

Appendix II
For Amendment 11 to the
Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan

Written public comments on the Amendment 11 DSEIS

WRITTEN COMMENTS ON AMENDMENT 11 DSEIS

(Deadline for comments June 11, 2007)

Comment #	Date Received	Name	City, ST
BATCH 1	COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE COUNCIL MAIL DATE (FRIDAY, JUNE, 8)		
1	4/30/07	B. Sachau	Florham Park, NJ
2	5/18/07	Donald A. Williams III	Owls Head. ME
3	5/21/07	Patricia Kurkul, NMFS	Gloucester, MA
4	5/26/07	Kenneth Ochse	
5	5/28/07	Maggie Raymond, AFM	S.Berwick, ME
6	5/30/07	G.C. Dean	Ocean City, MD
7	5/30/07	Edmund Blane	Seaville, NJ
8	6/3/07	Maine DMR public hearing notes	Portland, ME
9	6/3/07	Fisheries Survival Fund	Washington, DC
10	6/4/07	David Tedford	Chester, MD
11	6/4/07	James Gutowski	
12	6/5/07	Atlantic Capes Fisheries Inc.	Cape May, NJ
13	6/6/07	Scott Bailey	
14	6/6/07	Nordic Fisheries, Inc.	New Bedford, MA
15	6/6/07	Ray Trout	Lewes, DE
16	6/6/07	Stanley Pritchett	Cambridge, MD
17	6/6/07	James Fletcher	Manns Harbor, NC
18	6/6/07	William Anderson	Trescott, ME
19	6/6/07	Michael Welch	
20	6/7/07	Ralph Dennison	
21	6/7/07	Capt. Mike Skarimbas	Montauk, NY
22	6/8/07	Denis Lovgren	Point Pleasant, NJ
23	6/6/07	John, Mary and AJ	
24	6/8/07	Eric L Lundvall	Little Egg Harbor, NJ
25	6/11/07	Walter Jessiman	Cutler, ME
26	6/11/07	Troy Ramsdell	Cutler, ME
27	6/11/07	Robert W. Maxwell	
28	6/11/07	Stephen M. Ouellette	Gloucester, MA
29	6/11/07	David E. Frulla	Washington, DC
30	6/11/07	Richard Taylor	Gloucester, MA
31	6/11/07	Ronald Enoksen	New Bedford, MA
32	6/11/07	Phillip Michaud	Wellfleet, MA
33	6/11/07	Heinz J. Mueller	Atlanta, GA
34	6/11/07	William D. Delahunt	Washington, DC
35	6/11/07	Stanley C. Sargent	Milbridge, ME
36	5/30/07	Wallace A. Gray	Stonington, ME
37	6/5/07	Jimmy Hahn	Ocean City, MD

Woneta M. Cloutier

|

From: Deirdre Boelke
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 10:09 AM
To: Woneta M. Cloutier
Subject: [Fwd: ublic comment on federal register of 4/30/07 vol 72 #82 pg 21226]

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


Subject: ublic comment on federal register of 4/30/07 vol 72 #82 pg 21226
Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2007 07:46:16 -0400 (EDT)
From: Bk1492@aol.com
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov, americanvoices@mail.house.gov,
comments@whitehouse.gov, vicepresident@whitehouse.gov

doc noaa id 042507A - new england fishery mgt council

cut all quotas by 50% this year. cut them each year thereafter by 10%.
stop catering on ly to commercial fish profiteers, and relying on the fake information they provide to you (it is
only done so they can continue raping the ocean).

the interests of our children are being severely compromised.
b. sachau
15 elm st
florham park nj 07932

See what's free at <http://www.aol.com>.



#2

Donald A. Williams III
58 Granite Point Drive
Owls Head, ME 04854

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

cc Maine Senator Olympia Snowe
cc Maine Senator Susan Collins
cc Maine Congressman Tom Allen
cc Maine Congressman Mike Michaud
cc Terry Stockwell, Maine Department of Marine Resources

Tuesday, May 15, 2007

Comments on Scallop Amendment 11


Dear Ms. Kurkul,

I am writing in response to pending action on the New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) concerning Scallop Amendment 11, specifically pending changes to the allocation of the General Category fishery.

I am a commercial fisherman from a small town in Maine. I have a state lobster license as well as a Federal Area 1 lobster permit and currently I also have a General Category 1B, 400lb VMS scallop permit. After fishing through high school in a small skiff, I went to college and after graduation, I financed my first full-time fishing boat to go lobstering. After three years, I was able to pay this boat off, and last spring I had a new boat built. My intent was to fish for lobsters, both inshore and offshore, and to go scalloping in the winter/spring. To this end, when I financed my new boat, I also included equipment to go scalloping- dredge, winches, etc. I applied for a 400lb permit and also invested in a Boatracs VMS unit. Since this time, I have not yet been scalloping with the permit, due to the uncertainty of its future. I have however, complied with all reporting requirements and have kept my VMS active while awaiting final ruling on the General Category issue. Recently I was just re-issued my permits for 2007.

My concerns currently are that implementation of new rules for the General Category fishery within Amendment 11 will shut me out of the fishery. I do not qualify under any of the proposals the council has put forth in the final draft, other than the no action alternative; I was issued a license after the control date of November 1, 2004. Therefore, depending on when the rules are finally enacted, a license I already possess will be taken from me due to an arbitrary date established by NEFMC.

I believe that this is completely unfair and these are my reasons. The scallop fishery has a long



history of small boats from Maine. Before there was ever limited access and general category fishing, boats and men from Maine sailed all over the East Coast in search of scallops to feed their families. My father did so when he was my age, and his father before him lost his life on a scallop boat when they towed up a mine from World War II and it exploded, killing nearly all on board. Regulations have changed the industry. It no longer is the traditional small boat fishery of my father's time. What has not changed however is the need for people such as me to have alternatives in the fishing industry. As more and more species come under federal regulation, it is nearly impossible to diversify and participate in other fisheries. It is hard for self-employed fisherman such as myself to not feel like the deck is stacked against us. We do not work for corporations or have multiple vessels to supplement our income. I have one boat and one very large payment that requires me to fish year round. I need this license to supplement the down time between lobstering seasons. My whole livelihood has been invested in the hopes of using this license, and now I am in fear of losing it.

I also take issue with some other comments and proposals being presented. There has been uproar within the limited access fishery over the total share that the general category fishery will receive each year. Proposals have ranged from 2-11% of the total allowable catch for a given year. Firstly, the amount of scallops that I am going to catch using this permit in a year will not even be close to what one boat on one trip in the limited access fishery can catch. They have a year-round focused effort in very large boats. I am trying to use this permit to scallop when I cannot go lobstering. These are two examples of completely different effort, and I believe this should be considered.


Secondly, in section 3.1.6 of Amendment 11 there are proposals to allow limited access boats to continue fishing under the general category license. It is unbelievable to me that the council is proposing to take my license and continue to allow boats who have already been issued limited access to also fish within the general category fishery. Once again, it seems on the surface that the council is more concerned with allowing limited access boat owners all they want at the expense of traditional small boat fisherman. How can the council take from the small boat fisherman and give to large boat limited access companies? Is there not a conflict if these boats can fish in the limited access fishery and as soon as their days are used up, switch to the 400lb general category fishery? Is this not an issue of allocation not conservation?

