

**Subject: Fwd: Cutbacks**

**Date:** Thu, 30 May 2002 09:38:05 -0700

**From:** "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**To:** chuck.tracy@noaa.gov

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384  
Phone: 503-820-2280  
Fax: 503-820-2299  
Toll-Free: 1-866-806-7204  
On the web at: <http://www.pcouncil.org>

---

**Subject: Cutbacks**

**Date:** Wed, 29 May 2002 19:40:19 EDT

**From:** <llahodges@aol.com>

**To:** pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

We are in the commercial fishing industry and in the paper we read that we could face worse cutbacks next year that we already have. There is a statement that says if a survey on Halibut is done it could catch all of the yearly quota on bocaccio and yellow eye. If these fish are so endangered how can a survey catch the whole west coast allowance . If they are so scarce no one should be able to catch them. Someone needs to get thier head out of the sand and really see what is happening. The fishermen are seeing these fish which are suppose to live in the rocks out in the flat lands of the ocean. Does this make any sence? We are all having to be put out of business because of someones asumptions. Why not let the fishermen show what is out there? We all have to sit back and wait while you drive us into bankruptcy when we see the stocks are there. We don't know where the information is coming from but it is so wrong. UN REAL. All the fishermen have told you people what is out there but we are thought to all be liars. Don't you think it's time for someone to wake up and listen to the people who depend on the resource for thier lives? There is something seriously wrong with your data. It's time to check it or give us a way out without going totally broke!!!!!!!

---

PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**Subject:** Fwd: Bottom Fish  
**From:** "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, 03 Jun 2002 09:17:22 -0700  
**To:** john.devore@noaa.gov  
**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GX518Y00.TUG for <john.devore@noaa.gov>; Mon, 3 Jun 2002 09:17:22 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <32b87532b52d.32b52d32b875@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--5639709f20f718a9"

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384  
Phone: 503-820-2280  
Fax: 503-820-2299  
Toll-Free: 1-866-806-7204  
On the web at: <http://www.pcouncil.org>

---

**Subject:** Bottom Fish  
**From:** Paul Fako <prfako@worldnet.att.net>  
**Date:** Mon, 03 Jun 2002 08:29:00 -0700  
**To:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GX518Y00.TUG for <john.devore@noaa.gov>; Mon, 3 Jun 2002 09:17:22 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <32b87532b52d.32b52d32b875@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--5639709f20f718a9"

Greetings:

I was pleased to read the article concerning your proposed action to ban bottom fishing in US Pacific Waters to increase depleted stock. This is a few years late as far as I am concerned. Although I am an avid fish eater and one-time ocean fisherman, It is very noticeable to even the least active of us that we are losing our fish. I only hope that the order is strong enough to enable us to prevent other countries from continuing to fish our water out to at least 100 miles. they will be angry, but it happens. the entire world should take a hint and eat cereal for a few years to allow us to regain a hold on our fish stocks and STOP using this valuable for FERTILIZER and cat food and other unnecessary, profit/gain oriented enterpeises that are really of no benefit to me as a common man.

Thanks again. Vote YES to ban for 10 years!!!

Paul Fako, Pacifica, CA

PFMC Comments  
<pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**Subject:** Fwd: Rockfish populations  
**From:** "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Thu, 30 May 2002 09:37:45 -0700  
**To:** john.devore@noaa.gov  
**CC:** chuck.tracy@noaa.gov

**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GWXNIX00.B29; Thu, 30 May 2002 09:37:45 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <305cd230754a.30754a305cd2@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--237267a27f085ab0"

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384  
Phone: 503-820-2280  
Fax: 503-820-2299  
Toll-Free: 1-866-806-7204  
On the web at: <http://www.pcouncil.org>

---

**Subject:** Rockfish populations  
**From:** Kimball Marlow <kmarlow@earthlink.net>  
**Date:** Thu, 30 May 2002 08:53:14 -0700  
**To:** pfmc.comments@noaa.gov  
**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GWXNIX00.B29; Thu, 30 May 2002 09:37:45 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <305cd230754a.30754a305cd2@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--237267a27f085ab0"

