

Commenters labeled the following emails for Agenda Item H.3. The Council took final action on Pacific bluefin bag limit changes in November 2014. NMFS is currently undertaking rulemaking to implement the change. For that reason these comments have been included under **Agenda Item H.1, NMFS Report.**

### Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

#### **Messages in thread 1**

Thu Feb 12 2015 19:38:57 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b8104bcf5b64ef

From: Ken Thompson <ktboltman@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please no more restrictions on fishing without doing all the studies that are necessary before making a decisions

Sent from my iPhone

### Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

#### **Messages in thread 1**

Thu Feb 12 2015 19:29:36 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b80fc1341fb5a4

From: Karen Dalo <karendalo62@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Regarding further restrictions on pacific bluefin fishing. Please please hear our fisherman's voice on the proposed restrictions. While the San Diego fleet only accounts for 7% of the fish taken and in past years about 40% of owners had to walk away from their boats because their lively hood has been shaken so bad in the last 10 years with poor fishing . These hard working men and women are loosing their businesses , homes and complete livelyhoods, some even having to get public assistance are enjoying a complete fluke of being able to fish the bluefin all winter long and keep their business afloat (sorry for the pun) they do not over fish on these fortunate winter trips. They will not be able to run their boats with a one fish limit..it is very rare at this time of year to get 3 fish per angler, please reconsider and at least only cut it in half...please don't put any more people out of work...hasn't our government done that enough?

Karen Dalo, CST

### H3

#### **Messages in thread 1**

Thu Feb 12 2015 16:19:19 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b804e0a4b9c167

From: "John A. Hammargren" <ja.hammar@verizon.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Gentlemen: I've been fishing the California coast for a great many years. I agree we have suffered a serious decline in our Bluefin Tuna fishery. I suspect that most of the decline is the result of overfishing by the commercial fishing industry. It then stands to reason if we want to restore this fishery we need to limit commercial fishing. Tough, but we no longer hunt passenger pigeons.

John Hammargren  
15409 Grovehill Lane  
La Mirada, CA 90638

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Thu Feb 12 2015 09:25:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7ed2e3b0cea5f

From: D&D Overbay <doverbay1@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I do not support the reduction of Pacific Bluefin Tuna take by the non-commercial fishermen. What do the scientific studies of this reduction indicate for the future population of this species? Will it have an impact at all? What about commercial and charter boats' take? If the purpose is to keep a sustainable population of tuna for future generations, then shouldn't those who take the most be limited in their take? If the purpose is to stop recreational fishing in California, then you're probably on the right track...but you won't succeed.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Thu Feb 12 2015 08:24:00 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7e9ad6ad310e1

From: Scott Floe <scooter1960@aol.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please access the impact that recreation Bluefin fishing has on the tuna population vs the commercial slaughter that takes place here in the North Pacific Ocean by commercial overfishing. Somewhat here on the east side mostly in Mexico but mainly to the juvenile populations in the western Pacific's international waters by Japan and a few other Asian nations.

Please get real and stop placing less than token punitive restrictions on the recreational fishermen here in the eastern pacific and focus your attention on the real problem in the western pacific before it is too late! By doing so you perpetuate the problem by focusing the publics attention away from the real cause of the Bluefin depopulation. We recreational fishermen here in California share your objectives to preserve all fish populations in our oceans, help us join forces on a United front with you against the real cause of this challenge.

We recreational fishermen in the eastern pacific are not the problem, we can be part of the solution though if you partner with us rather than punish us for something that we have little to

nothing to do with the diminished Bluefin populations.

Scott Floe  
Scooter1960@aol.com  
951-813-2604  
Sent from my iPad

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Thu Feb 12 2015 06:51:14 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7e45dbc0f1c3f

From: Rich <janrich3963@sbcglobal.net>  
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Reduce the commercial catch by the same percentage as the recreational catch. It is the fair thing to do. Reduce the number of pens and place min size that would be allowed to be penned

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Thu Feb 12 2015 06:14:45 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7e27bfc9fa9b3

From: Ralph Gobel <ralph.c.gobel@gmail.com>  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Ladies and gentlemen, Imposing blue fin tuna restrictions on RECREATIONAL Anglers is the WRONG thing for you to do. Recreational anglers ARE NOT THE PROBLEM! Instead, you should be imposing restrictions on COMMERCIAL fisherman and blue fin tuna. What is wrong with you people!!?? Has the lobby paid you off? It sure seems that way. You need to do more accurate research before you even consider anything! Ralph Gobel, California Angler “The basic premise of the Founding Fathers was man’s right to his own life, to his own liberty, to the pursuit of his own happiness—which means: man’s right to exist for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself...” Ayn Rand

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 22:54:14 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7c9117e8199b2

From: MIRYAM LIBERMAN <mliberman1md@icloud.com>  
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I've been a sport fisherman for 33 years. I have always been appalled by the waste & carelessness of many commercial fishing outfits. Most sport fishing is targeted, less wasteful, and is small fraction of any commercial fishing. To limit individual anglers by 80% of blue fin catch and not do AT LEAST THE SAME to commercial fishing seems thoughtless and absurd.

Miryam Liberman.

**Sent from my iPhone**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 20:19:31 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7c037e80ce574

From: Anthony Morales <tone9424@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Look at the numbers... You're punishing the wrong anglers... Commercial fishing is depleting our waters... Please make the right decision and support your local recreational fisherman!!

Thank you!!

Pasqual Morales

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 19:12:24 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7bfec8c59ae44

From: Shane Bitler <shane.bitler@me.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I vote against the proposal to lower the limits on bluefin tuna for recreational anglers.

Thank you,

Shane Bitler

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 18:34:24 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7ba5c0f8db644

From: seadog1@gmail.com

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

While I agree that action needs to be taken to preserve the Pacific Bluefin, ANY action that does not significantly reduce commercial take is an action in vain.

YES, reduce recreational take! YES, reduce commercial take! But do this fairly and equally for both groups

Thank you!

Howard Folmer, Gardena, CA

### Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

## Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 18:10:22 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7b8d3a924f4d5

**From:** Andrew Sienkiewich <[andrewsienk@verizon.net](mailto:andrewsienk@verizon.net)>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I live near the ocean, have a recreational fishing boat and belong to a recreational fishing club. I find the proposed regulation as ineffective. The disparity is regulating the recreational catch of Bluefin tuna to two/day while not reducing the commercial catch limits. Everyone knows that commercial overfishing has impacted this species. Please balance the process with added regulations to the commercial catch which amounts to over 90 percent of the annual take and a more liberal limit for recreational fisherman. The proposed low limit of 2 fish per recreational angler is bound to hurt the recreational fishing businesses and will needlessly take the fun out the one or two Bluefin trips I will engage in this year. This unbalanced proposal if adopted will only crate a backlash from those of us love spending time on the ocean and who seek to preserve its assets. :(((((".....^.....(((((".

Sea ya, Andy Sienkiewich Long Beach, California

### **Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna**

## Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 17:22:17 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7b6127e1ea808

**From:** Jim Joe Farrant <jfarrant05@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**To Whom It May Concern-**

I am writing to voice my concern on the Pacific Bluefin Tuna limit being proposed for recreational anglers. It is my understanding the the recreational angler makes up just a small portion of the Bluefin Tuna catch annually. The proposed reduction of 80 percent is baseless and unfair when you consider the proportion being caught by the recreational angler.

The current restrictions imposed across the fishery for all types of fish have been obeyed and respected by every boat I have ever been on. As they change from year to year, the captains and crew are very much versed on the regulations and make sure to share and adhere to the policies set forth. If a restriction or reduction is to be imposed it should be proportional and fair to the industry of recreational fishing.

Bluefin tuna awareness is at a peak and I fully support a reduction or quota according to the science and research done by the good people that are fighting for the cause. I just believe that the reduction should be proportional and give the recreational fisherman a chance.

I believe that imposing this restriction is punishing the wrong group of people. I believe that since the recreational angler is by and large a law abiding group, it is easier to target for restrictions. However, this restriction is missing the point. It is the commercial fisherman and the mass catch and consumption that is reducing the population. The small percentage of Bluefin tuna caught by recreational anglers supports an industry of recreational fishing and a population of anglers. It bands the fisherman together as an organization and brings strangers closer to

each other in an unorganized culture. When 90+ percentage of the Bluefin are being taken by commercial vessels, the only happy person is the consumer in front of the plate.

It is unfair and damaging to the band of recreational fisherman to impose such such a reduction on the Bluefin catch when ignoring the commercial fishery and the real cause of such a restriction.

Thank you for your time.

James J. Farrant  
25925 Narbonne Ave. #9  
Lomita, CA 90717

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 16:11:25 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7b205ba00ae15

From: Nick Hartline <Nick@icicolorado.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Hello,

I live in Colorado and fly out to California a few times a year to catch fish and bring them back to Colorado to share with friends. On better trips I have BBQs for my crew on construction jobs sites never waisting any meat. I charter a 3 day fishing trip every weekend of July 19th, early season trips have been difficult until bluefin fishing started and we were able to catch a few bluefin through out the years. Last year sadly we missed bluefin fishing as the ban was during my charter. I completely understand that some people abuse fishing and waste meat and just kill to kill, how ever many of us throw back smaller fish, only catch what we will eat and donate time and money into wildlife.

This 2 fish limit, reminds me of anti gun laws, banning guns from civilians will not stop criminals from having guns. Banning a normal limit on tuna is punishing the rule followers but criminals will still do the same.

