited to only those vessels or their replacements. If vessels have to remain in the port of registry for operation, it could further help by preventing “harbor hopping”- thereby throwing off the accuracy of any assessments done.

2. Effective immediately, set a ceiling of 20 passengers maximum for all charter vessels. To help relieve the burden of more anglers for sport fishing, it would be beneficial if no vessel were permitted to carry more than 20. This will halt the expansion of some vessels/businesses to increase their passenger capacity from say an existing 20 to 35 or 50. This would mean even when 2 trips a day are possible, there would be only 40 anglers fishing from any one vessel rather than 70 or 100. This would provide legitimate limitations that could seriously assist in the fishery management. This means the Lady Irma II, Trek II, Telstar, Rumblefish and Seahawk would all be limited to a maximum of 20 passengers. The Patty-C and Theresa Jean are both six-packs so well under the 20 passenger limit. They would have to hold at their current maximum. This action would allow greater accuracy in projecting exactly what our sustainable fishery is.

3. Effective immediately, place observers in all ports and gather information specific to the geographic areas. In other words, get accurate data to base future decisions on. Make sure all ports are represented accurately. Currently, there have been zero observers in Fort Bragg for some years. Hire a local observer who can get the information.

4. Restore the bag limit to 15 fish. (By placing the moratorium on all commercial vessels, this should be doable.)

5. Reduce the number of hooks to 1(This would be accepted by most people)

6. Retain the status quo on ling-cod (With a 26” minimum size, more are being released already)

7. Change the closure to November-February for ling-cod (spawning time) and January-February on all Rockfish.

It is critical that the information gathered for decision making be accurate. The best way to do this is to hold to what is and observe carefully and diligently what is being caught where and by whom and how often. If no new
commercial vessels are permitted in the state, then there is no concern for additional burden. This can be further controlled by setting a limit to the number of sports anglers on the water by limiting the sports vessels/businesses to 20. This would mean that what is currently operating is all that is allowed for at least 3 years when the study can be completed and the actual figures assessed.

The importance of the fishery is greater than what we as fishermen see today. It is of the greatest importance that our way of life be preserved so that we might continue with our livelihood- we can't have that livelihood without a good fishery. The sports fishing sector has had closures and bag limit reductions already imposed without any reliable assessments. We need good assessments, and we need observers to do them. Fort Bragg has a different habitat that Bodega Bay or San Francisco or Eureka and Crescent City. It is unique, and it is not fair or right to judge it on the same basis. We have fewer charter boats by comparison. Our fishing industry is fragile and many of the locals will suffer if we loose it. It is a large part of what draws the tourists- and what keeps this area alive. Without the fishing industry, I believe Fort Bragg will loose.

The areas should be assessed individually: California-Oregon border to Cape Mendocino, Cape Mendocino to Pt. Arena, Pt. Arena to Bodega Bay, San Francisco to Half Moon Bay, Monterey to Big Sur, Big Sur to Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara to San Diego. Each of them has different conditions, habitat and fishery.
16 October 2000

Noyo Harbor Charter Fishing Association
P O Box 2596
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-964-0669

California Dept. of Fish and Game
National Marine Fisheries Service
Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dear Distinguished Members,

On October 10, 2000, a meeting of the above named groups was held in Sacramento, California. This meeting was also attended by a number of Commercial Vessel Operators. This letter is in response to the panel that requested input from all on how to address the issue of ground and Nearshore fishery management.

Those of us in the Fort Bragg area of California have met and herein submit our recommendations for fishery management based on both the information provided us at the meeting and experience with our particular fishery.

While we agree that fishery management is crucial to our business endeavors and the endeavors to preserve the marine environment, we do not agree with the methods that are currently under consideration. It is imperative that each area be considered on its own merits and not all areas judged as one. Our recommendations are as follows:

1. Release for immediate use the new logbooks that are species specific.
2. Disregard the MRFS surveys and gather accurate data on which to base decisions.
3. Engage observers on vessels in the Fort Bragg area in order to obtain accurate information.
4. Maintain status quo for 3 years and allow current regulations and limitations to work while accurate data is being gathered, then re-assess regulations.