In conclusion, what I am asking of you is to allow me to keep a license that I already have. I am asking the New England Fishery Management Council to reconsider the criteria for eligibility. I am asking you to help preserve this traditional small boat fishery for me and others in my situation. While to the large scallop fleet owner in New Bedford, my wish to be included in this fishery may not seem important or even relevant, it is important to me. I have invested time, money, and my future in the hopes of participating in this fishery. I hope that this chance will not be taken from me. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely Yours,



Donald A. Williams III



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
NORTHEAST REGION
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

#3

MAY 21 2007

John Pappalardo, Chairman
New England Fishery Management Council
50 Water Street
Newburyport, MA 01950

Dear John:

Staff in the Regional Office and Northeast Fishery Science Center (NEFSC) have completed their review of Draft Amendment 11 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan (Amendment 11) and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). Amendment 11 is a challenging undertaking to control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery. Reviewers commended the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) and its staff for completing a very complex document that provides a comprehensive overview of the issues and impacts of Amendment 11.

I urge the Council, as it selects measures to be adopted for inclusion in Amendment 11, to make efforts to minimize the complexity of the amendment and to keep in mind that implementation of Amendment 11 will require effective and efficient monitoring and compliance measures. Also, as with any allocation, the Council must clearly articulate the rationale for its allocation decisions.

Limited access criteria

I urge the Council to consider the implications of adopting limited access qualification criteria that are overly liberal in qualifying vessels. There would be allocation implications of allowing a relatively large number of vessels to be active in the general category fishery. Liberal qualifications criteria penalize legitimate participants with a current dependence on the fishery. Historically, they have also led to the Council needing to take additional and often, more painful action in the future.

Accounting for incidental catch

Amendment 11 includes incidental catch alternatives allowing vessels to fish for scallops without qualifying for a scallop permit or allocation, or without any federal scallop permit (the "No Action" alternative). In addition, TAC alternatives allow vessels to continue to fish "under incidental rules" (i.e., for 40 lb of scallops) after the TAC is attained. However, there is no discussion in Amendment 11 of a mechanism to account for scallops that may be caught by such vessels. The Council must provide a description of how it will account for all scallop catch, and cannot leave any harvest unaccounted for in mortality estimates. Amendment 11 should specify that the Scallop Plan



cc: DB Council (5/23)

Development Team (PDT) would need to provide an estimate of incidental catch and resulting fishing mortality based on available information.

Gulf of Maine Management Area (GOM Area) Alternatives

The Council has chosen the GOM Area Limited Entry Program as a preferred alternative. As I noted during the Council discussion of Amendment 11 on April 12, 2007, the GOM Area alternatives are not sufficiently justified on the basis of conservation. The justification is largely based on the fact that the scallop resource in the area has been sporadic over time. However, one of the reasons that it has been sporadic is that it has been consistently overharvested. The proposed program essentially recommends perpetuating that trend by liberalizing the limited access qualification criteria and allowing a large number of vessels to fish on a small portion of the resource. Without the ability to monitor state waters fishing activity, the effectiveness of the federal management program in the Northern Gulf of Maine would be severely compromised. As my staff and I have repeated at numerous meetings, this measure must be consistent with conservation of the scallop resource. Currently, I do not believe that the justification and analysis of the measure support its inclusion in Amendment 11.

Measures to allow better and more timely integration of recent data

I strongly urge the Council to adopt a change in the fishing year for the scallop fishery. Without a change in the fishing year, the Council will need to continue to make decisions based on survey data that is not current. Moving the fishing year to May or August would provide timely scientific information for use in the Council's framework management process. The arguments against changing the fishing year have not been sufficiently articulated, even though the problem associated with the current fishing year and availability of survey information is clear. If the fishing year is not changed, the Council may have to use more caution than would otherwise be necessary in establishing management measures. It could also encourage complex and rigid adjustment mechanisms in frameworks (like the Elephant Trunk Access Area trip adjustment procedure included in Framework 18). Without a change in the fishing year, the Council and NOAA Fisheries Service can also expect repeated requests to modify measures every year. This fishery cannot be managed in a way that precludes deliberative consideration of annual measures and requires the Council and NOAA Fisheries Service to react to "urgent" situations.

Allocation in trips

Although the alternatives that allocate harvest in trips currently do not include broken trip provisions, I suspect that there will be support during public hearings for including a broken trip provision. A broken trip provision identical to that established for limited access vessels in access areas would result in a significant administration burden, and would be ineffective. As an example, the limited access broken trip provision occupies the majority of a full-time staff's time. In the 2007 fishing year alone, we have had 132 broken trip requests for the Elephant Trunk Access Area and 22 requests for the Hudson Canyon Access Area. The volume of broken trips increases substantially with bad weather. Each request requires verification of landings and manual entry of trip information. The volume of broken trips with general category trip allocations will be higher than access areas. While incentives for broken trips may be higher with the larger possession limits for limited access vessels in access

areas, we have been surprised that owners file broken trip forms for compensation trips that would allow less than 100 lb of scallops.

The Council could consider putting limitations on a general category broken trip provision. For example, under trip allocation alternatives, vessel owners could elect to fish under a 200-lb or 400-lb possession limit each fishing year, with the trip allocation specified accordingly.

Monitoring provisions

If the preferred alternative is adopted for allocating a portion of the overall scallop catch to the general category fleet, the general category fleet will only represent five percent of the total scallop fishery. A hard TAC may therefore be the best alternative in terms of ability to monitor and enforce the program. However, I recognize that an overall TAC presents management challenges including the potential for a derby fishery. This TAC could be divided by trimester to minimize the incentive to derby fish.

After further consideration of monitoring requirements, we do not believe that trip-by-trip reporting through the vessel monitoring system or interactive voice response system is necessary. NOAA Fisheries Service would be able to monitor the status of overall TACs using weekly dealer reports. Vessel owners and/or operators would be responsible for staying within their allocation under IFQ alternatives and would be subject to enforcement action if independent weekly dealer data showed that they landed more than their allocation.

Allocation of yellowtail flounder bycatch TAC in access areas

NOAA Fisheries Service cannot effectively monitor a yellowtail bycatch TAC specifically for the general category fleet because the yellowtail bycatch TAC for that portion of the fleet could be extremely small. For example, if the general category fleet is allocated 5 percent of the SNE yellowtail bycatch TAC, using 2007 TAC figures, it would be allocated roughly 2,300 lb of yellowtail (5 percent of the 20.8 mt yellowtail bycatch TAC). We could not administer such a TAC effectively. I therefore urge the Council to adopt 3.1.7.3.1 "No Action" for yellowtail flounder bycatch TACs.

Sectors and harvesting cooperatives

I urge the Council to adopt the sector and harvesting cooperatives alternative. It would enable industry groups to develop future proposals. This program is proving effective in the Northeast Multispecies FMP and adds a management mechanism to the Scallop FMP that could be very effective in the future.

Stacking of permits

The permit stacking discussion implies that only stacking of full permits is authorized, and only if the stacked permits will result in a total allocation less than the cap (i.e., 60,000 lb or 150 trips). The intent seems to be that stacking is permanent. The Council should clarify if this is their intent. If the Council intends to allow permanent stacking, it must specify whether or not limited access permit splitting rules apply to current limited access vessels that also qualify for a limited access general category scallop

permit.

Ownership Cap

The Council needs to specify how the 5 percent ownership cap is calculated. Is it the Council's intent that an individual can have an ownership interest in no more than 5 percent of permits or 5 percent of the allocation?