I think "football" tuna should always be thrown back no matter what species of fish they are, "rat" yellow tail should always be thrown back. 10 fish per day is way more than people need. 5 fish a day per species makes fishing enjoyable and realistic on the amount of fish humans can consume.

I beg that when time comes to vote, you consider us sport fisherman that are out here following the rules and respecting the wild life will be hurt and feel mis treated for following regulations.

Thank you for your time and considering us during your vote,

Nick Hartline  
303-877-1020  
ICI  
(This message was sent from a Mobil device)

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 14:13:08 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7ab3fb73b288d

From: Payton Thatcher <paytonthatcher34@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I'm all for reducing the bluefin tuna catch; however, it seems incredibly unfair and ineffective to focus the reduction on recreational anglers. Why not find a compromise considering an 80% reduction is quite drastic. Also, focusing restrictions on recreational anglers won't be nearly as effective as it would be to do so on commercial fishing. I'm not asking for their to be no reduction for recreational anglers but I don't see how punishing recreational anglers instead of commercial fishing will do any good, especially when you realize that recreational anglers only make up 7% of the bluefin catch. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

-Payton Thatcher

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### **Messages in thread 1**

Wed Feb 11 2015 11:52:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7a334bbcc3fed

From: Randall Standridge <deepsea4270@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Good Afternoon PFMC.

I understand you are enforcing the take on bluefin tuna from 10 fish to 2 fish and that is so wrong. I had a chance to catch 5 bluefin tuna in the 30lb class on a 2 day trip in CA waters this year but it's been years since my last tuna trip.

My point is recreational anglers are not making an impact on the bluefin tuna like the commercial fleet does and you people have the proof right in front of you.

If it goes to 2 fish I will not board any sports boat to fish tuna because the cost way too much to fish for 2 fish. Your just hurting and killing jobs in the fishing industry on a large scale.

I've been with a few fishing clubs for over 10 yrs now and now VP of one of them. My club members feel the same and your welcome to come a speak for us and tell us why? Yea I thought so.

Educated fools,

Randy S.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 11:45:29 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7a2cd1c757f77

From: Lisa Rizzo <lisa@venturaembroidery.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear Council Members,

I am as interested as anyone in protecting and sustaining our fisheries. If the 2015 sport fishing take for blue fin tuna needs to be reduced to 2 per day, that is fine.

However, it does not seem right that commercial fisherman are not subject to the same reduction as sport fisherman; as their annual take is many times greater. I respectfully request that you consider a balanced approach to your decision so that both commercial and recreational fisherman will share in any reduction.

In my opinion the 2015 percentage reduction for commercial blue fin tuna fishing should be no greater or less than the percentage reduction that recreational sport fisherman will be required to accept. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rizzo

831 Casmalia Lane Ventura, CA 93001

805-654-0194

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 11:36:25 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7a24813255df7

From: Gary Bunn <gbunn@att.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Sportsmen and women do more for this industry than any other including Government. We spend Billions on hunting and fishing and value it as a sport with some table fare. We do not make a profit from this as others do. So please stay out of our form of recreation. Gary S. Bunngbunn@att.net 619 843 4198

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 11:28:57 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7a1dab58f08ba

From: Andrew Harris <[andrew.harris@myacot.com](mailto:andrew.harris@myacot.com)>

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

CC:

Hello,

I am a local tuna fisherman who wants to voice my concern with the proposal to limit the amount of Bluefin tuna recreational anglers can keep from 10 to 2. I understand that the species needs to be protected and the fishery controlled but this should be done by regulating commercial fishing instead.

Thank you

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 3

Wed Feb 11 2015 05:13:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b78c61fb036dcb

From: Dave Cummings <davesbsd@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Davesbsd@yahoo.com

Wed Feb 11 2015 05:15:04 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b78c763288e350

From: Dave Cummings <davesbsd@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Davesbsd@yahoo.com

Wed Feb 11 2015 05:15:48 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b78c81078fc177

From: Dave Cummings <davesbsd@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Davesbsd@yahoo.com

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 04:47:55 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b78ae822e6ab2e

From: mmillard58 <m.millard.58@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Recreational fishing provides a healthy sport that puts food on the table, promotes sportsmanship and also gives young people a healthy alternative to the negative lifestyle so consistent with todays youth..We pay our fees and respect the ocean..This would do damage to the sportfishing community..Please take a better look at reducing some commercial fishing and give us a reasonable limit on bluefin tuna Sent from my MetroPCS 4G Android device

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Wed Feb 11 2015 01:41:50 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b780e4aa4638ad

From: Adam Duran <preach818@mail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Hello, I wanted to send my opposition to any new restrictions on recreational fishing of Blue Fin Tuna. I am opposed to this idea since I a recreational fisherman. I believe more laws and regulations will be far more successful if the are made for corporate fishing since we recreational fishermen are only a fraction of the catchers. Please do not limit us recreational fishermen any more. Thank you.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 23:21:16 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b778379ecf3468

From: "Tanner S." <tannersaccento@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

We, the recreational fishermen, only account for 7% of the bluefin tuna catch annually. Yet, we receive far greater consequences than the commercial fishermen. This is not fair.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 20:54:07 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b76fa089928249

From: Colin Masters <dodo6179@aim.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Dear council,

The decision to lower the limit has not been seen through all the way. The economic impact to the recreational tuna limits has a much deeper impact than one might think. With lower Limits, yes there will be fewer juvenile blue fin tuna killed, there will be fewer passengers running on boats, less tackle bought, less fuel burned. This is not just about the environment, but more so of an economic impact.

-Colin Masters

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 19:48:08 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b76c054a85f950

From: Bruce Severns <severnsbruce@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Just leave us sport fisher-persons alone it is not us who are raping the fisheries the little fish we catch and eat cannot have an adverse effect on the fisheries. Yet the little person seems to always pay for the over catching and adverse effects caused by commercial fishermen and large corporations. fishing, Hunting and most out door sports have already become activities for the rich. If the fish population is on the decrease the go to those who pull more fish form our waters and make the reduce their catch, 10 fish or tons of fish who is raping the oceans, NOT the sport fisherman.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 14:37:20 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b75a3d5c8ca809

From: Ron Rudrud 818-448-6711 <ronrudrud@verizon.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I have been sportfishing in Southern California for over 50 years and I love it. I am as interested as anyone in protecting and sustaining our fisheries. If the 2015 sportfishing take for bluefin tuna needs to be reduced to 2 per day I can live with that.

However, I do not understand why commercial fisherman are not subject to the same reduction as sportfisherman. Their annual take is many times greater. Please consider a balanced approach to your decision so that both commercial and recreational fisherman will share in any reduction. In my opinion the 2015 percentage reduction for commercial bluefin tuna fishing should be no greater or less than the percentage reduction that recreational sportfisherman will be required to accept.

Thanks for the opportunity to have my say,

Sincerely,

Ronald Rudrud  
1123 Turtle Creek Lane  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320  
818-448-6711 cell  
818-647-7009 fax  
AmeriFund Lending Group  
CA Dept. of Real Estate - Broker Lic. No. 00942375  
NMLS Unique Identifier Number 319297  
"It is one of the most beautiful compensations of this life that no man can sincerely try to help another without helping himself." Ralph Waldo Emerson  
This transmission may contain information that is privileged, confidential, legally privileged, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Although this transmission and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect that might affect any computer system into which it is received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free and no responsibility is accepted by AmeriFund Lending Group or Ron Rudrud for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and destroy the material in its entirety, whether in electronic or hard copy format. Thank you.

## recreational bluefin limits

### Messages in thread 2

Tue Feb 10 2015 13:04:25 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b754eb7b2d8785

From: thomas hill <thillgeo@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC: luke burson <lmbur@aol.com>

Tue Feb 10 2015 13:52:05 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b757a50bbfa7fc

From: PFMC Comments - NOAA Service Account <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

To: Kit Dahl - NOAA Affiliate <kit.dahl@noaa.gov>

CC:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: thomas hill thillgeo@yahoo.com

Date: Tue, Feb 10, 2015 at 1:04 PM

Subject: recreational bluefin limits

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Cc: luke burson [lmbur@aol.com](mailto:lmbur@aol.com)

I understand that the proposed limit for take of Bluefin tuna by recreational fishermen is to be lowered to 2 fish per day, while the limits for commercial fishermen will hardly be impacted at all. Although we all understand that Bluefin stocks are on the decline and something must be done to mitigate this situation, it is my opinion that the change in limits needs to focus on the appropriate target, one that will actually help the situation, namely the commercial fishery. If I am informed correctly, recreational fishermen account for only about 7% of the annual take. If their limit is reduced to 2 fish per day, that number will be reduced to 1-2 %, hardly a big impact. I know that commercial fishermen need to make a living, but the industries that support recreational fishermen are in the same boat so to speak.

I urge you to consider a more reasonable take limit for recreational fishermen and to give more thought toward what will really help the Bluefin recover from overfishing. If you do, I think you will agree that recreational fishermen are not the problem.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 13:45:58 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7574cc9d52340

From: Ron Shrout <rshroud@bradfordrefi.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I'm a fisherman that lives in Southern Orange County, CA. I enjoy fishing for many fish especially Blue Fin Tuna (BFT) and I found it very interesting that BFT need to be above 60 pound before they reproduce. Based on this we all need to cut back on the amount of BFT taken from our Pacific Ocean. This must include commercial fisherman as well as sport-fishermen.