If the only options are what were presented at the Sacramento, California meeting, then we offer the following:

- Ling-cod
  1. Status quo – 26 inches, 2 fish limit
  2. 28 inches, 2 fish limit
  3. 2 hooks, 2 fish limit

- Rock fish (3 Canary limit is okay)
  1. Status quo, not less than 10 fish limit, 2 month closure
  2. Fewer hooks, 15 fish limit, 2 month closure January-February
  3. Fewer hooks, 15 fish limit, 4 month closure December-March (in keeping with the ling-cod spawning season)
• Nearshore defined as 20 fathoms limit, not 40 fathoms

An important factor in all of this is to at minimum, maintain the status quo until reliable data is gathered. It was admitted in the meeting that data was actually being extrapolated without any sound information for basis. All charter vessels in our area have agreed to allow observers in order to gather accurate data. Our area should be designated as being from Point Arena north to Cape Mendocino, though no one from the Noyo Harbor fishes further south than the Navarro River.

In closing, we would appreciate being on record as highly supportive of fishery management with the qualification that when regulations are mandated, they are based on accurate data responsibly gathered, not by hypothetical figures. We thank you for the time to review our comments and suggestions and look forward to a cooperative effort to appropriately manage our area fishery.

Respectfully Submitted,

Capt. Randy Thornton, Telstar Charters, 707-964-8770

Capt. Rick Thornton, Anchor Charters (Trek II), 707-964-4550

Capt. Jeffrey K. Kroemer, Patty-C Charter Fishing, 707-964-0669

Capt. Brandon Van Dine, Anchor Charters (Lady Irma II) 707-964-2816

Capt. Tim Gillespie, All Aboard Adventures, 707-964-1881

Jeremiah Waller, Deckhand, Trek II, 707-964-1290
PFMC,

the commercial fishing industry should be the primary target of quota reduction and season closure, since they take nearly 90% of the annual harvest. Many of the professional sport fishing boats will be driven out of business with a 4-6 closed month season and proposed limit reductions. I urge you to pursue fair but reasonable quota and seasonal restrictions for the commercial industry. The sport fishing industry should not suffer any further seasonal, bag limit, or size restrictions due to the gross mismanagement of the groundfish resource by the commercial fleet. It may indeed be necessary to drastically reduce their seasonal catch in the short term, but please keep focused on the long term objective - a plentiful, renewable resource for all.

Sincerely,

Marc Beccio
Zeneca Ag Products - WRC Lab R&D
Richmond, Ca 94804-0023
510-231-5042
fax: 510-231-1255
From "Thibodeaux, Hal X"
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 1:13 pm
To "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov"
Cc "Tom@Strienstra.com"
Subject Groundfish restrictions

Sirs:

I think it is absurd to severely restrict sport fisherman's rockfishing while letting the commercial guys get away with killing everything in their path. The commercial fishermen do 85 to 90 percent of the damage while sport fishermen do 10 to 15. Restrict the commercial guys and sport fishermen accordingly. Let's be fair!

Thank you for your time.

Hal Thibodeaux
From DonTKGreer@aol.com
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 1:53 pm
To pfmnc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc tom@stienstra.com, Fishtalegale@aol.com
Subject Proposed new Groundfish Rules

Dear Sir/Madam:

I wish to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposal that will severely cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco/Northern California area. Once again, the California Department of Fish and Game seeks to punish sport fishermen for the misbehavior of some in the commercial fishing fleet. Sport fishermen have been at the forefront in fisheries and habitat restoration, and yet these are the people that the CDFG has singled out to bear the brunt of the results of the CDFG’s poor management of the commercial fleet.

One example that comes to mind is the recent surge in Halibut populations within San Francisco Bay, once sport fishermen pushed for rules to limit the environmentally damaging commercial dragging operations. As a result, Halibut populations have rebounded, and are at the highest in years.

The CDFG’s unwillingness to enforce environmentally and biologically sound commercial practices are at the root cause of the problem. Both commercial and sportfishermen need a healthy fishery, but to force sportfishermen, who take 15% of the catch, to pay for the destructive tactics of draggers and wasted bycatch is inherently unfair.

Punitive closing of the sportfishing season is an outrage from a department that is unresponsive to the electorate, and that cuts deals with those that are responsible for the problem in the first place. I am a fisherman, and I vote. I will be letting my representative and Govenor Gray Davis know what I think of his CDFG.