To: Policy Makers

I read a article in the Oregonian this morning on 3 rockfish that have very low populations with a projected recovery time of 60 plus years. I have a few ideas that might help, both the fish, and the commercial fisherman. I agree that the populations need recovery time, and the only way to do this is to stop fishing where they breed and mature. It is to bad that the other fisheries will have to pay the price for the recovery of this group, but it seems the only clear path to recovery. I would like to see this problem approached in a manor that works for everyone, but I think that is not practical, some commercial fishing will have to be redefined such as the bottom drag net group that destroy a wide range of habitat and captures juvenile fish. Here is what I have come up with for a few solutions.

1. That recreational angling stay unchanged from the shore, and within the mouth of the bay.
2. That recreational angling outside the bay be confined to 2 mile north or south of the bay, and up to 4 miles out. (This will leave a very large area for natural habitat that can offer plenty of space to young fish, and will also reduce the take of young Salmon.)
3. Halibut fishing and Crab trapping stay unchanged.
4. All drag nets, gill nets, and long lines be terminated for a number of years, and then only allow them to work small strips of ocean bottom. Kind of like strip logging in the mountains, but 95% of the ocean bottom is untouched forever to keep fishery levels in good condition.
5. Institute a massive artificial reef/habitat project up and down the coast to provide work for the displaced commercial fisherman, and speed the recovery of the rockfish populations. I'm not sure what you would use for this, but I think I remember old tires being put to good use this way. This will keep their boats operating and the bills paid, so their families don't end up on the welfare line. ( get congress to recognize this as a disaster area that requires help)
6. Keep foreign fishing boats a long way of our continental shelf.

This is just some brain storming and you can take it or leave it, but I had to put in my 2 cents.  
Sincerely: Kim Marlow

PFMC Comments  
<pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**Subject:** Fwd: Don't Stop Sportsman from Bottom Fishing!  
**From:** "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, 31 May 2002 13:35:17 -0700  
**To:** john.devore@noaa.gov

**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GWZT6T00.LII for <john.devore@noaa.gov>; Fri, 31 May 2002 13:35:17 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <319e3d314239.314239319e3d@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--3ad61d78575c7aa"

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384  
Phone: 503-820-2280  
Fax: 503-820-2299  
Toll-Free: 1-866-806-7204  
On the web at: <http://www.pcouncil.org>

---

**Subject:** Don't Stop Sportsman from Bottom Fishing!  
**From:** "Wilsonville Dental Group" <wdgweb@wilsonvilledental.com>  
**Date:** Thu, 30 May 2002 21:48:02 -0700  
**To:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**X-Mozilla-Status:** 0001  
**X-Mozilla-Status2:** 00000000  
**Return-Path:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>  
**Received:** from mercury.akctr.noaa.gov ([127.0.0.1]) by mercury.akctr.noaa.gov (Netscape Messaging Server 4.15 mercury Jun 21 2001 23:53:48) with ESMTP id GWZT6T00.LII for <john.devore@noaa.gov>; Fri, 31 May 2002 13:35:17 -0700  
**Message-ID:** <319e3d314239.314239319e3d@mercury.akctr.noaa.gov>  
**X-Mailer:** Netscape Webmail  
**MIME-Version:** 1.0  
**Content-Language:** en  
**X-Accept-Language:** en  
**Content-Type:** multipart/mixed; boundary="--3ad61d78575c7aa"

## Wilsonville Dental Group, P.C.

29292 Town Center Loop E.  
Wilsonville, OR 97070  
503-682-3873 fax  
503-682-0431  
drclark@wilsonvilledental.com

May 30, 2002

*Pacific Fisheries Management Council*

Re: Commission to stop all bottom fishing for sportsman

Dear Sirs:

I am a concerned citizen and sportsman in Oregon worried about the pending rule changes that would eliminate all fishing in the Pacific Ocean for all bottom fish, including halibut, ling cod, sea bass, etc. As I am sure you are aware, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council is recommending eliminating all bottom fishing by January 2003. If this passes through the council and is adopted, it will be a disaster for Oregon's coastal economy, as well as a huge disappointment for all sports fishermen.