Please do all you can to see to it that the commercial fishermen reduce the amount of BFT that are taken from our waters by a similar amount as us sport fishermen do. If we are required reduce our take by 80% then the commercial fishermen must reduce their take by like amount.

Sincerely

Ron Shrout  
25332 Barents  
Laguna Hills, CA 92653  
949-951-7829

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 12:42:02 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b753a37b5d9f3d

From: Ray Smith <malibu9@sbcglobal.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

To whom it concerns

As a concerned citizen of this country I want my feelings and opinion to be known.....I do believe I have that right. My father thought me how to fish, many hours & days were spent with him, not just in learning the techniques in catching fish but also being taught to respect our environment. I now as a father and grandfather have the pleasure of passing on the same teachings and not to just my children but to anyone who wants to go fishing, weather fresh or saltwater fishing. I find it most concerning that the activity that has been part of my life spanning through 4 generations is being so regulated that the opportunities to continue on with this pastime now seems to be in

jeopardy. I feel completely taken advantage of related to the Pacific Blue-fin Tuna potential restrictions that are at our threshold. Are the voices of the anglers being heard.....is my voice being heard or is the voice of the commercial fishing industry simply too large and drowning out the rational voice of the private sector. Are the powers that be looking at the facts, the percentages, the real numbers without any bias. Last time I checked the sport-fishing, private sector only accounted for 7% of the fish being taken. Let's be fair. If regulation need to be considered let's look at where the larger percentage of the harvest is taking place.....The commercial fishing industry. I sincerely appreciate your taking the time to hear me out.....please be fair and do not penalize those who police themselves and want to have a fishery to pass onto future generations.

A concerned fisherman, Ray Smith

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 11:54:27 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7511835e3f648

From: Tim Reed <fishsouthcounty@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

We, the recreational fisherman of California, are not the problem for the decreased bluefin stocks along the pacific coast of California and baja . The overfishing via the Japanese controlled fleets and aquaculture along the baja coast is the problem. A 2 fish limit is outrageous. I think a medium of 5 fish per person per day is fine. Limit the take by the commercial fleet as they are the ultimate devastating factor.

Thank you for your time

Timothy Reed

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 11:12:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74e86dcd7f142

From: pmtnguyen <pmtnguyen@hotmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Please do not reduce recreational bluefin tuna fishing to 2. Thank you.

Sent on the new Sprint Network from my Samsung Galaxy S®4.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 10:53:46 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74d7228ea30eb

From: Mary Champion <mcham85185@aol.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Why punish recreational anglers? Recreational bluefin catches only account for 7% of total catches, while commercial fishing really impacts the species. Why don't you put limits on commercial fishing? Let's be fair! I am not opposed to a 5 fish bag limit, and size limits.

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 10:22:46 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74bab8bdc759b

From: Luke Burson <lmbur@aol.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I am 64 years old and have live in Southern California my entire life. My passion is sportfishing off our coast. Although I was surprised at the decision to limit sport caught Bluefin Tuna starting in 2015 to 2 per day I understand the "why" and will support this change.

I do find it odd that the  commercial fishing industry is not subject to the same change as the sportfisherman.  Especially considering that their annual take in many times greater. If the change was the result of the condition of the Bluefin stocks then why wouldn't the group that takes the most also see change?

At your meeting I request that you revisit this issue. The change is to preserve Bluefin for our future, all must participate for this to be successful.

Thank you for allowing me to provide input.

Sincerely,

Luther Burson  
25646 La Cima  
Laguna Niguel, Ca 92677  
(949) 433-2043

Sent from my iPad

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 10:19:50 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74b81dd4bbf81

From: Michael Seewald <michael@seewald.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Recreational fisherman catch such a small amount of tuna any change in 'allowed to keep' amounts is just plain wrong. Count me against the proposal, and do not vote for reducing anything. Michael Seewald

835 N. Vulcan Ave., B Encinitas CA 92024 USA

## Regarding: Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:52:48 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b749f458d3adb5

From: Paul Casillas <paul.casillas@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To Whom It May Concern,

The proposed reduction to reduce the number of Pacific Bluefin Tuna recreational anglers can catch by 80%, from 10 fish to 2 is THE WRONG ACTION!

This will cripple the recreational sport fishing fishery, as many anglers like myself will not be able to afford the cost of a trip when the possible take is only 2 fish.

Compared to the total numbers taken by Commercial fisherman, this is unfair.  
I urge you to reconsider and come to a more fair allocation for recreational anglers.

Regards, Paul Casillas

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:35:43 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b748fac75dae0d

From: Mike Pritchard <mjpritchard76@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Owning a San Diego based Sportfishing boat and having been in the business for the last 3 decades I can tell you that the 2013-2015 Southern California and Northern Baja Bluefin population is the best I've ever seen. This has had a great impact not only on the Southern California Sportfishing fleet but local businesses that have nothing directly to do with the business ( hotels, restaurants, liquor stores and gas stations) not to mention the great years that tackle shops have had and the number of fishing licenses sold.

The number of kids and first timers that were able to come out and catch the first Bluefin of their life this season was amazing and will ensure future business and revenue for previous said businesses.

A manageable limit of 5 fish would make a lot more sense and should not change anything in the overall worldwide Bluefin take.

We still do it one line and one hook at a time for recreation and so our passengers can feed there family's.

Mike Pritchard

Owner/operator Tribute Sportfishing inc.

mike@tributesportfishing.com

Sent from my iPhone

## Recreational Pacific Bluefin Tuna fishing

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:33:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b748d83985630e

From: Ron Owens <rowens72@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I'm all for conservation but if you ask me putting restrictions on recreational fishing to limit the number of Pacific Bluefin Tuna caught is a joke if you are serious about conservation you will also reduce the catch of the commercial fishery also. Recreational fishing accounts for 7% of the catch and the federal plan is to reduce this number caught by recreational fishing by 80% and at the same time no limitation have been placed on the commercial fishery. If you really want to do something look at reducing the commercial fishery reduce there numbers also.

Thank you,Ron OwensOrange, California

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:20:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7481d28d83dd8

From: John Hart <johnhart.insurance@hotmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

A five fish limit on Bluefin, as the same for yellow fin and yellowtail would be fair. An 80% reduction down to a 2 fish limit is unfair to the recreational fishing economy.

**John Hart**

A licensed California Angler for over 40 years

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:18:59 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74805208087ee

From: Jefrey Ong <jefrey888@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dont blame everything on recreational fishermen. An 80% reduction on bluefin tuna on the limit for each recreational fisherman is too much and unfair. Look where the real problem is, dont look for the easy way out. So you can say you did something about it. Do something on the real cause of the problem. Dont look for a scapegoat.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 09:13:58 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b747bb93e20fe1

From: Gerard Tuttoilmondo <gerardtutt@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

You wanna protector bluefin reduced the commercial catch they have too much money for you to do anything about that right

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 08:53:11 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7469a2dcf723e

From: Ivan Fujinaka <ifujinaka@sbcglobal.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Excessive commercial fishing is the real reason for  
the decline of Bluefin Tuna populations.

Blaming and punishing sport fishing is  
a farce.&nbsp; Wait until the news media picks up on this.

Sent from my iPhone

Ivan T. Fujinaka, Jr.

Left Coast Properties

PO Box 27398

San Francisco, CA 94127

415.279.7726 mobile

415.239.6560 fax

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 08:37:21 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b745a3e832b962

From: Robert Meyer <drummer4life1019@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I hereby reject this proposal. I say no to this change.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 07:55:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74340db280e37

From: Cory Visser <cvisser@pacbell.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To whom it may concern at the PFMC, RE: Reduction of 80% of Bluefin Tuna caught by the Recreational angler? I am constantly amazed how the California recreational anglers continues to be punished for the Commercial fishing interests whom catch some 98% of the species? Other than hurt the recreational fisherman with such a reduced quantity limit, how does this restriction help the overall cause of protecting the Bluefin Tuna when the Commercial industry devastates the species of Bluefin Tuna? It is crazy to punish us and allow the commercial fishing interest, whom due the majority of the damage, remain capable of catching enormous quantities of Bluefin Tuna? Outrageous! Please re-consider your proposal for an alternative solution. I believe we recreational fishermen can live comfortably with a daily five fish limit, not two! Also, please reduce the commercial catch of Bluefin Tuna accordingly to preserve the species. Thank you, Cory Visser, 67 years old and a conservative fisherman for over 50 years! Controller Far West Meats PH# 909-864-1990 Fax# 909-864-0554

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 07:45:48 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b742b05cac6e9b

From: Steve Price <steveprice114@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear sirs I would like to raise an objection for punishing anglers in California by lowering the limits of bluefin tuna from 10 a day to two a day. commercial fishing far outweighs the number of bluefin tuna taken and we don't believe that we should be punished for them depleting the stock please vote no on this bill to limit fishing anglers to catch bluefin tuna in California sincerely  
stephen W price

## Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 07:35:49 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7421e16a2f8aa

From: Steve.Songalia@engilitycorp.com

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Dear Sirs;

This is worthy of adding my opinion. Its WRONG that the small percentage of recreational anglers who catch Pacific Bluefin Tuna be punished unfairly compared to those who fish commercially. Not sure if my opinion will get anywhere, but collectively I believe enough people will care about this to have a more global effect. Thank you for your time.