Don Greer
Dear Sirs,

I am a sportsfisherman residing in Albany, California - making several trips a year for rockfish at the Farallon Islands and the Sonoma County coast. Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion regarding groundfish harvest levels proposed for 2001.

Your task of allocating the fishstock in an equitable manner is very difficult. Given that the population of several species of groundfish is seriously depleted, it makes sense to reduce the limit taken by sportsfishermen, particularly if there's an on-going evaluation of the need and benefit of this action.

It seems that most of the commercial fishermen will also be restricted; however, I'm not convinced that the calendar or species restrictions are adequate for large-scale, off-shore operations.

Your proposals range from minor to drastic. Note that I'm not certain which action will sustain & restore the fishing grounds.
I am certain that the restrictions must appear fair to the recreational angler.

By the way, I appreciate the information presented in your newsletter, Pacific Council News. Thanks again! Will Moore, 511 San Carlos Street, Albany, California 94706
From: Erick Carlson
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 2:12 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Groundfish Strategy

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

To whom it may concern:

I have not had sufficient warning and/or time to read the final groundfish documents posted at your website, and therefore cannot directly address any of the issues upon which your upcoming decision will be based. I'm wondering if the timing wasn't designed specifically so that such would be the case for many of us sportfishermen who are taken by surprise at the possibility of lengthy season closure and drastic limit reductions. Not to mention our friends, those who run the sportfishing boats, who we may well watch go bankrupt and be forced to uproot their families and lives. Nasty stuff.

I protest. Perhaps there needs to be more public scrutiny of your methods and your membership - with an eye particularly on why commercial interests are so well protected.

Erick Carlson
207 South Second Street
Rio Vista, CA 94571
I am an avid sportfisherman, and I strongly support efforts that ensure that our fisheries are maintained at the highest possible sustainable yields. I hear that the commission is planning on closing rockfishing for as much as 6 months out of the year. I believe that this action will fail, and will have some potentially devastating long term effects. As you know, rockfish have long natural life spans, and have slow growth rate. A typical rockfish (i.e. black or blue) takes about 7 years or more to grow large enough to spawn. Closing the fishery for 6 months will only protect them for half the year, yet provides no protection for the fishery other than by reduction of the fishing effort. It only postpones the collapse of the fishery if the overall take is beyond the sustainable yield. For example, what difference does it make if we take 5,000 tons this year, then cut the season and take 2,500 tons this year and the next, when the actual sustainable yield might be 8,000 tons in for the age class of the harvestable fish that spans, say, 8 years (these numbers are just for argument's sake). You'll still wipe out that age class, and then you start to take the next age class before maturity, and wipe that group out. No spawners, no more fish. Before economic extinction, all you get are progressively smaller fish.

From what I have been told, and read, populations of rockfish do not migrate very far. If this is so, I propose that the West Coast be divided into several zones. Rotating through these zones, closures of up to 10 years are imposed to allow the local populations to fully recover. Once a zone recovers, the fishery can open, with restrictions that ensure a sustainable yield, including closures (seasonal) in higher harvesting areas (ie. Cordell Banks, The Farallon Islands, the "Deep Reef" area, to name a few of my local areas). Establishing the zones will be a big issue, since I realize that closing a large area could pose disastrous consequences for local sport and commercial fishing businesses. The commercial fleet should be placed on a quota, and allowed to fish zones that are open. If I had my way, the commercial fleet would stop using nets, and go with short longlines, be under a quota, and inshore (waters less than 150') commercial take would be eliminated. Sportfishing would continue under a limit of 10 (in California), with anglers encouraged to use large baits, fish shallow waters (but not required), and release fish under 14" if they are not mortally wounded (i.e. eyes bulging, stomach sticking out of their mouths, swallowed hooks). Personally, I stopped targeting rockfish over 2 years ago, and decided that if I decide to go, we will fish shallow, and limit ourselves to 2 fish each with a 14" minimum size. There would be closures for a couple of months in the high use zones. I know that these ideas sound a little drastic, but given the nature of the groundfish species in question, I feel that this would offer a better alternative to a total moratorium. Once all zones have recovered, zone closures may only need an occasional closure, depending on the condition of the spawing stocks. Commercial take in each zone would be under a conservative quota. I believe the sports take will be insignificant under a 10 fish limit. Creation of artificial reefs to increase habitat, would also promote a healthier fishery. Like any other heavily exploited renewable resource, this one will require a lot of initial monitoring to determine the overall impact of each
management decision.