Measures to reduce incentive for limited entry qualifiers to fish for scallops with trawl gear

Alternative 3.1.2.6.4, which states "A limited access general category qualifier can fish with trawl gear, but scallops cannot be more than 5% of total regulated species onboard" is not enforceable. It is very difficult to assess the amount of fish and scallops as a percentage for at-sea or dock-side monitoring. The Office for Law Enforcement also noted that while it could enforce different possession limits (as proposed under Section 3.1.2.6.3) if vessels are issued a permit that specifies their allowance, different possession limits for different vessels would add to the enforcement burden. General category vessels that qualify to use trawl gear should be issued a permit for trawl gear, as is done for current limited access trawl vessels.

Also regarding qualifying to fish with trawl gear (Alternative 3.1.2.6.1), can a current owner who fishes with a trawl qualify for this permit if the scallop landings used for eligibility were harvested with a dredge by a prior owner? This needs to be clear.

Fleetwide Hard TACs

I am concerned about the proposal in several alternatives to use a five-year rolling average to calculate allocations for quarterly hard TACs given the nature of the fishery. It seems that unusual weather or other influences could affect landings (and therefore allocations) in subsequent years.

I hope that the Scallop Committee and Council will consider these comments at their meetings. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions or concerns that you would like to discuss prior to further Committee and/or Council discussion on Amendment 11.

Sincerely,



Patricia A. Kurkul
Regional Administrator

cc: Paul Howard

Comments
#4

Deirdre Boelke

From: Scallop Comments [Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2007 8:08 AM
To: Deirdre Boelke
Subject: [Fwd: "comments on scallop amendment 11"]

----- Original Message -----
Subject: "comments on scallop amendment 11"
Date: Sat, 26 May 2007 00:14:01 -0400 (EDT)
From: VOICOMOXY22@aol.com
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov

My name is Kenneth Ochse I own and operate the Christian and Alexa. The official number is 937930. The Christian and Alexa has a fulltime limited access scallop permit. I own the vessel with my brother Arthur Ochse and it is the only vessel we own. We have both been scalloping fulltime since 1976. I have a few comments on amendment 11.

The question of should the general category be a limited entry? Yes it should ,because it has worked in the fulltime limited access fishery. Without all the regulations that came with limited access we would not be having this discussion because the scallop resource would not would have recovered where it could take the amount of effort we have seen in the past few years. The general category allocation should be set at the lowest possible percentage to insure that overfishing does not occur and the fishery becomes sustainable again. With reduced effort the resource would be rebuilt as it was before the big influx of boats. 2.5% of the tac would be a low enough number to achieve this.

To qualify for a general category permit the boats would have had to participate in the fishery before the control date and to have fished for scallops from March 1, 2003 to November 1, 2004 with at least 5000lbs of reported catch. These are the most restrictive dates and pounds but are needed to reduce effort and not greatly impact the boats that have historically targeted scallops in the general category. Also allocation should be kept to a maximum of 400 pounds per trip so as not to increase effort. By allowing more pounds this would keep the vessels on the grounds for longer periods of time which the fishery does not need..

Stacking of days or pounds on to one vessel would also increase effort and should never be allowed. One boat,one permit. It has worked for the limited access boats.

To answer the question of should the limited access vessels be allowed to possess a general category permit I will say without hesitation that they should as long as they meet the qualifications. I don't agree with the preferred alternative to qualify. I think the most restrictive measure would have the most positive effect on the overall fishery by greatly limiting the effort and insuring that the fishery remains sustainable for all that participate.

See what's free at AOL.com <<http://www.aol.com?ncid=AOLAOF00020000000503>>.



Comment
#5

ASSOCIATED FISHERIES OF MAINE

PO Box 287, South Berwick, ME 03908

207-384-4854

May 28, 2007

Ms. Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

Dear Pat:

Members of Associated Fisheries of Maine (AFM) participate in the general category scallop fishery in three distinct ways: 1) a directed fishery that comprises 100% of vessel income, 2) seasonal directed fishery as an adjunct to other limited access fisheries, and 3) bycatch in the limited access groundfish fishery

3.1.7 - Allocation between limited access and general category fisheries

For the purposes of comment, AFM takes decision 3.1.7 "out of order" (in terms of its position in the SEIS) because this allocation decision is critically linked to so many other Amendment 11 decisions.

The public hearing document describes the importance of the allocation decision in this way: "Ideally this percentage would provide enough landings to be spread among various general category vessels that participate in this fishery at a variety of levels without having substantial impacts on the existing limited access fishery."

However, that "ideal" outcome is linked to several subsequent decisions, including:

- Whether or not current limited access permit holders may qualify for a new limited access general category scallop permit (3.1.6.1), and whether or not this allocation will include the future landings by these "dual" permit holders
- Whether or not this allocation will include future landings by vessels that qualify for a new limited access incidental catch permits (3.1.8)
- Number of vessels that ultimately qualify for a new general category limited access scallop permits (3.1.2.1)

If the percentage of harvest allocation includes all future landings in the general category scallop fishery by limited access general category permit holders (as defined by the Committee's preferred alternative), landings by current limited access permit holders who become dual permit holders, and landings from incidental catch permit holders, then 5% will undoubtedly be less than "ideal", and the percentage allocation should be increased to accommodate those decisions.

3.1.2.1 Qualification criteria alternatives (for limited access general category permit)

The preferred alternative results in an estimated 459 initial qualifiers (Table 2, public hearing document), and history of limited access programs in New England suggests that this estimate will ultimately equal or exceed 500 actual qualifiers after all appeals have been exhausted.

It is clear from debate on this decision to date, that the eleven year qualifying time frame and the 1000 lb landings criteria are each supported by separate rationale, and further, the supporters of each will not be swayed, even though the combination of these two components will likely result in more qualifiers than can be ideally supported by a harvest allocation of 5%. *Therefore, if the preferred alternative is adopted, it is essential to increase the percentage of allocation harvest for qualifiers beyond the proposed 5%, so that those qualifiers most dependent on the resource are able to remain economically viable.*

3.1.2.4 Allocation of access for general category limited access qualifiers

AFM supports 3.1.2.4.1 Individual allocation for all qualifiers (Option A) – allocation in pounds.

AFM concurs with the statement in the public hearing document (page 9) that “individual allocation is the fairest strategy”. AFM, however, supports allocation in pounds, rather than trips. Allocation in pounds will allow each permit holder to manage his allocation in the safest and most economical manner. Allocation in trips raises significant safety considerations. Allocation in trips, as will be explained later, also creates a dilemma for vessels that may qualify for a limited access incidental catch permit.

AFM strongly supports allocations made on an individual basis, as opposed to “equal” basis, whether in pounds or trips.

3.1.2.4.5 and 3.1.2.4.6

AFM strongly opposes a quarterly or fleet wide hard TAC for the general category harvest, without individual allocations or other restrictions to control the hard TAC.

3.1.2.5.4 Stacking of Permits

AFM supports 3.1.2.5.4.3 Allow stacking up to 60,000 pounds or 150 trips per vessel.

If, for whatever reason, none of the “permit stacking options” are forwarded with this Amendment, AFM requests that options to allow vessels to consolidate or lease allocations of pounds or trips be added to the list of items suitable for future framework action.

Comments on scallop amendment 11
May 28, 2007

3.1.2.7 Sectors and Harvesting Cooperatives

AFM supports establishment of a process, in Amendment 11, to allow general category limited access permit holders to form sectors and/or harvesting cooperatives.

AFM does NOT support 3.1.2.7.2.9.1 - 20% maximum allocation per sector. A 20% limitation on allocation has no useful purpose and simply restricts the number of members within a sector.