..Steve Songalia

STEVE SONGALIA

Engility Corporation

TACTRAGRUPAC, San Diego

[Steve.Songalia@EngilityCorp.com](mailto:Steve.Songalia@EngilityCorp.com)

[Steve.Songalia.ctr@nwdc.hpc.mil](mailto:Steve.Songalia.ctr@nwdc.hpc.mil)

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 07:11:56 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b740c05276c826

From: Tom Honaker <tunatom58@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

If you are truly interested in protecting the Pacific bluefin tuna stocks, passing the burden onto the recreational angler, is most likely the least effective way to do so. I have been a avid angler for over 40 years, and seen first hand, the devastation the commercials have caused. PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL! We all want healthy bluefin stocks! But this is not the way to do it!

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 07:03:53 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b74049e2dff6bf

From: William Hudson <tunacacti@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I am an out of state angler. Who has contributed to the West Coast Pacific fishery. And in turn the California economy for 20 years. Unfair limits on rod and reel anglers can affect the sportfishing fleet as well as the State. I would pay more for a can of tuna with much more restrictions on commercial interests.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 06:54:41 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b73fc41eb70a60

From: Alan Armstrong <aarmstrong@impedimed.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I Support the Recreational Tuna Fishing. I can truthfully state that I also support putting a cap/catch limit on the fish levels to maintain their existence. The limit should be fair and equal and should be spread accordingly amongst commercial and recreational fisherman or you are somewhat discriminating against the recreational fisherman and leaving the commercial alone.

My Friends and family have been commercial fisherman in San Diego for many years in the tuna fleet as well as being recreational fisherman today.

We hope for all that there is a favorable outcome to this situation.

Best Regards

Alan Armstrong

aarmstrong@xitrontech.com

858-254-0435

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 06:41:37 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b73f0621f03967

From: norris neale <norristheplumber@aol.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Its very true that the commercial fisheries are pulling blue fin tuna from OUR waters by the TUN and the recreational fishermen and even sport boat fishermen pull tuna out one by one,theres no comparison to who's depleting our blue fin tuna!!!! sounds like the regulations are not based on saving the BFT,but allowing more for the commercial fleets and selling them to other countries, Which to me asnbsp; a fishermen is totally wrong,strange I rarely even see BFT on our shelves at the market, Its definitelynbsp; about money and taxs and not about saving BFT in OUR waters!!!!

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 06:16:00 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b73d8e1d099f8f

From: luvtuna@aol.com

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Recreational anglers account for 7% of the total catch of Pacific Bluefin Tuna.

Why would you want to reduce our catch by 80% when the commercial Bluefin harvesters do the most damage. Why not reduce their catch by 80% and leave the recreational anglers alone.

Richard Schaffer

LA, CA 90045

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 05:09:36 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b739c046435a42

From: Michael Fox <rollin772@me.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

**Commercial fishing needs more regulation than the recreational fisherman.**

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Tue Feb 10 2015 04:32:27 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7379fde838a32

From: William Charter <kris2jon@aol.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Please reconsider you limitations on the Blue Fin quota being considered. I personally feel the commercial fleets are and should be your target.

thank you William charter

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 22:20:05 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7225d1ec8b79c

From: Ray Mendoza <cabal\_anchain@msn.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Sent from my iPad

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 21:53:21 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b720ca73ebf00c

From: berryblosser <berryblosser@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

This is to serve as notice of my severe displeasure and confusion on the lowering the BLUEFIN TUNA limits for the private recreational fisherman. I am not against this completely. Say cut it by two fish would be acceptable. But you should really take another serious look at cutting the greedy commercial industry that accounts for 93% of the fish harvested. That's where you need to look. Or why not put a two year complete ban for everyone. That way the fish can maybe replenish their numbers. Please vote wisely and not greedily. Thank you

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 21:39:28 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71ffe6cdc1f53

From: Terry Kennedy <kencorpp999@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I Terry L. Kennedy do oppose the restriction of blue fin tuna from 10 fish to 2 fish for the recreational angeler. Once again we see politicians duping the public with retoric while continuing to line their pockets with special interest dollars.

Terry L. Kennedy, J.D.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 21:10:12 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71e56b5b47d41

From: Randy <rn2care4u247@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Why is you are limiting recreational fisherman limits by 80% when you are not doing anything to the commercial fisherman who by far take more than recreational fisherman? I find it appealing that you are not even looking at the commercial industry.....I would like you to vote against lowering the the bluefin limit in the state of California.

Sincerely

Randy E Naguiat

Recreational fisherman

Sent from my iPad

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:58:51 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71dabb9c48d2d

From: Terry Huschka <terryhuschka@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

The thought of reducing the limit of ten fish limits of blue fin tuna down to two fish is ridiculously. I have fished many times and the most I have caught is four blue fin tuna. The people they should target is the commercial fishing industry. Reduce their tonnage and they could leave the sport fishing industry as it is. We do not over fish the blue fin tuna the commercial industry does.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:47:49 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71d09706cb035

From: Tony Hicks <anthonyhicks70@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I would like to voice my displeasure with the proposed Bluefin tuna limit change. I am a strong believer in limiting commercial fishing while still allowing recreational fishing to flourish.

Please hear my voice in my opposition to the proposed Bluefin tuna recreational limit decrease.

Thank you,

Tony Hicks, Esq.

---

\*THE LAL LAW FIRM\*

\*State and Federal: Civil, Business, Corporate and Criminal Litigators

and Advocates\*

Tony Hicks, Esq.

1020 S. Anaheim Blvd., Suite 202

Anaheim, CA 92805

Bar #: 299486

Tel: 714-635-1646

Fax: 714-635-2457

[www.lallaw.com](http://www.lallaw.com)

\*This message is from The Lal Law Firm and may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately advise the sender by reply e-mail that this message has been inadvertently transmitted to you and delete this e-mail from your system. Thank you for your cooperation. \*\*The preceding email message may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. If you have received this message in error, please (i) do not read it, (ii) reply to the sender that you received the message in error, and (iii) erase or destroy the message. Legal advice contained in the preceding message is solely for the benefit of the The Lal Law Firm client(s) represented by the Firm in the particular matter that is \*\*the\*\* subject of this message, and

**may not be relied upon by any other party\***

don't change the limits for rec fishermen unless you change the limits for commercial guys

**Messages in thread 1**

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:27:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71c0e7d772a9e

From: ez2rememberu@aol.com

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Sent from Windows Mail

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:22:45 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71b9aa9a404cd

From: Jeff Harris <jharris@gluckbuilding.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Attention Pacific Fisheries Management Council

We don't have Bluefin tuna regularly in American waters in great abundance. Commercial fishing takes a far greater percentage of this resource than recreational fishing. The recreational use of this resource benefits the American economy, especially the west coast, than does the commercial use of this resource. Percentage wise the proposed limits on recreational personal take are extreme, when compared to the commercial tonnage allowed to be taken. Management of this resource would dictate reducing the commercial tonnage a determined percentage, then determine if reducing the recreational tonnage a comparable percentage would be proper management of this resource.

Thank you for receiving my input on this very important issue.

Best Regards

Jeff Harris

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin TunaKo

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:16:30 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71b6c797e65e7

From: herbdog01 <herbdog01@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To whom it may concern, I hope you take the time to read this email and the countless other emails you surely have been receiving from fisherman just like my son and I who fish off our coast 3 to 4 times a year for bluefin tuna and other species for recreation. We do not believe that cutting back on the amount of tuna we can take will make much of a difference compared to the amount of tuna commercial fishermen are taking. For every one tuna we catch, the commercial fishermen are catching upwards of 90 and that is not fair to the casual fisherman. We hope you will reconsider these cuts and look deeper into the real problems with our fishery, which is the overfishing by commercial fishermen. Big industries, those are the ones you should be going after, not us. thank you for your time . Herb & Levi Prawl

Sent on the new Sprint Network from my Samsung Galaxy S®4.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 20:02:11 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71a6d27502b63

From: william stallman <stallman1@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**To Whom It May Concern:** Last year was one of the best Bluefin Tuna Runs I can remember .It has not stopped as of yet. To impose an eighty percent reduction in sport caught catch, which is only 7% of the total catch, while not reducing the commercial catch to anything close to that is truly unfair. From what I have researched on the internet our California / Mexico fishery is the only one not being overfished. I hope you would reconsider taking this action. Thank You, Willam G. Stallman

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 19:14:08 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b717af38a7a8ac

From: "w.stehman" <w.stehman@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To Whom it may concern.