I see no reason why the PFMC, commercial, and sport fishermen can't work out an acceptable solution to this crisis. Thank You for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Leslie E. Murayama
978 Kiely Blvd., Apt. i
Santa Clara, CA 95051
lesnopus@pacbell.net
I feel that the proposed restrictions on sport anglers along the Pacific Coast Stinks! The Commercial anglers should bear their fair share of the burden. They are the ones raping the fisheries.

Steve Thumlert
Stockton, CA
From: Wacrichton@aol.com
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 3:05 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc: Tom@stienstra.com
Subject: 2001 Fisheries Proposal

Sirs:
It has come to my attention through the press that you are proposing a drastic curtailment in ocean fishing in California. There certainly is a need to protect what is left of our fishery, but lets be fair with a proportional degree of pain inflicted on those who have caused this problem in the first place--the commercial boats, especially longliners and netters. Sportsfishing has a far lesser affect than does the commercial boats. The commercial season needs to be severely cut back, not the sports season.
Sincerely,
G. W. Crichton
From: Marydick78@aol.com
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 7:34 pm
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc: tom@stienstra.com
Subject: Sport Fishing

I strongly object to any suggestion that sport fisherman be penalized for the sorry state of off shore fisheries. We all know that this resource has been depleted by the commercial fisherman not by the sport fishermen.

You want to solve your problem, then ban dragnets and gillnets. Make the commercial boats go back to line fishing.

Richard Willhardt
Ventura, CA
From Donald Nash

Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 8:38 pm

To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Subject Sport Fishing

Dear Gentlemen,

It is sad that sport fishman get punished for 10% of the rock fish take and the commercial guys use hundreds of hooks, gill nets and and any thing they wont to take 90% of the rock fish. Sport fishmen do not make a living at fishing but investment to just get out there is forty to fifty thousand. In the best interest of all rock fish, what and who gives you the right to make decisions that affect so many without council. How many pay offs did you receive form commercial fishman. Have you check the catch of commercial fishman -vs- sport fishman this year(2000). If you had you would notice that sport fishman's take of rock fish is way down due to many weather mistakes by NOA and extremely bad sea conditions not allowing you to go rock fishing. I have had two rock fishing trips this season and both were no limits and not a single link cod. I sincerely hope someone reads this and think about what you are doing, by asking your self is the really fare?

A would be fishman

Donald Nash@excite.com

Say Bye to Slow Internet!
http://www.home.com/xinbox/signup.html
From Michael Hale
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 9:03 pm
To
Subject 10/31 to 11/3 hearing

Hello,

I'm writing to register my strong hope that you reconsider such a heavy restriction on sportfishing for rockfish and lingcod.

It seems abundantly clear that the commercial net fisherman have been responsible for the depredation of the groundfish population over the years and that they should certainly bear the brunt of the imposed restraints.

Sincerely,

--
Michael Hale
Michael Hale & Associates
Macintosh Consulting
mhale@silicon.com
mhale@mac.com
From: "David E. Quady"
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 9:54 pm
To: pfmccomments@noaa.gov, Tom@Stienstra.com
Subject: Comments on proposed sportfishing reductions

Dear PFMC:

I am neither a commercial fisherman nor a saltwater fisherman, preferring my pelagic creatures feathered rather than finned.

Prompted by another fine article by Tom Stienstra, I write to comment on your proposed offshore fishery closures, which apparently would affect both sport fishermen and commercial fishermen.

Compromise is fine . . . except when one side is wrong. This is such a case, with commercial fishermen -- not sport fishermen -- being in the wrong. The world is full of examples of commercial fishermen driving fish stocks to near extinction, and offshore California is well on its way to joining examples such as the Grand Banks. The right thing to do is clear: substantially (and, although I love seafood, I mean SUBSTANTIALLY) reduce the take by commercial fishermen. No other action will be effective except to substantially reduce the take by those who represent the vast majority of the take. The only question is how to do that, and I suggest you devote attention to that question, not on how to avoid taking the necessary action.