Further the regulations that govern the formation of sectors in the multispecies plan, now allow for the Council to approve allocations in excess of 20% (see 648.87 (b)(ii) "A Sector shall be allocated no more than 20 percent of a stock's TAC, unless otherwise authorized by the Council.")

3.1.2.8 Interim measures for transition period to limited entry

*AFM supports 3.1.2.8.2 Transition to limited entry alternative **without** a hard-TAC.*

Imposition of a hard TAC on the general category fleet, without measures to control the harvest, will result in a derby-style fishery with consequent negative results in terms of safety and economic return.

3.1.3 - Establish a Northern Gulf of Maine Scallop Management Area (NGOM)

AFM supports 3.1.4.2, Option A- Amendment 11 would not apply to the Northern Gulf of Maine (the GOM exemption area north of 42°20N). Of the two options, option A more closely corresponds with the "historic" general category exemption area established in multispecies framework adjustment #21.

AFM strongly opposes Option B -the area north of 43° does not correspond well with the exemption area established in multispecies framework adjustment #21, nor does it correspond well with the historic availability of the scallop resource in the Gulf of Maine. Therefore, Option B is not worth efforts required to implement and monitor a separate management area.

3.1.6 Limited access fishing under general category rules

AFM supports 3.1.6.1.2 Permit limited access vessels that qualify under general category rules.

AFM supports 3.1.6.2.2 Landings from this component of the fishery would be deducted from a separate allocation added onto the general category allocation.

Comments on scallop amendment 11
May 28, 2007

3.1.8 Incidental catch

AFM supports 3.1.8.2 - Establish a new permit category for incidental catch.

This option will minimize discards by allowing a small amount of incidental catch in other fisheries to continue.

However, this section does not adequately address historic incidental catch in excess of 40 lbs/trip.

For example, some groundfish permit holders have historic incidental catch and landings of scallops in excess of 40 lbs, as current regulations allow up to 400 lbs per trip. Many of these permit holders will meet both the qualification time period and landings qualification defined by the Committee as preferred. However, they will not be able to continue landing in excess of 40 lbs/trip if the Council chooses 3.1.2.4.1, option B - allocation in trips, because these are groundfish vessels that would not be declaring scallop trips.

3.3.1 Trawl gear restriction

AFM supports option 3.3.1.2 Clarification of trawl gear restriction for vessels fishing under a multispecies or monkfish DAS.

3.3.2 Possession limit of 50 bushels

AFM supports 3.3.2.2 Possession limit of 50 bushels shoreward of the VMS demarcation line and up to 100 bushels seaward of that line.

AFM suggests that the possession limit for bushels would be easiest to enforce if the possession limit in all areas were made consistent. By way of example, limited access and general category permit holders that today fish south of 42°20'N are restricted to the 50-bushel cap when the vessel is **shoreward** of the demarcation line [648.52 (d)]. Removing the reference to 42°20'N, would make this restriction consistent for all areas, and solve the problem identified, which is that 50 bushels of in-shell scallops is not always equivalent to 400 pounds of scallop meat.

As always, we appreciate your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

M. Raymond

Maggie Raymond
Associated Fisheries of Maine

Deirdre Boelke

From: GilbertGCDEAN@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2007 8:55 AM
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov
Cc: Deirdre Boelke
Subject: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

My name is Gilbert C. Dean. I own and operate a general category scallop vessel "Gold Digger", federal permit #150158 out of Ocean City, MD. I fully understand what you are trying to do and why with Amendment 11. Believe me that "most all" of us want to protect the fishery and do the right things to preserve it for years to come. However, some of the things that are recommended within Amendment 11 are unnecessary, unfair and possibly illegal. Here are a couple of reasons why.

1. Control date of November 2006. In Feb/March of 2006, I wanted to get into the scallop business. Having heard all of the "rumors" about the possibility of the fishery being closed, I personally called the NMF with my concerns. I wanted to be assured that before I invested in excess of \$350,000 for a new boat and gear that I was not going to be closed out anytime soon. I was given that assurance and told that they knew of nothing being considered that I should worry about and issued me a permit in May 2006.

I should have at least been advised of the proposals included in Amendment 11 and really should not have been issued a permit without such a warning to the effect. To my knowledge, you are still issuing permits to anyone who applies.

According to your records, there were 699 permits issued after the proposed control date. Out of the 699, only 119 are actually being used. Those 119 should be included into your proposed limited entry fishery. Those 119 general category boats are not going to have hardly any effect on the overall catch or adversely effect your overall plan.

This would satisfy all current permit holders with history and avoid any possible lawsuits that may arise based on this particular issue.

2. Proposed 5% share for general category vessels. The general category vessels caught between 12 and 14% in 2005 and 2006. That level should at least be maintained for the general category vessels in the future to be fair to all user groups.

3. Current Limited Entry Vessels should not be allowed to fish on general category permits. You have already proposed giving them 95% which is not only unfair but ridicules.

4. Board Members. If there are any members on the board from any one user group, there should be and equal number of board members from the other user group providing equal representation. If this cannot be done, then no one on the board should have any affiliation to any particular user group.

As stated above, I have invested in excess of \$350,000 getting into this fishery not even 13 months ago based the information provided by you and the issuing of the permit. Scallop fishing is my sole source of income. How am I supposed to make a living now? How am I supposed to pay off the balance owed on the loans secured to get into this fishery? What am I supposed to do with a scallop boat will definitely decrease in value should Amendment 11 go through as proposed?

You should change it to a limited entry, protect the ones that you have already issued permits, base your TAC on those numbers, move your control date to say June 1, 2006 and stop issuing additional permits immediately.

Regards,

Captain G.C. Dean

6/4/2007

6311 Suicide Bridge Road
Hurlock, MD 21643
410-943-1707
410-463-0049

See what's free at AOL.com.

Comment #7



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
NORTHEAST REGION
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

MAY 18 2006

- handed out at public hearing 5/30/07 -

Edmund Blaine
30 Foxborough Rd
Seaville, NJ 08230

Dear Mr. Blaine:

This letter is in response to the concerns you expressed in your letter regarding the requirements that are associated with the November 1, 2004, control date for the general category scallop permit. Currently the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) is working on Amendment 11 to Scallop Fishery Management Plan which proposes to make the open access general category fishery a limited access fishery. The proposed criteria to be used to qualify vessels for the limited access permit are still being developed by the Scallop Committee and the Council. I suggest you inform the Council of your special circumstances, as it further develops Amendment 11. It is important that the Council be aware of special circumstances as it develops new programs, so that there can be discussion and consideration of how they should be handled.

Sincerely,

George H. Darcy
Assistant Regional Administrator
for Sustainable Fisheries



July 31, 2006

To: New England Fishery Management Council
50 Water Street
Newburyport, Massachusetts 01950

Edmund Blaine
30 Foxborough Road
Seaville, NJ 08230

Re: General Category Scallop Permit/ Special Circumstance

Before Amendment 11 is finalized, I would like to address the council with my special circumstances as follows: I began searching for a bigger and safer vessel in June, 2004 in Nova Scotia. This vessel was specifically purchased for scalloping. On Sept 14, 2004, I spoke with Peter Christopher regarding a general category scallop permit for this new boat. He told me there was no control date as of that date and there was no projected date in the near future. He sent me an application and advised me to send it in when I obtain all needed documentation after settlement on my new boat. It took a substantial amount of time to get the paper work from Canada. The sequence of events happened as follows:

PURCHASE DATE OF VESSEL---9/20/04

DATE OF ENTRY INTO THE U.S.---9/24/04

CERTIFICATE OF TITLE ISSUE DATE---10/22/04

FEDERAL FISHERIES PERMIT ISSUED GENERAL CATEGORY SCALLOP PERMIT---
12/03/04

ALL DOCUMENTATION IS AVAILABLE IF NECESSARY.