As an avid angler and sportfisherman I urge you to reconsider the limit on U.S. Cough Bluefin from 10 to 2 fish per day. But to reconsider the daily limit to 5. I do agree that we need to be responsible in our catching of the precious resource but if the limit is dropped to 2 so many people will feel the pain. Whether it be tackle shops or sportfishing boat landings and owners. Please listen and let's come up with a happy medium. Thank

you. William Stehman.Sent via the Samsung GALAXY S® 5, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 19:05:51 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7173445ad4682

From: Paul <paul.qhp@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

To whom it may concern,

I've been a fisherman since I was 7.i don't see why recreational fisherman are having our limits changed on bluefin tuna fishing.majority of the damage caused to our fishery is the commercial fleet.i strongly believe that when we fish bluefin tuna we might catch 10% or less from a school of tuna we find where when a commercial boat drops their nets and take 90-95% of the school.the school has no chance of reproducing when one depletes the whole school.bluefin are usually fishing line shy and very timid in biting a hooked bait which in turn results in very little take from one school.we recreational fisherman work hard to find schools and most schools are not cooperative and we get a couple or none from one school,it's rare when we find a very hungry school and catch a lot out of one school.im sure all fisherman will agree to stricter commercial regulations so that we all enjoy fishing ,we all want our kids to grow up fishing and have the same experiences we've had In our great ocean.maybe 5 per day and stricter regs for the commercial fleet and also Japan bluefin sales aren't helping maybe make it illegal to sell bluefin?food for thought thanks for your consideration have a good day

Sent from my iPhone 5s

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 18:49:13 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71640443939ed

From: Sean Hiltgen <zilla051970@hotmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Really?? Wait a second let's come to reality now. If I go fishing with 10 guys we can only bring home 100 total blue fin correct? Now the average commercial boat has 5 maybe 6 guys on it. They can set one net and snatch about 2 tons of tuna at one time. They do this in a few hours then go look for more. So why do you want lower my limit and my hobby. I enjoy fishing to get away from the rat race. Do any of you truly enjoy fishing? Because if you did you would be trying to push for more limits on commercial fishing. Do you really think limiting us to just 2 fish is fare? Why is it ok for tons of tuna to be caught commercially by one boat without lowering there limits. Now let's talk about Tuna wranglers for a minute. You talk about depleting a fishery this will kill the Tuna stock in 10 years or less. If they continue to take mid size fish and pen them up were in trouble. They kill a single eco system where ever these pens are set up. They take all the bait fish from one area to keep the Tuna growing. If any of you had taken any science you would remember if you kill one element of a eco system then all will perish. So why put a limit on recreational fisherman. We are not the ones depleting the fish stock. My daughter is 6 years old do you really think she has a chance at catching a Blue fin Tuna over 100 lbs when she is a adult. Please please don't limit but do limit the commercial fisherman so maybe just maybe my daughter can catch a 100lb Blue Fin tuna.Thank you for your time

Sent from my HTC on T-Mobile 4G LTE

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 18:23:04 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b714c1fdb3896

From: Dennis Andrade <[adennis@surewest.net](mailto:adennis@surewest.net)>

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

CC:

The recreational anglers should not be penalized by PFMC by imposing a reduced take of 2 Pacific Bluefin Tuna.&nbsp; Why are recreational anglers being punished for excessive commercial fishing?&nbsp; Recreational anglers only account for 7% of the Bluefin Tuna catch rate so it doesn't make sense that we are targeted for a reduced bag limit while the commercial fisherman account for 93% of the take of Pacific Bluefin Tuna.&nbsp; The PFMC should make reforms to the excessive commercial take of Bluefin Tuna to realize a more sustainable population of Bluefin Tuna.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 18:06:27 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b713ce55849346

From: Victor Ortiz <ortiz5983@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

That is not right to punish recreational fishermen to only two bluefin. Let's be fair about this. I can under stand that it is a resource that needs to be protected. From two blue fin per angler how about five per angler and restrict the commercial fishermen more. This is a activity that I enjoy to experience with my children and it helps feed our family.

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 18:03:46 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b713a6d69e31fb

From: bryan bain <bryanbainfish@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**Lower limit to five for recreational fishing. Don't punish the angler for commercial overfishing.**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 17:56:00 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7133436bb0437

From: Rocky Taylor <rockytaylor@cox.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please be reasonable about lower limits on our recreational fishing experiences. So much is continually being taken away. Please consider a 5 fish limit and consider more restrictions on the commercial fishery which as we know is devastating our oceans.

Rocky Taylor

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 17:50:27 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b712e3c4a0ea50

From: Michael Monteleone <thereelmonte@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**To whom it concern: this means everyone!**

Well here we go again. Another attack on&nbs; recreational&nbs; fishing. Why? What did the sport fishing public do to deserve such unfair treatment? When will it stop?

Why do we always get the blame for overfishing? Is it because commercial fisheries want us to buy their fish instead of the weekend angler having some fun and catching his own dinner?

Please do not reduce the limit of bluefin tuna recreational anglers are allowed. We do not waste these fish and are we do not produce by-catch which depletes other species that commercial fishing can't avoid.

Thank you for your time.

Michael Monteleone  
20022 Lawson Lane  
Huntington Beach, CA 92646  
thereelmonte@yahoo.com  
60 yr. California fisherman

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 17:30:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b711bd8a6229d1

From: Bill Beebe <bbbeebe33@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

That is little different than removing umpires from baseball or football because they interfere to the play of the game.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 17:24:11 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b71164fadf12bb

From: Larry Diamant <larrydiamant@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please be fair to recreational anglers. There is no logical reason to punish recreational anglers while commercial catch is enormously more and the real problem.

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:53:49 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70fa62430f0e9

From: Richard Root <rootfish1@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I don't understand why this is proposed on recreational fishermen, we fished 2 to 3 months out of the year for tuna, but yet we are the most restricted of all fishing industries? This makes no sense, I don't understand how these things pass, or who makes these laws..?

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:38:08 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70ec2456de452

From: L & M Brown <lmbrownxx@earthlink.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear PFMC Council Members,I am an avid recreational fisherman, scuba diver and marine enthusiast. I am also an ardent marine conservationist. I was a very vocal activist to institute limits on bluefin tuna and albacore when there were in fact no limits at all, not that many years ago. I advocated much lower quotas for commercial anglers and limits of 5 bluefin and albacore per day for recreational anglers, the long time practice in Mexico. Most recently I supported the efforts to further dramatically reduce limits for recreational and commercial anglers. Now I see the proposals to make the limit for recreational anglers only 2 per day, an 80% reduction, but hardly any reduction in the commercial quotas. This is not equitable, nor is it an effective protection for the bluefin tuna, which we all want to see. If the ratio of recreational to commercial catches are 10/90 an 80% reduction of daily limits for sports anglers will only reduce the catch rate by 8%, and that assumes that every recreational angler catches his limit on every outing, which is a preposterous assumption. If the average recreational angler catches 3 bluefin tuna per day on a stellar trip, the 80% reduction of daily limits would only be a 1% reduction in catch rate from 3 to 2. On trips where recreational anglers catch zero, one or two bluefin tuna the limit changes being considered save no tuna at all. Contrast this with the commercial fishing industry that has a seasonal quota, not a daily limit or quota. They fish until they reach their quota. Any percent reduction in the commercial quota is a real percentage reduction in catch and effective protection for the resource. Please implement changes in the limits of bluefin tuna that are scientifically well thought out, are going to effectively protect the resource and be equitable for all stakeholders. I also strongly urge PFMC and other government and NGOs insist the international community dramatically reduce and enforce commercial quotas. Our US State Department and Trade groups have enormous powers to implement penalties and sanctions for bad behavior, as we have done with Iran and Russia. If this nation is serious about protecting pelagic species of tuna and other fishes, we must assure the cooperation of the international commercial fishing community. Thinking we can have any meaningful, positive impact on the global bluefin tuna population by penalizing US West Coast recreational anglers is silly. Respectfully,Larry Brown Larry Brown Youth Fishing Charity Charters7020 Earldom Ave.Playa Del Rey, CA 90293- 310/578-2288 home- 310/910- 7398 cell- LMBrownxx@earthlink.net- LarryBrownxx@gmail.com

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:19:21 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70dad675f7a93

From: R S Fiske <rsfiske@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I believe recreational anglers are willing to do their fair share to protect the Bluefin Tuna. However reducing the daily bag limit from 10 to 2 is excessive. Commercial fisherman take far more Tuna and should also be willing to help protect this valuable resource.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:17:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70d90042c5886

From: Wstridge@aol.com

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC: magodfrey2@yahoo.com, frankpolak@wolveshockey.net, johnballotti1@gmail.com

Gentlemen - The reduction of the recreational anglers catch from

10 fish to 2 fish is dramatic. Considering that recreational  
anglers

take but 7% of these tuna it is incomprehensible that similar reductions  
for the commercial catch are not initiated.

Is it because they have a more organized lobbying  
organization?

Please consider the effects of this reduction. We - as recreational  
fishermen understand the need for these reductions - but consider it  
unfair to the recreational sector. Scientists have told us that the  
bluefin resource is at but a 6% of normal levels and that we are catching  
fish that have not yet spawned. So are the commercials!!!

Thanks for "listening" to us - Los Angeles Rod & Reel club  
members.

Eric Rogger - Environmental Committee Member.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:17:13 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70d8ddb734cd

From: kevnsiu <kevnsiu@aol.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

It is such a helpless feeling to see such a blatant disregard for the recreational fisherman's needs.

We represent such a small portion of the total catch yet we seemed to be held responsible for the lions share of preserving the fishery. Drastic limits on non commercial species like Calico Bass/ White sea bass are widely support .There is need for constant monitoring as we the recreational fisherman can impact these non pelagic species. Kudos to everyone in imposing restrictions and monitoring these vital fish stocks.

However with the PACIFIC bluefin as everyone knows, we are a drop in the proverbial bucket. This wylie species is very difficult to catch in the first place. You maybe get one week a month where they bite in such a manner you can even come close to the 10 fish limit. If you are lucky enough to find that school that wants to bite the experienced fisherman feels extremely lucky. If the limits were cut to the ridiculous number of 2, even a die hard bluefin addict like myself would not bother to pay the \$300 per day it would cost me to fish. They would have to huge and practically "jumping in the boat" for me to think to even spend a few days out on the water chasing these elusive prizes. And as you know that rarely happens. They usually bite a few days then are done.

