HMS FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

Date: February 2, 2002
Hearing Officer: Ms. Marija Vojkovich

Location: San Pedro, CA
Hearing Officer: Ms. Marija Vojkovich
Hilton Port of Los Angeles/San Pedro
Terrasini Room
2800 Via Cabrillo Marina
San Pedro, CA  90731
Location: San Pedro, CA

Other Council Members: Mr. Don Hanson

NMFS: Mr. Svein Fougner

Attendance: 65
HMSPDT: Dr. Norm Bartoo

Testifying: 24
Ms. Susan Smith
Dr. Dave Au

Staff: Mr. Jim Morgan

Organizations Represented:
· Avalon Tuna Club
· Southern California Tuna Club
· United Anglers of Southern California
· Inland Saltwater Fishing Club
· Light Tackle Marlin Club
· Sportfishing Association of California
· Ocean Wildlife Campaign
· Harbor Rod and Reel Club
· Izaak Walton League of America
· Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club
· The Billfish Foundation
· Chark Bait Saltwater Fishing Club
· Balboa Angling Club
· Western Fishboat Owners Association

Synopsis of Testimony

Of the 24 people testifying, generally:

· 17 represented the recreational fishery
· 5 represented the commercial fishery
· 1 represented conservation groups
· 1 represented the general public

Commercial Comments

Some believed limited entry is not necessary for the albacore fishery. There was some support for small mesh (albacore) gillnets, because there are so few vessels and the number of vessels is not likely to increase. There was some support for experimental longline fishing north of Point Conception.

Recreational Comments

Some speakers urged a precautionary approach to stocks of unknown status, encouraged a catch and release program, and opposed longlines in the EEZ and drift gillnets. There was some support for observers, and monitoring and reporting provisions.
Conservation Group Comments

Some speakers urged no exploratory fishing through Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs). Some recommended the use of EFPs to reduce bycatch. Generally, this group supported use of the precautionary approach.

Other Testimony

None.

Written Statements Submitted at the Hearing = 3

PFMC
02/27/02
February 1, 2002

To: Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC)
Fm: Southern California Tuna Club (SCTC)

Re: HMS Plan

Dear Council Members,

On behalf of the 238 members in good standing of the Southern California Tuna Club, the Board of Directors unanimously supports PFMC’s adoption of the “preferred option” currently described as the Highly Migratory Species Plan.

SCTC is opposed to allowing longline fishing within the 200 mile EEZ.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Woody- President

Doug Boynton- Secretary

Dan Mundy- Vice President

Hat Bateman- Treasurer

Dick Shafer- Board of Directors

Joel Babic- Board of Directors

Lynn Fasnacht- Board of Directors

ON VACATION

Terry Krauss- Board of Directors

Geoff Magnall- Board of Directors
ADDRESS TO THE FEBRUARY 2ND 2002 MEETING OF THE PACIFIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

GENTLEMEN:
MY NAME IS ERIC ROGER AND I REPRESENT THE LOS ANGELES ROD AND REEL CLUB. I ALSO SERVE ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF UNITED ANGLERS OF CALIFORNIA. LOS ANGELES ROD AND REEL CLUB HAS A 52 YEAR TRADITION IN THE SOUTHLAND AND BOASTS A NON-PROFIT ARM WHICH TAKES UNDERPRIVILEGED KIDS FISHING AND MAKES GRANTS TO ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN THE PERPETUATION OF OUR MARINE RESOURCES.

THE MEMBERS OF YOUR GROUP ARE ASKED TO MAKE SOME VERY SERIOUS DECISIONS WHICH WILL NO DOUBT ALSO IMPACT OTHER AMERICAN COASTAL FISHERIES. AT ISSUE ARE THE LONG LINERS' EFFORTS TO OPERATE WITHIN THE EEZ AND THEIR CONSEQUENT INDIRECTLY DISASTEROUS EFFECT ON HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES, MAMMALS AND BIRDS.

THIS PUBLIC HEARING GIVES US THE OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU THAT WE SUPPORT THE BILLFISH FOUNDATION AND UNITED ANGLERS IN THEIR OPPOSITION TO OPENING UP OUR COASTAL WATERS. NOTE THAT MOST OF OUR CONSTITUENTS HOWEVER, ARE NOT PRIVATE BOATERS BUT AVERAGE RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN INVOLVED IN TAKING THEIR FAMILIES ON PARTY BOATS OR CHARTERS. MENTION LONGLINES AND IT CONJURES UP THE ISSUE OF THE DREADFUL BYCATCH PROBLEM CREATED BY MILES OF HOOKS.

YOU KNOW BETTER THAN WE DO WHAT SPECIES ARE BEING MOST IMPACTED. IN SOUTHEAST AND CERTAIN GULF WATERS 133,000 SQUARE MILES OF OCEAN HAVE BEEN PLACED OFF LIMITS TO LONGLINES FOR THE HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES BY THE NMFS. VAST AREAS OF THE PACIFIC OUT OF HAWAII ARE ALSO OFF LIMITS. OUR RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE SIMILAR.