Any effective action you take will harm the livelihood of some commercial fishermen, and that is regrettable . . . but necessary. We have a clear case here of 'the town common' effect, with commercial fishermen trying to maximize their consumption of resources owned by the people and entrusted to you to protect. You must protect the town common. Whether you reduce the length of the commercial fishing season substantially, or reduce each commercial fisherman's allowed take substantially, or issue a severely limited number of fishing permits on a lottery basis, or take some other similar action is up to you decide, with fishermen's input. But take some such action you must, in order to allow our offshore fish stocks to recover their numbers, and to protect the birds and other creatures that depend upon them for survival.

Do the right thing.

Thank you.

Dave Quady
39 The Crescent
Berkeley, California
davequady@worldnet.att.net
From: "Tom Ryugo"
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 10:02 pm
To:
Cc:
Subject: rockfish and lingcod limits

Dear Sir,

I fail to understand what the Pacific Fisheries Management Council is doing by further reducing the rockfish and lingcod limits for sport anglers while allowing drag netters to keep overfishing. The drag netters and other commercial fishermen take 90 percent of the rockfish. If anybody is threatening rockfish populations, it's the commercial netters.

This is exactly the kind of nonsensical bureaucratic decisions that make sport anglers think that the PFMC is in bed with commercial fishing lobbies and PETA simultaneously.

Tom Ryugo
1725 Shattuck Ave. #107
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 845-5978
From: "Tom Ryugo"

Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 10:17 pm

To,

Subject: Proposed Pacific Fisheries Management Council Rockfish Regulations (Oct. 31st)

Dear Governor Davis,

The proposed new sport fishing regulations from the Pacific Fisheries Management Council to be decided on October 31 are the most illogical and baffling pile of malarkey ever thought up by bureaucrats who obviously know nothing about fish populations.

The plan is to close the rockfish season for four to six months and reduce the limit to three. Last year, the limit was fifteen which was reduced to ten in 2000. The 2000 season was closed in March and April.

The aggravating part of this is that commercial fishing isn't going to be reduced on iota. It's the commercial fishing that takes 90 percent of the rockfish and lingcod and cause incredible environmental damage by killing marine birds, seals, sea otters, and non-target fish. Why isn't commercial rockfishing being reduced 90 percent since they are responsible for 90 percent of the take?

No wonder people get mad at the government. PFMC acts like it's in bed with the commercial fishing lobby and the animal rights lobby simultaneously. They let the despoilers wreck the resource that sport anglers have worked hard to conserve and then punish the very sport anglers who have done their best to protect fish populations. If that's not a pile of bovine feces, I don't know what is.

Tom Ryugo
1725 Shattuck Ave. #107
Berkeley, CA 94709
Subject: Proposed Pacific Fisheries Management Council Rockfish Regulations (Oct. 31st)

Dear Mr. President,

The proposed new sport fishing regulations from the Pacific Fisheries Management Council to be decided on October 31 in Vancouver, WA are the most illogical, moronic, and baffling pile of malarkey ever thought up by bureaucrats who obviously know nothing about fish populations.

The plan is to close the rockfish season for four to six months and reduce the limit to three. Last year, the limit was fifteen which was reduced to ten in 2000. The 2000 season was closed in March and April. At this rate, there won't be any rockfish season. That will put charter fishing boats out of business through no fault of theirs.

The aggravating part of this is that commercial fishing isn't going to be reduced on iota. It's the commercial fishing that takes 90 percent of the rockfish and lingcod and cause incredible environmental damage by killing marine birds, seals, sea otters, and non-target fish. Why isn't commercial rockfishing being reduced 90 percent since they are responsible for 90 percent of the take? Instead, the sport anglers will take the brunt as usual even though they take 10 percent of the fish and don't kill endangered seabirds and mammals. That makes a lot of sense.

No wonder people get mad at the government. PFMC acts like it's in bed with the commercial fishing lobby and the animal rights lobby simultaneously. They let the despoilers wreck the resource that sport anglers have worked hard to conserve and then punish the very sport anglers who have done their best to protect fish populations. If that's not a pile of bovine feces, I don't know what is.

Tom Ryugo
1725 Shattuck Ave. #107
Berkeley, CA  94709
(510) 845-5978
To:
Pacific Marine Fisheries Council
2130 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 224
Portland, Or 97201
Email address: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

October 22, 2000

Dear Pacific Marine Fisheries Council,

It has come to our attention that some drastic measures are being considered to reverse many years of abuse of our local Rock Cod fisheries. We applaud you on taking the initiative to do so.