Can you imagine playing \$600 then finding your dream bite and only allowed to take 2 fish. Sure if they were 50-100 ponders sign me up id pay \$600 for 4 of those fish , but those fish are even more rare due the live "pen" market.

The commercial industry has the technology to hunt these fish and capture them in massive quantities. They fish them the entire month and with the spotter planes, huge nets, massive pens and mega ton fish holds , that is why they take the vast majority of the fish.

You can see why we are wondering why we are being told absorb an 80% reduction in our catch. The is obviously some reason the average person is unaware of . Whether its scientific or political there has to be a reason , because simple logic is totally absent,

It is truly scary what will happen to the sport boat operators and all the supporting industries if the Albacore never return. The rat yellowfin/yellowtail (I understand last year was a very good year) we commonly get here do not have the legs to support the entire industry very long. Especially in San Diego.

Kevin N.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 2

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:32:37 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70b006d0239f1

From: Robert Weitzel <bluefinbob1@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I oppose the new limit on Bluefintuna. I see all the time were commercial boats from many different country's in our fishing water's.

These boats and tuna pen's take a hundreds of thousand pounds of fish yearly. I know the limit in California waters is 10 fish per person per trip. But 2 fish that's just plain silly, I could see a limit of 5 fish per person a day. But 2 fish would you pay 200 to 300 dollars a trip and catch 2 Bluefintuna. I know I would probably go only half the time I fish now and I fish 45 to 50 days a year. So who does this hurt. The manufactures of fishing equipment, rods , reels, line , hooks, weights and the biggest would be the sport-fishing boats owner and crew, also you have to look at the bait company's . California fishing industry is a \$32 million dollar a year industry and think if that gets cut in half. Whoops there goes tax dollars.

I hope you would consider my letter

There are many California and US citizen that feel the same way I do.

Thank You

Robert C Weitzel

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:04:47 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70cd7aa3242f8

From: Robert Weitzel <bluefinbob1@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Hi, my name Is Robert C Weitzel, nick name Bluefinbob. I was giving that name many years ago back in the early 80's. Was on a trip to the wonderful Cortes Bank. I landed 17 Bluefintuna on that trip and that was a 2 day trip. I have been fishing for 55 years since the age of 8 years old. To cut the limit to 2 fish from 10 is a big number. I could see 5 fish per person per day and that would be consisted with Mexico's limit for Bluefintuna also. If it went to 2 fish per day who do you think you would be hurting. Well all of the fishing manufactures rod,reel,line,lure,weights and a assortment of more. But who would take a big hit would be the sportfishing boat's owner and crew. Would you pay \$200 to \$300 hundred dollars to catch 2 fish. I know I would most likely cut my fishing in half. Also look at the state and federal tax dollars. WHOOPS there gone. The sportfishing industry is a \$ 32 million dollar a year Industry . And most likely higher this past year with some of the best fishing I can remember.

Almost all the trips I go on you see the commercial boat's from other country's and also the tuna pen's. Their taking hundreds of thousands of pounds ever year. I really think the bluefin in our water's are thriving. The last 5-6 years have been some of the best bluefin fishing ever. Look their out at the Cortes and Tanner Banks in big numbers in December, January and February, just unbelievable. I don't think you can say there's a shortage of the Bluefintuna in California water's.

I hope you take this letter in consideration

I know a lot of fishermen and women feel the same way

**Robert C Weitzel**  
**714-892-2762**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 16:01:38 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70caa22917c00

From: Michael Dickter <mdickter@ffrla.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I am a Bluefin tuna sport angler. I do not want my catch limit reduced. We catch a very small portion of tuna, compared to the commercial fisherman. Sport tuna fishing is one of my joys in life. As a member of the Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club, we are respectful of the tuna we go after.

Please leave the count the way it is today. Thank you.

Michael Dickter

Michael A.

Dickter, RHU

M.A. Dickter & Associates, Inc.

3504 Terrace View

Dr.

Encino, CA 91436

Phone: 818-986-3477 Fax: 818-715-1505

Insured

Financial Solutions

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:57:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70c6e6cdc462c

From: brett.goldberg@ubs.com

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC: mgodfrey2@socal.rr.com

I am taking the time to voice my opinion of the recent proposal to reduce the personal catch of Bluefin tuna in California water by anglers. It is not the anglers that create the real issues. If any problem is being created, it is by the commercial fisherman who have very little regard for sea life off our coast. They will herd up entire schools essentially wiping out bio-diversity by wiping out an entire gene pool all in one 2 mile net. Most of the catch is then sold to markets and shipped overseas. If you truly wish to reduce the catch off of our coast, and reduce the pressure on the local fishery, then heavily tax and tariff fish shipped out of the country. This will do two things: First, by simple economics it will become cost prohibitive to round up and catch California fish and ship them to areas outside the US. And second, it will raise revenues that can be used for the purpose of furthering aquatic research, for efforts such as the program that used for bringing the white sea bass back to our coast with a captive breeding program (we could possibly do the same thing for Bluefin given time, money, effort and support). The catch from anglers is very limited in relation to commercial, and at the same time more and more anglers are practicing catch and release and sustainable habits, this is true for most species, once they catch what they can eat or supply their families. This could be furthered by education as opposed to punishment. This is a punitive act to a group of people who spend money on the local economy, use the food locally (as opposed to commercial), practice good fishing habits, in general are good stewards of the sea, and supporters of NOAA. Every time a new "save the fish" campaign comes down the pike, it punishes the angler, yet the commercial fisherman are responsible for more damage. The only reason this is the case is that the legislators get larger contributions from the commercial fishing industry and therefore when trying to appease the outcry, legislature "goes with the money" by voting in, non-effective, non-informed and illogical rules, that can make headlines but do nothing about what they were intending to do. The perfect example of this is the collapse of the Salmon population, the restrictions on individual anglers were tough, yet the commercial fisherman and their lobbyists were able to keep the "fishing fleet in business" until the collapse of the fishery. At this point when there is no more commercial fishing or revenue from that industry, we lose jobs, businesses and the contributions dry up anyway We need to better spend these tax dollars on creating and enforcing global restrictions, working with foreign governments to create global rules and freedoms. The fish do not understand borders and they do not remember where it is safe to travel, so our efforts should be, global sustainability, through diplomacy and tariffs, working with our foreign neighbors, and we should not pick on or bully the small and unorganized group of recreational anglers. We should not support countries were harvesting practices do considerably more damage to our local population, to any and all species, including the Bluefin which circumnavigate the pacific ocean, being hammered by countries surrounding the pacific rim. By controlling only the catch of the individual anglers we do very little to stem the destruction of the population , and we just open up the rest of the globe to taking more and more share. We need to redouble our efforts to work with other countries around the world to slow down the wholesale takedown of fish for commercial use and not pick on the angler that truly loves the sea, and as a group, harvest less fish in an entire year than one seiner net does in one set. Brett P. Goldberg

First Vice President-Wealth Management

**UBS Financial Services, Inc.3011 Townsgate Rd Suite 300Westlake Village CA 91361**

**805-367-3663 Direct855-231-0179 Fax**

**Brett.goldberg@ubs.com Kate Mogg Assistant805-367-3693Kate.Mogg@ubs.com**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:48:21 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70be6f7fc0fbb

From: John Collins <jonekat70@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:** Just a short note. It is my understanding that recreational fisherman account for about 2-3% of the overall Bluefin Tuna catch. That leaves approximately 97% being taken by other means. I am all in favor of stricter limits if in fact the Bluefin fishery is in jeopardy. It would seem to me that if the same reduction were imposed on the other 97% then this overfishing situation could be resolved in a relatively short period of time. At that time a reasonable quota could be imposed in order to keep our stock of Tuna healthy. Thank you for your consideration. John Collins

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:41:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70b82b597226e

From: dcarlisle123@gmail.com

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear Committee Members,

If sustainable levels of Pacific Bluefin Tuna are truly at risk and your goal is to protect them, it seems only logical and reasonable to limit their intake where it will have the greatest impact, i.e., THE COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY. Furthermore, placing the burden of reducing the intake of Pacific Bluefin Tuna on US recreation fishermen unfairly penalizes US citizens as the majority of the COMMERCIAL Bluefin tuna caught are sold to, and benefit, overseas Asia markets.

As a member of the recreational fishing society of California, I strongly urge you to more thoroughly study the impact of commercial fishing verses recreational fishing on the Bluefin tuna population and increase restrictions where they will make the greatest impact, i.e., THE COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY.

Sincerely,

Dave Crandall  
San Diego, CA

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:37:45 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70b4c0f2fe287

From: greenballwatcher <greenballwatcher@sbcglobal.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Where would fisheries be if not for the private fishing people.we pay to fish but yet we are told stocking is not going to be very good we have to stop keeping fish in the ocean but yet I see spotter planes bring in the Comercial fishing bots wiping out schools of blue fin tuna.sometimes we hunt all day without a fish

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:34:38 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70b1e5ad52800

From: Steve <simonmurphy08@sbcglobal.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:32:01 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70af7c22f9faf

From: John Gilkerson <a.salt.weapon@att.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Dear PFMC Members,

Please do not punish recreational sport fisherman for overfishing by commercial fishermen and poor management in the past. The proposed two fish limit for Bluefin Tuna and other filleting restrictions will not have a significant affect on the populations. Instead, limit or stop allowing commercial take for a few years and you will have an effect. Also, try to find a way to stop Mexico and the foreign interests that are netting the tuna and raising them in pens, and in the process depleting the tuna and bait fish populations.