Enclosed, you will find a copy of a letter I received from George Darcy. He is an Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries and has advised me to provide you this information so you can act accordingly when working on Amendment 11. I have invested a significant amount of money in the vessel, the gear and the Vessel Monitoring System and hope that you will take my situation into consideration when implementing the regulations of this fishery. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Edmund Blaine
F/V Laura Marie

**Draft Amendment 11
to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan
DMR Public Hearing
May 22, 2007
Casco Bay Lines
Portland, Me**

Public Attendees: Rick Cullow, Bob Tetrault, Donald Williams and Gary Hatch. Terry Stockwell, Kohl Kanwit and Donna Hall from the Department of Marine Resources.

Terry Stockwell presented the Amendment 11 Public Hearing PowerPoint prepared by the NEFMC and explained the proposed measures that concern Maine General Category scallopers which include:

- a limited entry program with specific qualification criteria (permit in at least one year from March 1, 1994 – November 1, 2004 and at least 1000 pounds of scallop landings in any one of those years)
- individual allocation of access for qualifying vessels in number of trips with a maximum of 400 pounds per trip
- a separate limited entry program for vessels to fish at a reduced level in the Northern Gulf of Maine
- an overall allocation of 5 % of the total projected annual scallop catch for the general category fishery

Public Comments:

R. Cullow – I think anyone who had landings and had a permit should be able to have one, anyone with idle permits should not. I don't have a permit anymore, the boat is still there but I don't have the permit. Somehow there needs to be a way to be grandfathered if you were issued permit in 2007 they should be able to get a permit.

B. Tetrault – I never had bi-catch of 1000 lbs, it was always under, but I have landings but I cannot show 1000 lbs.

G. Hatch – We are not going to get any qualifying criteria, if we were not going to look at the way the fishery should be managed. We are only left with being hard-nosed. We'll manage this but like a small boat fishery, we'll say no the big boats, they are not going to come back like they did 20 years ago and wipe this out. We're just taking the history and throwing it out.

B. Tetrault - This State had an active fishery and was managing it; this sounds like protection for certain group.

R. Cullow - Why are you still issuing licenses, the control date should be out the window, it should go on if you were issued a 2007 license you should be allowed to continue being issued a license, this doesn't add up, if you give the license, land the scallops, they shouldn't be allowed to take away.

D. Williams - Where did that date come from? What are the other alternatives? I built boat, invested all this money and I've asked questions for 2 years and no one could give me any answers. Some people say there is nothing we can do, where do I stand on this matter? They just issued me a federal permit, I can't believe they can just take it away, just because of a date, how can they do this? Have they worked out transfer of permits? This is part of my families' heritage, it's unbelievable that the feds can come in and take it all away. What I want is to have my 400 lb permit and not lose it, have they thought about the impact of what can happen down the road?

B. Tetrault - Why are they differentiating, don't the habitat people get to chime in on that? Why should you shut the door on certain people?

R. Cullow -- We're losing out on every permit that we've ever had, your taking that much away and it will keep another 100 families out, the big boats are not up around here anymore.

D. Williams - It doesn't look like conservation, it looks like allocation instead, what I'm going to catch in a year is a drop in the bucket as to what the big boats are catching. You have to know I have an interest in this, but what am I going to do, the State has to take in to consideration there are going to be more people, have they figured out the transfer or the buy out.

B. Tetrault - We need to add unique history to this document, I'm trying to help you at being successful at getting this thing. This looks like a political solution, didn't we just get rid of this small mesh line, we spent years getting rid of it, why do we want it back, why are we inviting it back?

G. Hatch - We have to fight for Gulf of Maine, this is like trying to outrun a steamroller- think about the majority voters on this council, this is no more than a majority of big fisherman that want to buy permits up...this is perfect of our government at it's best, every time it gets more and more, they are managing 5% of the industry, it's got so thick we can't manage it, we have to say NO, this has nothing to do about managing the fishery it's all about money.

D. Williams - It's hard not to see it that way, they just want to take away from the little guy, this is important to me, and this is nothing that I would prefer.

R. Cullow - I just invested 50K in a boat, there has to be something for people who had a 2007 permit.


B. Tetrault -I would work on that 1994 thing, we can't just walk in to the wall, and I have records that go back to 1983. Do you want us at the next meeting? There is too many Mainers' that will be eliminated and it shouldn't be that way. We're just looking for a bi-catch. 1994 cuts off too many people, it won't add anything to landings.

G. Hatch -That's what got the limited access guys going.

D. Williams – When you think of all other factors, the number of people that actually have permits to those that used them, if they are allocating 5% to general category or even a smaller amount going to the small guy, why is it us that has to take the sacrifice, there needs to be more enforcement out there.

B. Tetrault – If you go back to 1975 the boats came up for New Bedford to fish here. We are humble and weak.

G. Hatch -We are setting ourselves up the same way as the quahogs if you look at this chart. Gov. Brennan got it back for the downeast guys. The driving force to this is money; limited access is worth 2.5 million and they are saying they will spend the money to get what they want. This is the end of us, this is completely bull and we need to be brave or stupid. We publicly need to go and change the process, this is total failure of the process, what are you going to qualify, 14-15 people in this State, those are the real numbers. We need to get as many signatures as we can get.




comment
#9

KELLEY DRYE
COLLIER SHANNON

DIRECT LINE: (202) 342-8648

EMAIL: fruba@kelleydrye.com



June 4, 2007

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. David G. Simpson, Chairman
Scallop Oversight Committee
New England Fishery Management Council
50 Water Street, Mill 2
Newburyport, MA 01950

Re: Amendment 11 to the Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan

Dear Mr. Simpson:

As you know, we represent the Fisheries Survival Fund ("FSF"). FSF's participants include the bulk of the full-time, Limited Access scallop fleet. FSF's participants have been involved in Amendment 11's development, while recognizing that General Category participants also have an interest in designing a limited access scheme that matches their diverse fishery.

FSF submits this letter for the Scallop Committee's consideration in advance of its June 6 meeting to select final Amendment 11 alternatives for the Council's consideration. FSF will also provide a fuller set of comments by the June 11 deadline. Now that the public hearing process is over, many of the issues confronting the Committee have come into better focus, based on the public hearings and the analyses in the Public Hearing Document ("PHD").

FSF participants attended four of the public hearings (Hyannis, Fairhaven, Newport News, and Manahawkin), and their attendance exceeded that of the General Category participants, at all but perhaps the Hyannis hearing (where the respective contingents were relatively equal). In summary, and as explained below, FSF submits that the Council should allocate no more than five percent of the overall resource to the General Category (a point with which certain General Category participants agreed), but the Scallop Committee and Council should take steps to more effectively distribute that share using Amendment 11 options. The episodic nature of the General Category also argues against a 10% allocation during the transition to the Amendment 11 limited access program, though some lower cap is necessary.

Executive Summary

The PHD Amendment 11 Vision Statement summary states, among others, "Amendment 11's overall intent is to ... maintain the diverse nature and flexibility within this component of the scallop fleet, and preserve the ability for vessels to participate at various levels. The Councils' vision for the general category fishery ... is a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities." PHD, at 1.