If, however, the means by which you proposed to do this, are as we have been informed, we will find ourselves as opponents instead of allies.

While literally many thousands of tax paying citizens that are purchasing their annual fishing licenses and gear, are asked to sacrifice their access to a relative insignificant number of fish you would allow long liners, and netters to curtail only a small amount of the pillage and damage they cause?

It is the consensus of this group that this would be totally unacceptable. A more equitable solution needs to be developed.

A number of suggestions have been made, and are worthy of serious consideration.

1.) Terminate indefinitely all netting operations within 15 miles of shore.

2.) Terminate indefinitely all netting operations within 15 miles of the Channel Islands, Farallon Islands, Santa Barbara Island, ..........

3.) Limit the activities of Long liners to 6 months per year for at least 5 years.

4.) Place one 1 square mile area for every 50 square miles contained within the areas described in numbers one and two above, as additional protected areas to serve as nurseries.
5.) Promote and encourage the utilization of the rock cod fisheries by sports fishermen to increase revenues.

6.) Leave the limits for rock cod by sports fishermen as they were adopted this year, 2000.

Damage to the fish habitat as well as the ‘wipe out’ nature of the netters are seen as the true villain in this now acute problem. Sports fishermen, leaving more fish behind for them to harvest, will not improve the condition of the fisheries. It would only insure that a few more fish will be available when the nets come through to wipe out the area.

Loss of revenues from fishermen unwilling to pay the license fee to venture out for so few fish will have an adverse effect on State fish and games budgets. Loss of ridership on Charter boats will cause a loss of jobs. All this will have far reaching effects on the coastal communities, tackle shops, fueling operations, boat mechanics, new and used boat sales, fishing gear manufacturers, bait shops, bait fishers, and, were sure, much more.

It is quite clear that the impact on the sport fishing community has been underestimated and that commercial interests have been the foremost of the tendency to minimize impact.

If local alternative sources for retail market fish are not available the increase in costs of fish in the market place will be adjusted by default. If the sport fishing “Industry” is virtually eliminated, that faction will just die. The economic losses will be complete and catastrophic.

Thank you,

Members, BaySportsmen / PCS
pcsportsmen.com
c/o John Suelen
aka "MakoWish"
http://www.makowish.com (My Fishing Page)
john@suelen.com
From: jim and sherri
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 7:20 am
To: PFMC.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Ground fish management

Fishery Management Council I would like to register my outrage at your groundfish management proposal. It will absolutely cripple sportfishing operations in San Francisco, Bodega Bay and all along the north coast of California. I believe you are targeting the wrong group of fishermen. I fish mostly Bodega Bay area and what I see is when all the fishermen are coming in to port at the end of the day, commercial boat after commercial boat are leaving the bay to fish all night. These boats waste more fish than the sport fishermen catch. Also the small commercial fishermen are fishing the local reefs to death, they are there day after day eight to twelve hours at a time taking everything. Why do you severely restrict the sport fisherman when the problem is the commercial fishermen? Thank You for your consideration: James W. Lalley, 3356 Kathy Way, Loomis, Ca
Email: triplall@pacbell.net
From LEROYSHIM@aol.com
Date Wednesday, October 25, 2000 10:28 am
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Cc TOM@tomstienstra.com
Subject Closure of Sportfishing for Rockfish

Dear PFMC,
I protest the Sportfishermen being the scapegoat for 25 years of failure to manage and restrict commercial netters and long liners. Commercial fishermen take 90% of the catch and they are the main responsible party for overfishing, this having been allowed by fisheries mismanagement. We sportfishermen as an organized group are monitoring your decisions as a Council and seek fair fisheries management. Sportfishing must be fairly considered and considered a small part of the problem, not be a convenient political victim to the Council not standing up to the commercial fishing interests. We sportfishermen and recreational Party Boats are visible to the public, while raping of the seas go on commercially without common public knowledge. It's time to develop fair, sound, responsible Council actions.
Sincerely,

Leroy M. Shimizu
401 Gregory Lane, ste. 226
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
(925) 689-4409
From: Barcastr@aol.com  
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 12:24 pm  
To: PFMC.comments@noaa.gov, Tom@tomstienstra.com  
Subject: Mismanagement

To whom it may concern (Pacific fisheries Mismanagement Cartel),
Shame on you! To even contemplate reducing the bag limits of recreational fisherman is a complete farce! Our take is a mere fraction of what the drag boats take, yet once again, we are being asked to shoulder an unfair burden. And, don't even get me started on the commercial waste known as by-catch!
SHAME ON YOU!!!!

