

Public Reporting

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council



Public Comment Form

Amendment

Comprehensive Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule Amendment

Modifies the ABC Control Rule to address flexibility allowed under the MSA and revise how uncertainty and risk tolerance are addressed in setting ABCs.

Submit Date	Submitted By	Location	Affiliation	Comment
1/25/2023	First Name: MAURICE Last Name: MANN Email: mauricemann543@outlook.com	City: maysville State: North Carolina	Commercial	as a commercial fisherman,i would like to ask to take the time limit off setting flounder nets in the sounds and rivers,this has caused nothing but problems,especially with my age of 61 theres no limit of time that is justifiably to catch fish,the tides are what effect the fish and when you catch them.trying to put a limit on the time you can set nets to fish does not work,,the other thing is we shouldn't have to have other fish to go with red drum,to keep them,this is a waste to the fisheries,by throwing them back, especially if there dead but saveable,give us a number to keep per day,i suggest 10 ,regardless of other fish,this at times is not enough but easier to keep up with ,and simplifies the regulations,,we are already having to go by sizes to keep,and how our nets are made,i guess for turtles,but common sence will tell you that it doesn't matter what size nets u use ,there is always a possibility of catching a turtle,or something you don't want,i suggest you go back to letting commercial fishermen use at least 5 and three quarter webbing stretch,or bigger if they want.and to change the meshes deep to 25 meshes or less,a turtle don't no the deference,its common sence.and you don't have to close down setting flounder nets it will close itself,fish will leave in November,the other thing that is backwards is not being able to keep stone crab claws ,another waste this time of year,when setting nets,u cant get them out,but sometimes,once there in a net you cant get them out,so they may have to be smashed so the hole crab is no good but you could save the claws to eat or sell.its common sence to save the claws at least to get some good out of them.so I say open it up so we can save the claws,all this is common sence and can make it easier on the laws and law enforcement and commercial fishermen that set for flounders or anything else.my name is Maurice mann,i take observers out,and they agree what I say makes sence,
1/25/2023	First Name: Mike Last Name: Coats Email: mikecoats96@gmail.com	City: New Smyrna Beach State: Florida	Private Recreational	Why more regulation. The previous regulation does not work. I can see close any species during spawning season. Fish killing is all that's going on with current regulations. I have spoke to everyone on the board and in the biology departments and nobody seems to want to take responsibility for the Miss managed waters of the coast of the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. It's crazy to see the fish you catch the most of you can't keep. In addition the fish a fishermen catches the least of you can keep. WTF is going on. The scientific data has been proven to be inaccurate. Why are we still following it. I have fished out of Ponce inlet for forty years, and fishing is good. Fish limits are good and proper regulations are good, But just stick 20 fish aggregate, and recreational fisherman will stop fishing and fisherman will go home. Two snapper per person per trip, with a snapper stamp on license is not to much to ask. Opening snapper season three days two time creates mass fish kills. Snapper stamp should be the only way to have one in possession, and it makes money. Last trip I caught 40 plus snapper. 5 snapper to 1 other species. Average weight was 8-15 pounds. I could have stopped fishing by noon if the regulation were done right. Just go to a 20 fish per person limit, any species. That will limit the amount of discards also. Think about it. You don't need a scientist to figure this out. Ask the people who have been fishing out here for years. That's the best intel available.
1/25/2023	First Name: John Last Name: Moscarillo Email: jphnmoscarillo@att.net	City: Jacksonville State: Florida	Private Recreational	1) Institute a reef fish stamp. Charge a nominal fee so that only those who are really fishing will purchase them. 2) Add a red snapper permit with a limit that can be used year around. 3) Make reporting the catch mandatory. 4) Close fishing during the spawning season for each catchable species. 5) Begin and end seasons for all species on a calendar year.
1/25/2023	First Name: Jonathan Last Name: French Email: french60wasp@gmail.com	City: Falls Church State: Virginia	Private Recreational	ABC Control rule should have a high low range based on uncertainty that catch estimates and uncertainty can fall within. Currently, critical fisheries which rely on low sample catch estimates, reflect statistical variation which is significantly larger than what any other industry would utilize for responsible management. For example, in 2016, in one week in Virginia, MRIP took two fish reported via phone survey, and turned those two fish into over 379,000 pounds of catch. This was 37% of the catch for the entire SAFMC management area for the year. This single outlier existed despite other weeks with larger samples and nowhere close to the same estimated catch. Instead of rectifying the issue with soft targets, MRIP is now estimating 2018 cobia catches at three standard deviations higher than the previous decades worth of catch, again with minuscule sampling. It is worth noting than VMRC mandatory reporting data, with exponential higher sample sizes, paints an extremely different picture. The variance between state and federal estimates alone should trigger soft targets. The reality is simple. Hard -line estimates do not take into account the significant uncertainty in catch estimates nor possible short comings of the data for certain species. As result, currently healthy fisheries are punished. For example, management for cobia is based on catches exceeding a cap. Meanwhile, king mackerel, which hasn't come anywhere close to the ACL in years, has zero investment by fisheries managers in root cause analysis as to WHY catches are down? Instead, hard caps drive fisheries managers to focus on fisheries where fishermen are having success, and fishermen having success usually equates to a healthy stock.
1/25/2023	First Name: William Last Name: Mandulak Email: wreelfun@gmail.com	City: Raleigh State: North Carolina	Private Recreational	I believe allowing carryover to the next year for ABC is very reasonable as fish swim and do not always swim in the same timeframe as expected nor in the same locations. Therefore, a given sector or sectors may not catch its ACL. So a carryover to the next year should be allocated to that sector or sectors in the following year. It may well be that a given sector, possibly recreational, would choose to conserve a given species and that sector should benefit from that conservation action. I strongly disagree that the carryover from one sector should be allocated to a different sector.

