

-----Original Message-----

From: slshcrkwtrwks@aol.com [<mailto:slshcrkwtrwks@aol.com>]

Sent: Friday, August 17, 2012 5:39 PM

To: Duval, Michelle; fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com

Subject: RE: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

Michelle, yes if you would please forward this as my public comment since i don't feel like wasting the time to rewrite it to a council that will ignore it anyway. And please make sure to note that the low turnout that i assume occurred at the informal hearing was mainly due to both logistics and weather (too beautiful to waste a day on a 4 hour drive). Believe me, this is reason for alot of concern up here. This council has shown it's colors enough with the reallocation of everything from our paltry mahi quota to the present snowy trip limit that prevents historical participation and allow;s the recreational community to essentially hijack it. (How do you reckon the snowy rec quota allowing 523 fish has remained open when the golden tilefish recreational quota is almost three times as much and was shut down months ago when fishermen have to drive over snowies to get to goldens.

I am tired of losing and as stated won't without a fight again.

Anyway, thanks.....jeff

slshcrkwtrwks@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Duval, Michelle <michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov>

To: Jeff Oden <slshcrkwtrwks@aol.com>

Sent: Wed, Aug 15, 2012 2:13 pm

Subject: RE: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

Jeff, If you would like me to forward these comments to SAFMC staff as part of the public comment period or for distribution to the rest of the council members, please let me know, I am happy to do so. michelle

From: Dewey Hemilright [<mailto:fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, August 10, 2012 10:15 PM

To: Daniel, Louis

Cc: Duval, Michelle; Jeff Oden

Subject: Fwd: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

Michelle

Can you forward to Tom burgess for Jeff ,I don't have his e-mail in my iPad.

I all so share 100% Jeff comments for me too.

Thanks
Dewey
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:
From: slsherkwtrwks@aol.com
Date: August 10, 2012 10:06:36 PM EDT
To: fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Subject: Fwd: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

-----Original Message-----

From: slsherkwtrwks <slsherkwtrwks@aol.com>;
To: sean <sean@ncfish.org>; fvtarbaby <fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com>; louis.daniel
<louis.daniel@ncdehnr.gov>; michelle.duval <michelle.duval@ncdehnr.gov>;
Sent: Fri, Aug 10, 2012 6:59 pm
Subject: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

Dewey, this for some reason did not get throught to Louis or Michelle.
Anyway, if you would send it on to them as well as Tom ... Thanks and good
fishin.....jeff

slsherkwtrwks@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: slsherkwtrwks <slsherkwtrwks@aol.com>;
To: sean <sean@ncfish.org>; fvtarbaby <fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com>; louis.daniel
<louis.daniel@ncdehnr.gov>; michelle.duval <michelle.duval@ncdehnr.gov>;
Sent: Fri, Aug 10, 2012 6:59 pm
Subject: South Atlantic/workshops/informal input

As a fisherman that has in the last 36 years watched a steady and increasing erosion of my
industries ability to survive, the latest SA public hearing in New Bern on Aug 16th just about
tops the cake.

First you have a council that on one hand ask for input on the sale of bag limit caught king
mackerel as well as the ability to sell tournament caught king mackerel, and then you on the
other hand have a council that sees nothing wrong with having a discussion about taking latent
commercial effort out of the fishery.

My question is, what is wrong with latent effort? It is not impacting the stock, and every
individual that has a permit either earned it or bought it.

Also there is already a income qualifier involved in the fishery with either a \$10,000.00 or
25% rule involved in the fishery. So where is the problem. Is someone not fishing a problem. If
so then we could say that no one that had never recreationally fished for said species could never
ever do it.....if we were going to be fair about it.

The truth is i haven't commercially fished for any mackeral species for a few years for various reasons but i am still a commercial fisherman that values that permit AND WILL FIGHT FOR IT. My landings prior to the mid 2000,s compare with anybodies and just because i haven,t fished in a few years doesn,t mean that that permit is not near and dear to me and many more like myself up in northeastern N.C..

Interestingly enough, in this months "Commercial Fishing News" out of New England there is a case made by none other than NMFS that croaker may become the next cod in New England. Yes, they admit that climate change may be altering fisheries which is partially why i haven,t participated in the last few years in the mackeral fisheries.

For unknown reasons the spring and fall fisheries have been less than stellar in the last few years in N.C. and for those reasons i chose a different path. And now you have a council willing to listen to a few self serving individuals that seem to think just as they have done in the endorsement process for golden tilefish and sea bass,.....that we need to take permits that are unused out for "their" benifit even though latent effort hurts nothing..... That's right NOTHING.

Just say i am a mechanic. The golden tilefishery was my 9/16 th wrench. The sea bass pot fishery was my 3/4 wrench. If you take my mackeral fisheries you have taken my adjustable wrench and my ability to survive.

Bottom line, if you have and individual that hasn,t fished at all commercially in the last 10 years, his permit should not be allowed to be sold. You can't take it, but he shouldn,t be able to sell it.

As for any individual that has met the income qualifier already required, then leave them the hell alone.....enough said.

As for sale of recreationally caught bag limits and mackeral tournaments, as long as they come off the recreational quota.....i got no problem with it....provided they also have to jump through the same hoops that i do with safety, logbooks etc.....! Yes, folks, money definitely changes the equation.

As for .Comprehensive Ecosystem-based amendment 3.....i am amazed that this amendment mentions commercial and for hire reporting requirements consistent with maintaining compliance with (ACL,S) yet only mentions the use of VMS,s commercially.

Question is, does the council really want to know what is going or just commercially. The simple fact is, if this council is going to mention MPA,s as this hearing does, then it had better'd start the discussion because there isn't enough of us left commercially to save the day. Either everybody is on board or NONE should be. (I have had a VMS by the way for over 10 years and i would be glad to take it off and get rid of the monthly fee)

Thanks Michelle for listening to my rant.....

jeff