Specifically, I feel sport fishing should be considered separately from commercial fishing, and like all the other fishing regulations, be regulated separately. I think the economic impact of this decision must be balanced with any concern for the fish. There must be better science behind such a decision, one that has such sweeping results. This should be better thought out and more gradually implemented. I have outlined below the reasons for this important point. If there is anything you can do to help keep the sport fishing open, it will keep the charter boats, the guides and the private fisherman on the water. If bottom fishing is eliminated for sportsmen, all the ocean charters will cease to exist. Please have one of your staff call and interview some of them and you will be shocked at how catastrophic this will be to them personally and as an industry. Here are two names you can call:

Jeurgen Turner, Captain of the Tacklebuster, Tradewinds Charters, Depoe Bay, Oregon 1-541-765-2949, 1-800-445-8730

Wayne Butler, Captain of the MisChief, Bandon, Oregon  
1-541-347-9126

Outlined below are the main points to consider:

1. Sportsmen make a huge contribution to the local economy. Depending on the area, we are talking about millions and millions of dollars, from gas stations, to shopping malls, to hotels and restaurants, etc.
2. Sportsmen catch only 3-4% of the total catch, statistically insignificant. This is way less than the margin of error that the researchers use for guessing the numbers of total fish and their alleged decline. In other words, the impact of sport fishing could not even be measured! They are swatting a fly with a sledgehammer, and then want to measure the impact of the fly on reducing the speed of the sledgehammer as it comes to a stop. Whether there was inshore sport fishing or not would have no statistical impact on the total population of bottom fish, either up or down.
3. Sportsmen generate 40 times as much money per pound of fish caught than commercially caught fish for the economy. Thus it would be fiscally irresponsibly to eliminate millions of dollars from the economy without any proven benefit. The commercial boats catch 97% of the fish but contribute only 2.5%, per pound of fish caught, as much to the economy as the sport fisherman. Wouldn't it make a lot more sense to have your cake and eat it too, i.e. cut the commercial fisherman, thus reducing fish catch by 97%, and retain the sport fishing with it's millions and millions of dollars in the economy.
4. Sportsman practice targeted fishing techniques, not indiscriminate, non-selective methods, like the commercial fisherman. Sport fishing uses simple hooks and bait targeted toward a specific species. If the wrong fish is caught it can generally be released unharmed. Generally fish are caught one at a time, therefore reducing to total damage, worst-case scenario, to one fish! Commercial fisherman's techniques will kill all the fish caught, regardless of their species or desirability, and this may be thousands of fish by a single boat. The by catch/incidental catch of non-target fish can sometimes be greater than the targeted species. The incidental catch fish are generally not allowed to be kept, thus a double problem; not only were they needlessly killed, they will not even be eaten. Generally the unwanted fish are simply pitch forked over the side. To put this into perspective, every year the incidental catch of halibut by commercial fisherman fishing for other species, is greater than the total amount of halibut caught by sport fishermen! This can also be true for salmon and other fish depending on the commercial fishery and location.
5. Sportsman's fishing techniques do not harm the fish's habitat, like can happen with some commercial harvesting. There is no impact to the fish habitat by sport fishing. Some types of commercial fishing can cause irreparable damage to the bottom structure that can totally wreck the habitat and seriously disrupt the food chain. The indiscriminant harvesting of "everything" on the bottom can totally devastate the populations of some species to the point of complete extinction in that location.
6. Sportsmen have proven they will follow conservationist regulations. These regulations do not need to be all or none. If there are target fish needing help with survival, let the sportsman be an educated conservationist and make those species catch and release only. Sportsmen have been doing this successfully for many years with numerous other species.
7. Sportsmen are willing to team-up with the Fish and Wildlife agencies to help with the rehabilitation of bottom fish habitat and populations. They are willing to contribute time and money to help. This new regulation will not make them a team member but will make them an enemy. There will be no money, time or cooperation when such fact less and groundless regulations are put into effect.