Sincerely,

John Gilkerson

item H3 - pacific bluefin tuna

**Messages in thread 1**

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:27:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70ab660a07785

From: Daniel Rubio <haprubio@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**please dont punish recreational fishermen by reducing the daily limit  
on bluefin tuna**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:18:36 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70a330a182035

From: Jwstew@aol.com

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Gentlemen,

If the object is to protect the Bluefin Tuna is should  
not matter  
how they are taken. I suggest that any reduction in the take  
should  
be on an equal percentage for both the commercial and  
recreational  
fisherman.

Jeff Stewart

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:09:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b709ac1c4cb5ca

From: Gary Massimino <andiamo48@att.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I'm

against reducing the Bluefin Tuna Catch by recreational  
anglers.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 15:06:57 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7098b4e5167d6

From: Brian Carness <brian@carnesslaw.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Hello. I am writing regarding the plan to limit the number of Pacific Bluefin Tuna that can be caught by recreational anglers. I have been recreationally fishing for tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean (California and Mexico) for approximately 20 years. In recent years, we have seen an increase in the number of Bluefin Tuna schools in the eastern Pacific Ocean. From my experience, recreational anglers are very concerned about conservation and maintaining the local tuna fishery. To that end, most recreational anglers do not catch more fish than they need, and often engage in "catch-and-release" fishing. I am particularly concerned that the proposed limitations do not apply to commercial fisherman. Studies show that recreational angler account for only approximately 7% of the total catches of Bluefin Tuna. Accordingly, the commercial industry accounts for the remaining 93% of the Bluefin Tuna catches. Limiting the number of fish allowed to be taken by recreational anglers does nothing to protect the tuna fisheries. If the government wants to make a real impact on tuna conservation, the plan needs to start by limiting the catches of commercial fishermen; not recreational anglers. Please take this into consideration and reject the current plan to reduce allowable recreational catches from 10 to 2 fish. Thank you,Brian Carness Law Office of Brian A. Carness, Esq.578 Washington Blvd., Suite 331Marina Del Rey, CA 90292(310) 822-7814brian@carnesslaw.com

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:57:39 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70900fed1ec40

From: Geraldo Rodriguez <gfishrod@aol.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please do not reduce bluefin catch by 80%. When reducing the catch for recreation fishermen it affects thousands of people. The Sports fishing industry, travel&nbsp; tourism to the state of California, and quality family time. How about 5% reduction on the commercial catch. This should be enough to save the stock of bluefin tuna.

Thank you For your consideration,

Geraldo Rodriguez

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:54:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b708d49e8c4fee

From: Norman <ynstock@msn.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Please do not lower our limit on blue fin tuna. Norman  
Weinstock

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:47:28 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7086af29171a3

From: David Morton <lauralpkg2@aol.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear Council,

I oppose

a proposed Federal plan to reduce the number of Pacific Bluefin Tuna recreational anglers can catch by 80%, from 10 fish to 2. In comparison, the commercial fishermen's catch is being reduced nowhere near that even though they catch far more fish than we do — Way More! How can this be fair when recreational anglers account for a mere 7% of the Pacific Bluefin Tuna catch?

Best regards,

David Morton

Laural Packaging Group

323-728-4565 office

818-652-0420 cel

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:46:51 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7086219569a46

From: Rich G <nogo7@hotmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I am in favor of some limits to the Pacific Bluefin Tuna caught each year, however I feel that all limitations should be equal.

You are proposing an 80% reduction for the sport fisherman. Limit to 2 per day and in the bag from 10. and only a slight reduction for the commerical fleet.

Be fair, make things equal.

Thank you.

Richard Goka

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:42:51 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b708277c2dcba8

From: stevemorey@earthlink.net

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I wish you would consider just cutting the recreational take to 5 as we have been hurt by the closures already with all the MLPA's you have already imposed. You are doing this because you think other countries will follow. They won't. Don't do like them and let money be your best friend. Let the little guy have a chance.

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:35:40 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b707befebecbcc3

From: Michael Godfrey <magodfrey2@yahoo.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I understand the the P.F.M.C. is considering lowering the recreational fisherman's catch of Bluefin Tuna 80% from 10 fish to 2.&nbsp; As an ardent recreational fisherman, member and past president of the Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club (150 + members), I join with the rest of the California anglers who oppose this proposed Federal plan to reduce the number of Pacific Bluefin Tuna recreational anglers can catch.&nbsp; In comparison, the commercial fishermen's catch is being reduced no where near that even though they catch far more fish than we do — Way More! How can this be fair when recreational anglers account for a mere 7% of the Pacific Bluefin Tuna catch?

I do not understand why recreational anglers are being punished for excessive commercial fishing. Please consider this item very carefully and do not validate such an unfair, uneven lowering of recreational fishermen's catch of bluefin tuna.

Sincerely,

**Michael A. Godfrey  
Past President and Member of the Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:27:37 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b707484cb02d8c

From: john delaurentis <j4250@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

It's always difficult for us recreational anglers to understand why commercial fishers, with their sophisticated, efficient gear and even spotter planes are continually overlooked or less regulated when it comes to restrictions on fish species. Mexico destroys much of the local pacific bluefin mass with the highly inefficient bluefin pen industry, not to mention harvesting so much of the baitfish resource to feed the pens that sea birds such as pelicans are starving and flying north seeking forage in California waters. Personally, I caught 7 bluefin tuna out of 6 offshore trips last year. With that fish-to-trip ratio, it's unlikely a 2 fish limit won't impact me negatively and I don't prefer bluefin as a table fish. I know no one has the courage to approach Mexico about their severe, highly destructive overfishing, but it would be fair to bring our own commercial fishery in line with the restrictions placed on the recreational sector. The disparity in treatment breeds much resentment, particularly with the price of a license north of \$50.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:26:52 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7073d9b14bed9

From: "Ko, Dan" <Dan.Ko@teradata.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

To The Pacific Fishery Management Council,

I am a California recreational fisherman and would like to express my concern regarding the recent restriction proposal on recreational Bluefin Tuna in Pacific waters. Although the intent of the regulation seems to be honorable, the reduction for recreational anglers is far greater than those restrictions implemented on commercial fishing.

Recreational fishermen do not have the ability to profit from and as a result have a greater incentive to preserve the fishery for our future generations. Imposing greater restrictions on recreational anglers communicates that preservation of the fishery is a residual concern when profits from commercial fishing are weighed in comparison. Furthermore if passed, it will weaken the voice of recreational anglers and create the facade that tax dollars are being spent in a productive manner. If preservation of the fishery is the true concern of this legislation then restrictions should be first imposed upon commercial as the recreational fishermen are the minority group impacting the fishery. This would ultimately most efficiently allocate budget defined for preservation of the Pacific Bluefin fishery.

Sincerely,

Dan Bryan Ko

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 14:01:44 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b705dfdb130987

From: Tony DelMonte <tony.delmonte@cox.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

I don't understand the reason behind reducing the recreational limit to two blue fin tuna when commercial fishing with helicopters huge nets take and have far greater impact on the blue fin resource

In my opinion recreational anglers have the right to the resource as much as commercial and should have the same quota.&nbsp; That would be fair!&nbsp; Recreation anglers wouldn't even come close!

Regards,  
Tony Delmonte

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:33:29 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b704574602bbc5

From: ROBERT BLACK <blackroscoe@sbcglobal.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>,

"info@californiasportfishingconservation.org" <info@californiasportfishingconservation.org>

CC:

Dear Sir/Ms.

I have fished for tuna off the California and Mexico coastlines for 16 years and, not being blind or stupid, I see

tuna pens, I see purse seiners and I see the tuna supply declining.

That obvious over-fishing by International Commercial Fishermen cannot be corrected by penalizing California's recreational fishermen. If

California Recreational Fishermen were prohibited from catching tuna altogether, the tuna stock would continue to decline until catching tuna here is no longer profitable for the International Commercial Fishermen.

Furthermore, the main reason for your proposed action is that you have little or no control over International Commercial Fishermen so you want to compensate that failure, that lack of control, by penalizing California's Recreational Fishermen. International Commercial Fishermen catch 93 % of all tuna taken while California's Recreational Fishermen catch 7 %. Reducing the catch by Recreational Fishermen from 10 to 2 is an 80% reduction. The same total reduction in the tuna take could be made by reducing the International Commercial Fishing catch by a mere 6% but, unfortunately, you can't control them.

You could at least kick the problem upstairs and ask California and the federal government to put pressure on Mexico to cut the catch of the International Commercial Fishermen. Is that too hard to try? We are accustomed to the Mexican government authorities openly selling fishing "rights" to the Japanese and Koreans; ignoring the impact on the tuna stock simply because money talks and species conservation walks. We are not accustomed to American governmental authorities attempting to compensate for the lack of conservation practices of other governments by invoking draconian penalties on American citizens (that is, other than California's "Clean Air" and other idiotic environmental policies). It is characteristically Orwellian for California to restrict/penalize its citizens, sometimes out of business, to compensate for the lack of conservation participation by the rest of the world.