As is explained herein, the Vision Statement can be realized with a five percent allocation, and other long-term problems (such as latent effort and disproportionate shares) can be avoided. Such a five percent share may be most effectively divided among General Category qualifiers under the Vision Statement if: (1) the control date is maintained; (2) directed day boat scallopers landing over 5,000 pounds in their best year are provided with allocations of 400-pound trips; (3) a "contribution factor" should be used to recognize multi-year participation during the qualifying period (Alternative 3.1.2.3); (4) General Category fishery qualifiers landing between 1,000-4,999 pounds in their best year (most likely these are incidental catches) are provided with 200-pound trips under Alternative 3.1.2.4.2; (5) General Category qualifiers directing on scallops with a net should have a reduced possession limit of 250 or 300 pounds so as to equalize mortality in recognition that scallop trawls demonstrably catch smaller scallops (Alternatives 3.1.2.6.3.1; 3.1.2.6.3.2); (6) General Category dredge qualifiers should only be able to scallop with a dredge (Alternative 3.1.2.6.2); (7) the Consistency Amendment should be maintained and only one permit should qualify per vessel (Alternative 3.1.2.5.1.1); (8) illegal and unrecorded landings should not count toward qualifications or allocations; and (9) a Northern Gulf of Maine exemption area makes far more sense for that very episodic fishery than an additional overall allocation of scallops, especially in terms of not creating latent effort.

The Public Hearings

One surprising result was that many of the public hearings were lightly attended by General Category participants. In fact, at Durham, there were no General Category participants in the audience. In Newport News, about ten General Category fishermen attended, but their landings history uniformly post-dated the control date, and they argued for a forward extension of the qualifying period. By contrast, in Ellsworth, the large majority (if not virtually all) of the public hearing participants had not landed scallops during the qualifying period, but prior to it.

For its part, the final public hearing in Manahawkin was attended by over twenty participants of the FSF and only a few members of the General Category fishery. Notably, all the General Category fishermen who testified declared that a five percent allocation was sufficient. In general, the General Category fishermen at the Manahawkin hearing were more concerned with creating stricter qualification criteria for the Limited Access fleet.

The public hearings did reveal that there are some essentially full-time General Category participants from New England. About a dozen of them attended the Hyannis public hearing, and some of those present at Hyannis (along with a few others) also participated at Fairhaven. This contingent has been very active in Amendment 11's development.

An Episodic Fishery Should Not Receive a Disproportionate Overall Allocation

The public hearing materials show that the Scallop Committee and Council will need to be careful about acceding to a vocal minority's demand for individual allocations, coupled with an historically disproportionate share of the overall resource. FSF considers any more than the 5% share that the non-Limited Access General Category landed in the control date year of 2004, *see* PHD Table 1, to be disproportionate.¹

As explained above, a handful of day boat scallopers that claim to operate essentially full-time were present at the Hyannis and Fairhaven public hearings. Notably, this contingent is not a large group overall: according to the Public Hearing Document, only 37 General Category participants landed over 20,000 pounds of scallops in 2004, the year of the control date. This number of "high liners" was 23 in 2003, only 9 in 2002, and 19 in 2001. (PHD Table 7.)

Nonetheless, certain participants in this modestly-sized directed day boat fishery contingent from New England have been steering the Amendment 11 process toward individual allocations, apparently so that they can maximize their personal shares.² These fishermen have made it clear they do not want to get grouped into tiers where their relative shares might be averaged with others having less history. Their approach may be understandable from their perspective (although some of their personal attacks on the Limited Access fleet aren't).

¹ An allocation of even seven percent bears no relation whatsoever to the historic General Category fishery, and would be fundamentally unfair and wasteful (as the allocation would go unharvested in this demonstrably episodic fishery). Indeed, even a five percent allocation is generous. During the Council's preferred qualifying period, 1994-2004, General Category landings (by Amendment 11 qualifiers and non-qualifiers alike) averaged under two percent of overall harvest. (PHD Table 1.) The Council's preferred alternative of five percent thus represents a 255% increase over average landings in the qualifying period. An allocation above five percent represents an even greater windfall and would credit overfishing by the post-control date fleet to the historical General Category fleet. Such a result is not only unjustifiable as a matter of policy, but defeats the purpose of establishing the control date in the first place.

² In that vein, claims were made at the public hearing in Fairhaven that the General Category needs an average of 4.0 million pounds to be "satisfied." An allocation at that level would provide every qualifier with virtually his or her best year as a dedicated allocation, notwithstanding the episodic nature of most of the General Category fishery. (*See* PHD Table 11, which reports "total best year landings" for preferred option qualifiers as 4,187,916 pounds.)

In contrast to this handful of “full-time” day boat scallopers, the Public Hearing Document demonstrates that most General Category participants fish only episodically. In fact, of the 459 estimated qualifiers, only 234 (or roughly half) of the qualifiers had any recorded scallop landings at all in 2005, the year after the control date. (PHD Table 11.)

If the preferred alternative of individual allocations is chosen, then there is a strong likelihood that up to half of the general category quota could go unused. This would be a huge loss of sustainable scallop yield—yield that the Limited Access fleet would fish each year, because scallops are their fishery, and dependently so, ever since Amendment 4. In fact, the Scallop Committee and Council will need to be careful not to end up creating the same kind of latent effort that plagues the groundfish fishery, via significant, permanent, individualized allocations of scallops to vessels that will not regularly harvest them.

The potential for such latent effort from a disproportionate overall allocation is even more manifest when potential Maine qualifiers are considered. According to the Public Hearing Document, 130 Maine vessels would qualify under 11-year timeframe, but only about half that number, or 70, would qualify under a 5-year period. Put differently, 60 projected Maine qualifiers under the preferred alternatives have not landed even 1,000 pounds of scallops in any qualifying year since 1999, but they would get a dedicated, individual allocation of scallops under the Council’s preferred alternatives. (PHD Table 13.)

In addition, Amendment 11 would already fundamentally reallocate the General Category fishery back to New England, to the benefit of these participants on the Cape and in Maine seeking a disproportionate overall allocation. In recent years, about 70% of General Category landings have come from the Mid-Atlantic (PHD Table 10), but only 149 of the estimated 459 qualifying permits (or about 32% overall) under the Council’s preferred alternatives are from the Mid-Atlantic.³ (PHD Table 13.) It is not clear whether Amendment 11 will result in a major increase in effort in inshore New England fishing grounds or a cash transfer program as/if allocations are sold or leased.

Gulf of Maine

The Ellsworth public hearing showed just how real that Amendment 11’s potential to create latent effort really is. There, most attendees were self-described lobstermen who advocated for the no-action alternative. The rationale was that none would qualify under even the most lenient criteria because most (if not all) had not landed any scallops since the 1980s. However, they wished to retain an option to re-enter the fishery in the future, via a large dedicated allocation of scallops to the General Category. They did not (and cannot) explain why the Council’s preferred alternative to create a Northern Gulf of Maine exemption area would not

³ Of this number, 88 are from New York and New Jersey, and 61 are from other Mid-Atlantic states. (PHD Table 13.) Of the 310 projected New England qualifiers, 130 are from Maine, 168 are from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and only 12 are from Connecticut and Rhode Island. (PHD Table 13.)

suit their episodic fishery better than their receipt, via Amendment 11, of a large dedicated allocation of the overall scallop harvest they would rarely take (but might sell or lease as a windfall).