1/25/2023	First Name: Robert Last Name: Lorenz Email: blpinfisher@gmail.com	City: WILMINGTON State: North Carolina	Private Recreational	<p>The proposal to grade and publish risk of overfishing a species to 3 specific levels (low, medium, high) would be an improvement in presenting overfishing risk potential to the public. Three simple levels will be easier for the public to ascertain, than presentation of the percent risk of not meeting a recovery goal, that the scientists calculate. Leave the differentiation of options, by publishing the calculated numerical percentage of risk, to the scientists. The general public, with varied skill in logic and math, will provide too much variability in interpreting what is low-medium-or high risk when assessing the impact on them of the fishery management plans and revised control rules. One person's 50% may mean medium risk, to another it is high risk. There is a need to develop a methodology and to publish hard recovery dates, and the concurrent stock abundance, that determines a stock is no longer overfished and overfishing is not occurring. Fishery stakeholders deserve hard and strong targets on just when a fish stock will be expected to be recovered, and what measured criteria will constitute a stock is recovered, and that fishing will be controlled to maintain MSY with a steady biomass. The phase in of modified ABCs would be a fair improvement to fishery management, if not overdone. A phase in period extending beyond 3 years would not be in proper spirit of why so many of us so strongly endorse the MSA. 1-3 years appears proper and fair. I personally would prefer 1-2 years, since in my lifetime I have experienced some species of fish stocks as overfished and within recovery plans for a third to a half of my so far long life. Striped Bass come to mind nationally, and Southern Flounder within the state of North Carolina. I would not be pleased to see this type of situation extend to any species within SAFMC fishery management jurisdiction. Any "phase-in" should also be front loaded with the greatest cut in quotas during the very first year of the recovery plan. An example would be 50% the first year and maybe 25% more each of two following years. An allowance for carryover of fish, to a following year, from a sector underfishing a yearly quota that was in total compliance within a FMP would be an acceptable refinement and allow smoother fishing opportunity. There already is action mandated by MSA that must be taken if a quota is exceeded. It will appear as "fairer" to stakeholders if fish not fully harvested in any one year could be available for "take" in an immediately following year. I would not agree, however, to any proposal for a rolling, cumulative, carryover that would sum multiple years of under caught quota and make those fish available. This option did not come up, but if it is mentioned, avoid it. A one year carryover of untaken fish within a quota, available in the immediately following year should have no impact on meeting the final recovery date and the recovery criteria for a fish stock in recovery mode within a FMP. When combined with the current mandate for "paybacks" after a year a quota is exceeded, a "carryover" should simple smooth the rebuilding plan for a stock without pushing out a hard recovery date. The carryover provision should work well in the South Atlantic, where due to ecological science our fisheries are more "boutique" and smaller. A lot of species, but no massive population or fishery for any one species. I do not think the carryover would be a good idea, and be strongly in the spirit of the MSA for any massive fishery such as the types experienced in the Pacific Northwest and the extreme Northeast Atlantic where carryover could put a fishery in to a more "derby prone" fishery a following year that could severely impact a spawning stock. The SAFMC jurisdiction fisheries should be clear of this risk.</p>
1/31/2023	First Name: Luke Last Name: Nelson Email: Lukenelsonsemail@gmail.com	City: Daytona State: Florida	Private Recreational, Commercial, For- Hire	<p>Amendment 35 would destroy fishing along the Atlantic coast, (no disrespect) it seems no one who is making these regulations actually has an idea into what we are encountering fishing everyday. Chicken rigging is what we do to NOT catch red snapper. Please don't do this. We have families. Think of the children.</p>