With all due respect, I give you leave as one of your captive "taxable, fineable and penalizable" citizens,

Robert Black Blackroscoe@sbcglobal.net

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:35:19 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7044a240e78b5

From: Sam Koh <sam.koh@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To whom it may concern,

Please note that our fishing community has been greatly bothered by the possibility of reducing the Blue Fin Tuna limit by 2. Please consider the limit of 5 BFT vs 2 if the commission decides to regulate. In comparison to the commercial fishery, recreational anglers put only a small dent on the population. Please consider our plea.

Sam Koh

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:30:05 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b703fed0e3cf01

From: Ruben Ortiz <tunabliss@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Dear Pacific Fishery Management Council,

It has come to my attention that you are considering reducing the take on bluefin tuna to just two. I am highly perplexed and offended by this move seeing how U.S. recreational anglers catch a very small percentage of these fish compared to commercial industries (not to mention the damage commercial fishermen in countries such as Japan and Mexico do to the bluefin population). Why attack the small percentage of U.S. civilian anglers who catch these fish mostly for sport but also because they enjoy the quality of these fish as table fare.

I personally can only afford to take one or two fishing trips per year. These trips are very expensive and IF I am lucky I might come home with a few Blue-fin tuna. We already have to deal with ridiculous limits set forth by the Mexican Government so they can save the fish for the Japanese market. I think the tuna pens and mass fishing techniques used by modern fishing fleets are horrible! And yet, you are targeting the ones who support better management and take the least amount of fish! WHY?

If you really want to help this fishery, place limits on commercial tuna fishermen in U.S. waters and then work with Japan and Mexico to reduce their take. Don't go after the smallest beneficiaries of these wonderful fish. Use your power to do good not to hurt your fellow citizens!

Thank you, I welcome your response,

Ruben OrtizAKA TunablissPhenix Rods ProStaff

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:25:51 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b703bfda353fbb

From: steven roy <stevenalanroy@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Hello,

**It is terribly wrong to impose this 2 fish limit on recreational fishermen.**

**Although the 10 fish limit seems generous, you must factor in the cost of trips when no fish are taken.**

**Imposing this limit on recreational fishermen will just move more of the harvest to the commercial fisherman. Boats from foreign countries will line up off our coast catching all our tuna!**

Thank you, Steven Roy Nevada County, California 530-477-0911

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:05:41 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b702988711fa26

From: John Riordan <jriordan@venturepacificinsurance.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

The two fish limit for Blue Fin Tuna seems incredibly restrictive for recreational fish take , John Riordan

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 13:04:59 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7028e676ea4ee

From: Randall Van Natta <randallvannatta@yahoo.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

**Look I know you need to do something about the blue fin . But your plans are draconian and unfair to us recreation fishermen . Stop sending these fish to Japan!!!!!!!**

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:56:07 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7021b1dfe7553

From: Philip Walton <phil1416@juno.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To Whom it May,

The proposal to reduce the recreational Bluefin Tuna take makes no sense to a reasonable person. The recreational take does not approach the commercial take and is almost negligible by comparison. Please use sound science in any decision regarding this matter and don't make a decision to appease the anti everything someone wants to do crowd.

Thank You

Philip Walton

Sent from my Samsung Captivate(tm) on AT&T

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:51:36 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b701caa8cf696e

From: "cbumbles@aol.com" <cbumbles@aol.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Life is not fair but humans can do alot to make it fair. The amount of bluefin taken by rod and reel does not compare to the commercial take. Let's be fair and reasonable. Happy Connecting. Sent from my Sprint Phone.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:31:17 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b700a0274aef4

From: Peter Tran <tinhtranq@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

To whom it may concern,

I believe it is a great injustice to punish the recreational fishermen when the problems lie with regulations within the commercial fishing industry. Please take into consideration that recreational fishermen only account for 7 % of bluefin caught. The price of a tuna trip is already expensive as it is with anglers hopes of catching limits of 10 tuna to compensate for the expensive trip. I'm scared the recreational tuna fishery will collapse if the limit is brought down to only 2. Please take my thoughts and opinions into consideration before trying to pass this act.

Thank you for your time.

Tinh Tran

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:24:34 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7003dba99128d

From: Wes Pashong <wpashong78@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**It really concerns and bothers me and many other recreational fisherman that the pacific blue fin is being limited so much for our consumption. All while the commercial tuna fleet nets and wraps up millions of blue fin tuna at a time. We recreational fishermen are a meer drop in the bucket compaired to them. Thank you for reading my concern and have a great day.**

**Wes Pashong**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:23:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b7002d2b546954

From: Morgan Haight <mhaight27@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

This is outrageous that the recreational fisherman be punished for the excessive commercial fishing that you are allowing. We the recreational fisherman account for less than 10% of the tuna fishing and to take away or limit our ability to fish is wrong. The restrictions should be implemented on the commercial industry not the recreational. If you really want to protect the species you will limit the ones responsible for the vast majority of the fishing. Not the ones who are not responsible.

Morgan Haight

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:22:46 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b70026651bb146

From: "elynberg@sbcglobal.net" <elynberg@sbcglobal.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Stop punishing sport fishermen. The commercial boat take all the fish.

T-Mobile. America's First Nationwide 4G Network.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:15:26 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ffb7444cd101

From: [nexform@sbcglobal.net](mailto:nexform@sbcglobal.net)

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

CC:

80% reduction from 10 to 2 fish for sport fishermen is just absurd.&nbsp; Why does the commercials who take 93% of the tuna do not have a drastic reduction?&nbsp; This will wipe out many fishing boat small businesses since it does not make sense for an angler to spend hundreds of dollars to go catch 2 fish.&nbsp; What is wrong with you?

Darren Kim

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:15:04 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ffb3ec70b653

From: Pedro Garcia <melaque7979@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please don't reduce out tuna limits.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:13:11 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ff9af57a0ed2

From: "Mike A. Mellano" <mamellano@mellano.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

As an avid recreational fisherman in Southern California waters I can not see how restricting limits of Bluefin Tuna for recreational anglers over those of commercial anglers makes any sense nor that it would significantly impact the populations. Factually the instances where fisherman can actually catch 10 fish in a day are few and far between and most are luck to get just a few so it surely seems like an unnecessary regulation. Commercial fisherman however with their spotting abilities and efficient capture techniques can remove tons of fish very quickly. It seems that regulation of that aspect is more important than targeting the few recreational anglers that might catch a limit!

I urge you to focus more effectively on commercial operation where there is potential to make an impact rather than recreational angler limits.

Thanks for your attention in this matter.

Mike Mellano, PhD

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:10:01 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ff6983835e90

From: Paul <1beachnut@sbcglobal.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I do not understand the logic of imposing an 80% decrease of BFT on the recreational fishermen. We only catch a small percentage of the species. I've read less than 10 percent. Clearly if you want to save this fish from extinction then greater restrictions should be placed on the commercial fishermen. I vote no on this proposal. Paul Chamberlain 1391 Rosewood Ln Napa CA 94558

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:05:57 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ff2da1d4576c

From: Jeffrey Rubalcaba <jeffreyrube@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Please make it fair for the average person. Restrict the commercial fishermen more.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:05:53 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6ff2d948c5dec

From: John Ballotti <johnballotti1@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Please consider a more proportional reduction in blue fin tuna catch. Commercial and recreational reduction should reflect the amount of tuna taken by each group.

John Ballotti

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:01:52 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6fef141a6450e

From: Ray Cloud <rccs@comcast.net>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear PFMC: It is patently absurd to cut recreational limits by 80% but not even near that in commercial fisheries. As a small but seaworthy boat owner count me among those totally against this unfair proposition. SHOW US that you are not beholden to the money at play and truly wish to manage the fishery for the sake of the resource itself.

Ramon CloudSanta Maria, CA

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 12:01:38 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6feede6abef72

From: Don Ford <deerhunterdon@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

I as a recreational angler purchase a ca.state fishing licence (\$52.00) every year. The Comercial fisherman take almost all of the fish harvested yearly yet you want to reduce our take by 80%. That really will only affect us recreational anglers and do nothing to help conservation.

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 11:57:47 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6feddd1ece514

From: AUGUSTUS PISANO <augiepie@verizon.net>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

this is totally ridiculous' that Californians are being reduced to 2 only 2 Pacific Bluefin tuna'swe are getting really screwed around here we must all unite and stop these people frommaking there own rules

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### **Messages in thread 1**

Mon Feb 09 2015 11:55:08 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6fe92b4ad07da

From: Darrell Moore <crazyredmoore@gmail.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

**LEAVE RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN ALONG, GET AFTER THE COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN!!**

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 11:49:29 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6fe42664c54e1

From: Matt Y <flyprops@gmail.com>

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

CC:

Why are we being restricted to the amount of bluefin we catch when It has clearly been commercial fishing that catches hundreds of tons more than us ? Though their restrictions are a fraction of ours! You want to bring this fishery back than no longer allow purse seiners to rape our ocean!!

Sent from my iPhone

## Item H3 - Pacific Bluefin Tuna

### Messages in thread 1

Mon Feb 09 2015 11:49:23 GMT-0800 (PST)

ID: 14b6fe3d16ea1e44

From: Ray Millman <ray@millmanteam.com>

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC:

Dear Sirs It is not fair and I highly oppose recreation fisherman being limited to 2 bluefin tuna from the previous limit of 10 or 7% of the total take. While the commercial quota is only slightly reduced. I have been fishing CA waters for over 50 years and own a boat. With Regards