Recognizing Incidental Catch By Qualifiers

Another contingent of General Category participants largely went unrepresented at the public hearings. According to the Public Hearing Document, about half of those recording General Category landings in the years when the statistics were available landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds of scallops in their best year. Indeed, a full 256 of the 459 projected qualifiers landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds of scallops in their best year. (PHD Table 2, derived by subtracting the number of 5,000 pound qualifiers from the number of 1,000 pound qualifiers). This proportion applies year over year, as well.⁴ It appears that many of these General Category participants landed scallops incidentally, in other directed fishing operations. A non-transferable allocation, in line with Option 3.1.2.4.2, that enabled them to land 200 pounds of scallops per trip as incidental landings would make a better use of these qualifiers' allocable shares under Amendment 11 than directed 400 pound day boat trip allocations. Such an approach is also more in line with the Vision Statement.

* * *

We appreciate your taking the time to review our comments. FSF believes the Committee has the ability to lead the scallop fishery towards a successful future with Amendment 11.


Sincerely,



David E. Frulla
Shaun M. Gehan
Andrew Minkiewicz

Counsel for Fisheries Survival Fund

⁴ In 2004, 114 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, and 109 vessels landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2003, 71 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 58 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2002, 55 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 72 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2001, 60 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 45 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. (PHD Table 7.)



Comment
#10

June 4, 2007

David Tedford
104 Bentons Pleasure Road
Chester, Md 21619
410-310-8767

U.S. Congressman Wayne Gilchrest

Dear Sir:

My name is David Tedford and I am 49 years old. For the last 30 years, I have worked on the water commercial fishing, oystering, crabbing, clamming, hard shell clamming, soft shell clamming, patent tonging for oysters, diving for oysters, and hand tonging for oysters. I am a fourth generation waterman; my great great grandfather worked on the water, my grandfather, my father, and now myself. I have primarily worked in the Chesapeake Bay and its surrounding waters, but due to the digression of the shellfish business and harsh restriction laws for Commercial Waterman in the Bay, I have recently begun to work in the Atlantic Ocean. Presently, and since November of 2005, I am catching scallops in the Atlantic. I have a General Category Permit granting me the right to catch 400 pounds of scallops per trip. I like this job, it's a lot of fun, and it is still a viable way of making a living working on the water, which I have always enjoyed.

It seems to be that my rights as far as working the water have been taken away. I used to hard shell clam in the Coastal Bays off the shores of Ocean City, and in the last year, a law to stop clamming in 2008 was legislated. My right as a permitted Commercial Clammer has been taken away with the inability to hard shell clam in the back bays, in Chincoteague Bay, and Isle of Right. This is just one way that our government has taken away my right to make an honest living. And as if this law was not enough, the New England Fisheries Management Council has now proposed Amendment 11 to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP) that, if passed, will refuse me the right to scallop simply because I was licensed after 2004- the "control date" for scalloping licensure. The Council may be denying me the right to renew my permit when it expires in March of 2008. The elementary fact that I have been working the water for my whole life is not considered relevant simply because I attained my scalloping license in 2005, not 2004.

What is being proposed is quite unfathomable. I will be able to work one day, and denied that function of survival the next. After having commercial fished for the last 30 years, not just as a job, but as a traditional way of life, it is an abomination that this governmental agency in this Land of Freedom and Opportunity is denying my family's income! I have income tax records to prove the fact that I have been in this profession for 30 years. I have been paying taxes on commercial fishing for the duration of that time and this law will restrict me from my family's way of life. The most ironic and disheartening fact about this bill, is that if some person who had never worked a day on the water in his life, bought a boat, obtained a permit, and went scalloping before the year

2004, worked for a couple of years, and left the industry would be eligible to reinstate their scalloping license because of their history- but not me, a life-long Commercial Waterman. When I obtained my permit from the National Marine Fisheries, no one from this department notified me in writing, or even verbally, that I may not be able to renew the permit. In order to continue my career, I bought an ocean boat and built a scallop rig. To obtain the equipment to scallop in the ocean, I invested over two hundred thousand dollars. Now Marine Fisheries is telling me I may not be able to continue the endeavors in which I spent so much time and money to begin, due to problems with the fisheries. I obviously would not have started in this business and invested such a magnificent amount of time, energy, effort, and money to stick my neck out in this way had I known my permit was not to be renewed. It seems it would have saved, not just me, but many hardworking Commercial Fisherman a great amount of stress and anguish had Marine Fisheries denied permit requests after their proposed "control date" in the first place.

From day to day experience, there does not seem to be a lack of scallops. However, Marine Fisheries believes, due to statistics, that day boats are the prime cause of scallop numbers deteriorating in the Ocean and that day boats are responsible for immense disturbances of the ocean's floor. In actuality, Marine Fisheries should know (with all the information on which we file reports, such as: when we leave port, when we come in, how many each boat has caught, in what area they were caught, in what depth of water, etc.) that day boats are much less responsible for these disruptions than the trip boats their Council seems to be endorsing. It takes only a matter of simple logic to figure out that the small percentage of day scallopers is not damaging the ocean the way trip boats are. Day scallopers dredge for a few hours each day. Trip boats are continuously dredging for eight to ten days. These boats catch 18,000 pounds of scallops- obviously a multitude compared to a day scalloper's 400 pounds. According to Amendment 11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan "prepared by the New England Fishery Management Council" states in table 1 that General Category vessels only landed 12.18% of the scallops caught in 2006. We few General Category vessels are not even putting a dent into what is being caught. There must be an obvious correlation between those catching the scallops and those causing fishing mortalities. If General Category vessels are catching less, we are causing less fishing mortalities.

Our product is certainly worlds fresher and therefore healthier. It seems consumers should much rather want to buy fresh day scallops than a form of seafood that is two weeks old by the time it gets to market. It makes me wonder what the bacteria count would be on these old products, if tested. I know how important age and temperature are when dealing with the shipping of seafood. I am vastly experienced when it comes to shipping soft-shell clams to the New England area. I can not understand why the New England Fishery Management Council would want to shut someone out of catching a fresher product for the consumer.

There are many things about the situation that do not make sense to me. Why would the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) have issued a permit that I would not be able to renew? Why would they allow a Commercial Waterman to spend so much money in

order to scallop that he will not be able to make back without that renewed permit. How can the Council say that the miniscule number of scallop caught by day scallopers (compared to those caught on Limited Access vessels) is causing these environmental issues? How can the Council support trip boats if their best interests are in the preservation of natural resources and the seafood industry? The answer seems to be greed. It seems that the Council is hanging ethics in order to support trip boats which are quickly beginning to monopolize this industry by shoving out every little-man trying to make a living and delivering a older and inferior product at the same time. It can not be that with all the technology available and information available to the Fisheries that they truly believe denying hardworking family men the right to work as day scallopers can be the answer to saving the ocean's resources and preserving her natural gifts.

Thank you for your valuable time. Please also read the attached addendum concerning the public hearing I attended for Scallop Fisheries Management.

Sincerely,

David Tedford

June 4, 2007

David Tedford
104 Bentons Pleasure Road
Chester, Md 21619
410-310-8767

Addendum

On Tuesday, May 29, 2007 at 6:00 pm, I had the privilege of going to a public hearing for the Scallop Fisheries Management Plan in Newport News, Virginia. While a lot of things were discussed there, the main topic was the Scallop Fisheries Management Plan. I heard a lot of different opinions; but I was mostly appalled by the constituents of the management plan and the way in which the NMFS is handling its concerns.