Tim Pierce

2815 Chanslor Ave.

Richmond Ca. 94804
PS I fish, and I vote!
From: Chad Broderick
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 12:48 pm
To: pfmcomments@noaa.gov
Subject: Closure of Rock Cod fishing

Please consider carefully who is responsible for the majority of the harvest of rock cod type fish when deciding closures. Typically commercial fishermen account for 90% of the catch and should shoulder 90% of the closure. I realize that we sport fishermen do not have as good of a lobby or a voice but please consider our point of view too. We would not mind a closure that represents fairly our share of the catch percentage. What would this beautiful coastline be like if we could not even go out and enjoy our natural resources and have to rely on supermarkets for all our fresh fish.

Thank you for your time,
Chad Broderick
2016 Pioneer Way #180
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 525-0818

iWon.com http://www.iwon.com why wouldn't you?
From: "Johnson, Eric"
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 2:52 pm
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov"
Subject: additional measures to manage rockfish and lingcod in nearshore California waters

Gentlemen:

I urge you to consider United Angler's Interim Measures to Manage the Commercial Nearshore Fishery. As a resident of a coastal community, I firmly believe the crisis we are experiencing with regard to rockfish and lingcod depletion is due for the most part to unsustainable commercial fishing operations. By enacting the measures proposed by United Anglers, commercial fishing impacts will be reduced to allow time for the fishery to replenish itself.

Thank you!

Eric Johnson
151 Easy Street
Alamo, CA 94507
925.866.5888
California Dept. of Fish and Game biologist Greg Walls did an exhaustive report with information from 53 studies/sources. Check it out and the only response to long lines is no way. Do not allow long lines off ca. coast. It's a bad idea.

sincerely

Jeff Horning
From: "Jim Gay"
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 7:23 pm

Subject: groundfish

> Pacific Marine Fisheries Council
> 2130 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 224
> Portland, Or 97201
>
> Dear Pacific Marine Fisheries Council,
>
> It has come to our attention that some drastic measures are being considered
> to reverse many years of abuse of our local Rock Cod fisheries. We applaud
> you on taking the initiative to do so.
>
> If, however, the means by which you proposed to do this, are as we have been
> informed, we will find ourselves as opponents instead of allies.
>
> While literally many thousands of tax paying citizens that are purchasing
> their annual fishing licenses and gear, are asked to sacrifice their access
> to a relative insignificant number of fish you would allow long liners, and
> netters to curtail only a small amount of the pillage and damage they cause?
>
> It is the consensus of this group that this would be totally unacceptable.
> A more equitable solution needs to be developed.
>
> A number of suggestions have been made, and are worthy of serious
> consideration.
>
> 1.) Terminate indefinitely all netting operations within 15 miles of
> shore.
> 2.) Terminate indefinitely all netting operations within 15 miles of the
> Channel Islands, Farallon Islands, Santa Barbara Island, â€¦â€¦â€¦.
> 3.) Limit the activities of Long liners to 6 months per year for at least
5
> years.
> 4.) Place one 1 square mile area for every 50 square miles contained
within
> the areas described in numbers one and two above, as additional protected
> areas to serve as nurseries.
> 5.) Promote and encourage the utilization of the rock cod fisheries by
> sports
> fisherman to increase revenues.
> 6.) Leave the limits for rock cod by sports fishermen as they were adopted
> this year, 2000.
>
> Damage to the fish habitat as well as the 'wipe out' nature of the netters
are seen as the true villain in this now acute problem. Sports fishermen, leaving more fish behind for them to harvest, will not improve the condition of the fisheries. It would only insure that a few more fish will be available when the nets come through to wipe out the area.

Loss of revenues from fishermen unwilling to pay the license fee to venture out for so few fish will have an adverse effect on State fish and games budgets. Loss of ridership on Charter boats will cause a loss of jobs. All this will have far reaching effects on the coastal communities, tackle shops, fueling operations, boat mechanics, new and used boat sales, fishing gear manufacturers, bait shops, bait fishers, and, were sure, much more.