8. The continued sport fishing for bottom fish enhances public awareness of the problem. As long as people are still fishing for bottom fish, even with catch and release regulations, there will be an increased public awareness of the problem. Out of sight and out of mind will take place if there is no bottom fishing.
9. The government should not have a "knee jerk" reaction to limited and potentially flawed science.
  - a. Perhaps the same El Nino climatic changes, which produced a huge reduction in the salmon populations for a decade, may be responsible for a similar cyclic low in the bottom fish population. (El Nino's change in winds and currents reduced the near shore upwelling of nutrient rich deep water. This in turn diminished the food for plankton, which diminished the food for herring and other baitfish, which diminished the food for salmon.) Since it is known that bottom fish, in general, mature slower and live longer than salmon, and since they are effected by the very same food chain changes, perhaps it is simply the same cyclic change in their population that was observed for salmon, but delayed in observance because of their slower growth and reproduction. This would be a naturally occurring cycle, not one completely caused by over fishing. Likewise, it will self-resolve with the return of normal ocean conditions more conducive to providing the necessary food chain for all the bottom fish involved; and until the ocean conditions favor the reproduction of bottom fish populations, sport fishing restrictions will have zero positive effect.
  - b. Perhaps, since the only real research on bottom fishing populations is on fish inside 250 fathoms, the cause of a decline in fish populations is related to chemical pollutants and other toxins. If we focus on fishing as the only cause of the decline, more time and money will be senselessly lost. The focus of regulations should be as specific as possible to target and control the most likely causes of the bottom fish decline. Sport fishing is not one of the principle causes and restricting it will cause more harm than good. The money generated by the sport fisherman can be used to fund more research and find effective solutions to the fisheries problems. Eliminating the sportsmen's revenues will reduce the amount of funding to find the true causes and solutions.
10. The regulations should relate to actual local conditions, not global, sweeping regulations that treat every area with the same restrictions, regardless of the local fish populations and conditions. They should have accurate estimates of past fish populations and be able to show conclusively there is a decline, (not a natural cyclic adjustment to fish populations) and then do this for each area they wish to regulate. Since the fish are not migratory, it is not acceptable to generalize conditions and populations and assume that in area X it is the same as in area Y. It would be criminal to damage people and economies in areas where it is not needed; where restricting fishing in healthy areas would have no positive benefit for the areas where the problems exist, and would cause great harm to the people and economy where there isn't even a problem.
11. The Federal Government has no constitutional right to regulate Oregon State waters, i.e. inside three miles of our coast. It regulates salmon because the fish are migratory and extend their range beyond state boundaries; halibut because it is impacted by commercial fisherman from all west coast states in waters generally outside the state's three mile boundary, and other fisheries that are primarily outside the state's boundary, i.e. shrimp, haddock, cod, etc. However, bottom fish are not migratory and the part of this new regulation that would impact inside the three-mile state's constitutional boundary is outside the federal government's jurisdiction. It would be tantamount to the federal government regulating crappie fishing. It is the states sovereign right to control it's own boundary waters. The state of Oregon should vigorously oppose any federal regulations inside it's own boundaries.

As I began, I am a concerned citizen and sportsman. Professionally I am a dentist, not a charter boat operator or guide. I am very interested in seeing sound science behind any decision and believe we have not been given any. Nor has the Commission considered the State's rights and ability to handle much of this on a state level.

Please balance your considerations and do all you can to help protect not only the fish, but the fishermen as well.

Sincerely,

Terrence A. Clark, DMD

PFMC Comments  
[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)