RECREATIONAL SALWATER FISHERMEN NUMBER 10.4 MILLION. THE RECREATIONAL FISHING INDUSTRY GENERATES $20.7 BILLION IN RELATED ACTIVITIES. THE COMMERCIAL INDUSTRY, WHICH IS RESPONSIBLE FOR 97% OF THE FINFISH CAUGHT GENERATES $1.6 BILLION IN LANDING VALUES. THE RECREATIONAL INDUSTRY TAKES 3% YET GENERATES 13% OF THE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

CONCLUDING, WE ASK MEMBERS OF THIS PANEL TO NOT ONLY LOOK AT THE IMPACTED SPECIES- SOME ENDANGERED - CAUSED BY INDIRECTLY DISASTEROUS GEAR, BUT ALSO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESULTS TO BE CONTEMPLATED.

WE ASK THAT THIS GROUP DO THE RIGHT THING AND THANK YOU FOR LETTING US BE HEARD.

Prepared on behalf of LARod & Reel Club by Eric Roger - 310 476-5936
January 12, 2002

Dr. Donald McIsaac, Executive Director
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 220
Portland, Oregon 97220

RE: Highly Migratory Species Draft Plan

Dear Dr. McIsaac

I acknowledge receipt of the Pacific Fishery Management Council’s Draft Fishery Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for U.S. West Coast Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species hereinafter referred to as the “Plan” that, frankly speaking, seems to favor certain fishers and therefore can only be interpreted as prejudicial to fishers, such as the undersigned.

For your consideration, I am a California Drift Gill-Netter for shark and swordfish. That there is a potential due to this “heavily regulated fishery” (Plan @ ES-4) that I could be out of business should this highly charged political-environmental trend continue.

There is every indication this trend will continue as evidenced by California Proposition 132 in 1990 putting the inshore gill netter who traditionally fished just off the beach out 3 miles from Point Conception to the Mexican border and locally in the Los Angeles and Orange County area out 12 miles effectively placing their target species out of reach and out of business.

Further evidencing the “trend” the National Marine Fisheries Service relative to the California Drift Net Fishery implemented gear restrictions, e.g., six fathom suspenders, and the use of pingers with the Marine Mammals Protection Act; and prohibited taking and zero tolerance of endangered species and most recently (August 2001) limiting fishing grounds above Pt. Conception by implementing the Pacific Leatherback Conservation Area. It is my understanding the NMFS now proposes in El Nino years limiting the fishing grounds from Pt. Conception to the Mexican border relative to the sea turtle.

It is clear the California Drift Net fishery is politically and environmentally charged and those fishers, such as myself, are in danger of being legislated out of business.
Dr. Donald McIsaac, Executive Director  
Pacific Fishery Management Council  
January 12, 2002  
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RE: Highly Migratory Species Draft Plan

Should this happen, and like most fishers, I have all my monies invested in my boat and gear, after all it’s been my living for many years, as in any business. Consequently, my only alternative would be to continue in the highly migratory species by supporting my family in the albacore surface hook and line fishery.

Unfortunately, the Highly Migratory Species Draft Plan proposes a limited entry plan with a control date of March 9, 2000. (Plan @ ES-11)

I am very concerning with the Council’s position relative to albacore and related species that it is accepting a “plan” that “Some individuals from this fishery expressed concern to the Council that a limited entry program may be necessary to control excess capacity.” (Plan @ ES-11).

That “In response to this concern” those individuals and not based upon scientific studies which clearly indicate there is no over fishing of the albacore as evidenced by the participation of vessels “peaking at more than 2,000 in the mid 1970’s. In 1999, 775 troll vessels landed albacore.” (Plan @ ES-3). In fact the number of vessels has sharply declined.

That the Status of Fish Stocks as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and implemented by the IASTTC assessments which states “Presently the albacore stock is healthy, and stock and catches are both increasing . . . no regional harvest guideline is recommended”; Eastern Pacific Yellowfin Tuna “no regional harvest guideline is recommended; Bigeye Tuna “no regional harvest guideline is recommended”, Skipjack Tuna “no regional harvest guideline is recommended and Northern Bluefin Tuna “no regional harvest guideline is recommended”. (Plan @ ES-6--ES-7)

It seems the Council is favoring a certain group of fishers who want to eliminate any and all other fishers in the obvious hope they can drive the price of albacore up being the “only” ones fishing albacore. That knowingly or unknowingly the Council’s proposed draft plan is creating a commodity (albacore) that is being controlled by one group of fishers, effectively, creating a monopoly that in all likelihood would be thrown into the judicial system for resolution.

I propose the Council give consideration to those fishers who are already in the California Drift Gill Net fishery being able to change over to the Albacore Fishery without being sanctioned by a control date of March 9, 2000.
RE: Highly Migratory Species Draft Plan

I will be attending the February 2, 2002 public hearing in San Pedro, California and request that I am placed on the list of speakers as well.

Further that my letter be circulated to all members of the Council for the March 2002 Council meeting and that I am placed on the list of speakers as well.

Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. HENSLEY

cc: Congresswoman Jane Harman