It is quite clear that the impact on the sport fishing community has been underestimated and that commercial interests have been the forefront of the tendency to minimize impact.

If local alternative sources for retail market fish are not available the increase in costs of fish in the market place will be adjusted by default. If the sport fishing "Industry" is virtually eliminated, that faction will just die. The economic losses will be complete and catastrophic.

Thank You,

James Gay
jimgay@ecis.com
From Rebernhardt@aol.com
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 4:45 pm
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject Groundfish management proposal

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?

Ron Bernhardt
447 Malibu Court
Livermore, CA 94550-5239
From  LTCRDent@aol.com
Date  Tuesday, October 24, 2000 11:43 am
To   pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject  Ground Fish Management Proposal

own letter to: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov or fax it to (503) 326-6831.

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?

LtCol Robert M. Dent, USAFR
Retired
5200 Dredger Way
Orangevale, CA 95662

LtCol Walter Laun
9512 Flintridge Way
From Batch02@aol.com  
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 9:48 am  
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
Subject Fwd: Monday's HotSheet

In a message dated 10/23/00 6:29:36 PM Pacific Daylight Time, Fishtalegale writes:

<< 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?

>>
From Lloyd Hiramoto
Date Tuesday, October 24, 2000 10:03 am
To pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject Groundfish Management

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

To whom it may concern:

I would like to voice my outrage at your proposed groundfish management
measures that will cripple sportfishing operations in the San Francisco
Bay Area. Your proposals are excessive to the sector that has least affected stock
depletion 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 overfished 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 rock fish) 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 the San Francisco Bay Area sport boats
and that the Council is paying no heed to the sport fishing interest,
only to that from the large commercial operations.
The sport fishers have policed themselves for many years, so it is not reasonable nor
logical that they bear the brunt of retribution for the excesses of large moneymed interests.

Please re-evaluate your proposed groundfish management measures as they are excessive
to the sector of the fishing community that has least impacted this fishery.

Lloyd Hiramoto
1085 Yorktown Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
I.hiramoto@worldnet.att.net
October 30, 2000

Pacific Fishery Management Council
2130 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 224
Portland OR 97201

I request this letter to be read into the minutes of the November meeting.

Council Members:

I'm writing to you in regards to the proposed sport groundfish regulation changes.

My name is Jeurgen Turner, owner/operator of Tacklebuster Inc. My background is in ocean charter fishing goes back to 1975. I have operated a year around charter service out of Depoe Bay, Oregon for the past twenty two years.

I do and always have supported conservation measures. The sport fishery is the Cleanest of all fisheries. We have made great sacrifices already in recent years. Since 1993 we have had our Salmon seasons cut to a ZERO fishery for six years and the past few years our Bottom fish cut back to the lowest levels ever. This made a negative impact on not just on the sport fishing, but all of the tourist related business as well as state fishing licenses. Remembering that we sell trips and not fish! The chance to catch something does not mean you will always get your limit. With this in mind, we need to look at this realistically and not politically. If you are going to use historical numbers, setting new limits on fish, without even giving them a chance for a few years, does not make good scientific sense.

The sport caught canary rockfish make up only, at best, 3% or less of the total landed, and for the most part are caught in different areas than where commercial trawlers fish. They are also more seasonal for the sport fisherman. There are many trips run that do not even have canary's on board. We should not be penalized 30, 40, 50 or more% on something we did not do! there has been great measures by sports fisherman do their best to avoid known areas of canary's during this past year.

While positive measures were done, and supported with black rockfish and other inshore rockfish,(blues,coppers,qwills,cabezon and sea trout (kelp greenling). There is now an equilibrium in the limits of fish and catching, while still being able to market our fishing trips. Any option that restricts a year around bottom fishing is NOT an option!

The Ling Cod limit worked very well last year. I would like to see a one Ling Cod and 10 Rockfish with the a canary limit in place. Lowering the hooks aloud from 3 to 2 could help 25 to 30%. This is a workable and maintainable balance that should keep Oregon's sportfishing strong for a very long time.

This is very important to our business and all of the other coastal business's. Also future of the fishery.

Thank you for your time on this matter.

Thank you,

Jeurgen Turner