National Marine Fisheries Services claimed to be concerned about the fishing mortality, but they have already implemented a plan to slow and stop the rate at which scallops are harvested. A major part of the East Coast's Ocean bottom has been closed up and deemed illegal ground for scallopers. From New Jersey to Ocean City Maryland, there is only a small strip of 8-10 miles that we are allowed to work in. From the 38'10 line south all the way to about the Chesapeake Bay the bottom is closed for scalloping- the NMFS has closed it; I can't see how something can be over fished if it's closed up-not even if there are 10,000 boats out there. Over fishing something is impossible if the bottom is closed. Certainly this is a good way of keeping over fishing from happening. Even rotating the bottom to give things a chance to reproduce and come back would be a legitimate way to regulate and reduce fishing mortality and over fishing.

When it comes to protecting our resources, the Council has not taken these bottom closures into consideration. Amendment 11 express the need to honor a General Category Permit control date of 2004 in order to further the protection of scallops. While denying anyone who obtained a day permit later than 2004 will undoubtedly cut down on the number of boats in the water, it will not create a drastic difference in the number of scallops being harvested, nor will it be a fair way to conduct business-especially from a government run agency such as NMFS. No such action needs to be taken.

The Council intends to deny the renewal of a General Category Permit to anyone who has not obtained their permit prior to 2004. At this meeting my friends and I spoke out against this unethical injustice. I expressed my concerns about my freedom as an American Citizen and my rights being taken away by these restrictions that seem to be undoubtedly going into affect. I even made a statement concerning the shamefulness of our men fighting for our freedoms in Iraq, and my freedoms being taken away right here in our own country.

Let me reiterate to you what statements I made during this meeting, and by doing so, further explain the consequences of the "implementations," the restrictions on the scallop fisheries concerning the General Category Permits:

What is going to happen to my colleagues and me if our permits are taken away because we came into the scallop fisheries after the control date in 2004?

I knew nothing about this control date when I applied for my permit. Of course, I was never told anything about it until I *after* I bought my boat, invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the vessel itself and the equipment necessary to get my boat ready to go scalloping.

The National Marine Fisheries *FAILED* to protect American citizens by informing everyone about this control date prior to the date itself and by the issuing of permits post-2004. The Fisheries should have made everyone sign a statement to the effect that their permit "could be revoked" due to this control date. I live 100 miles away from the ocean, and am learning as I go as far as the ways of the wide waters. It was dishonest of the Fisheries when they chose not to alert me and others like me about this possibility when I filed for my permit. As I have previously stated in my first memo, I'm a 30 year fisherman, a *Commercial* Fisherman. I am not a wealthy entrepreneur who enjoys fishing while vacationing all summer with my buddies. I am devoted to the water business and I have been for my entire life.

I ask again: What is going to happen to me if my permit is revoked-after I have spent so much money to prepare to scallop? Who will pay off the boat? Who will pay off my mortgage, for that matter! I can guarantee it will not be NMFS!

What we have here, it seems, is a systematic extermination of the Commercial Waterman. It's just one more way to push Commercial Fisherman off the face of the earth. This is parallel to Ocean City, MD where the laws were recently legislated to stop hard shell clamming in the Coastal Bays. I used to do that. Clamming is only part of my livelihood that has been taken away. Parts of my rights are gone. Where I live, on Kent Island, and in the surrounding areas, our government has not controlled the sewer systems. Nothing grows in our waters anymore. Out oysters and clams! Out soft shell clams! They won't grow there anymore, or at least they won't grow enough to sustain a living on the water. It's a shame. And it was for this reason that I ventured into the scalloping world. And now- What happens? Thanks to government controlled changes and regulations, my livelihood is suffering permanently again.

NMFS claims to be an equal opportunity employer. That statement is on all NMFS letters. It needs to be removed. The little-man is being discriminated against. Marine Fisheries will not just be revoking my right to scallop, but my right to make a living to survive. And it seems to be for two reasons: I do not own a trip boat, nor do I know anyone on the National Marine Fisheries Council personally.

Certainly by knocking many of the General Category scallopers out of business, trip boaters will be able to monopolize the scalloping industry. But what does this have to do with the Council's bias? At the meeting last week, I asked the Council how many of them owned, or knew personally individuals who owned trip boats. The Council chose not to honor my request for information. Their silence leads me to believe that if they had

answered truthfully, many of them would have in fact, been owners of trip boats or friends of trip boat owners. I stated that if they were owners or supporters, this conflict of interest could not possibly be legal. It is discriminatory to have these individuals sitting on the board and making decisions that cause self-employed day scallopers like me to lose their jobs and therefore their sole form of income. Even though I wasn't scallop fishing before 2004, I was a waterman just like all the owners of these trip boats. But once again, the little guy suffers.

No action in the General Category Fisheries should be taken. Allow any permitted fisher to renew their permit. How dare the Fisheries give out permits to scallop fishers and allow Commercial Fisherman to spend two or three hundred thousands dollars- only to revoke this permit in the future. This is despicable and unacceptable from our government- and especially from the NMFS- a group of individuals with enough data to know that the few hundred General Permit Scallopers with permits issued since 2004 are not the cause of fishery mortality. We submit hundreds of reports; there is no lack of information.

With all of the records that the NMFS has at hand, they have definitely failed when it comes to giving out permits after their control date. The least they can do now is to honor these permits. **Leave any man licensed who is already licensed**, and simply give out no more permits at this time. The Fisheries should have done this whenever this concern first came about. If there was a problem long ago, NMFS should have known it, and it should have been taken care of before present times. Many of us would not be in this position right now if it was done years ago. And the Council would not be to blame for the devastating decisions that are getting ready to be made.

As for the description of the Council's preferred actions, it is to allocate 2.5 to 11% annual projected catch. General Permit scallopers can not be causing more than 5-10% of the damage of fishing mortality out there. The other 95% goes to the trip boats or Limited Access Permit holders. There are countless trip boat and Limited Access fishers that are pulling two dredges, two 15 footers, working around the clock, seven days a week. It doesn't take a rock scientist to figure out who is doing the most damage out there. The General Category fishery is doing considerably less damage compared to trip boats and Limited Access fishers making up nearly 95%.

Why now are we trying to squeeze out the little guy with such a high percentage due to fishing mortality? There doesn't seem to be a reason, other than greed. There is no logical reason to deny me, or any other General Category Permit Holder, a renewal of permit when we are only responsible for a miniscule amount of damage in comparison to trip boats. With such an insignificant annual projected catch and an insignificant amount of damage being caused by day boats, who can justify taking away a hard-working American citizen's livelihood? The answer is as simple as this: No one can.

Please consider carefully the things I have written, as it is my career and way of life, along with my family's survival, that is now in your hands.

Comment # 11

Ms. Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

5/30/06

Re: "Comments on Scallop Amendment 11"

I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments on General Category Amendment 11. My name is James Gutowski and I am a Full time limited access permit holder who has participated in both the General Category and Limited Access Sea Scallop Fisheries.

In line with Amendment 11's vision statement I support a historical inshore General category fleet, with a limited access management plan set at no more than 400 pounds per day for a reasonable amount of days for those who qualify.

Overall Allocation

In the preferred alternative's qualifying period 1994-2004; General Category landings were 1.96% of the overall catch. In 2004 (control date year) the General Category landings were 5% of the overall catch. The Council's Preferred Alternative of 5% should be an upper end percentage.

Limited access vessels should be allowed to fish under the General Category if they meet the qualifying criteria. During the qualifying period (1994-2004) limited access vessels fishing under the General Category landed an average of 1.12% of the overall catch. This same percentage should carry through to Amendment 11

Reallocation

Since the implementation of Amendment 4 Full time limited access participants have made conservation sacrifices, engaged in cooperative research and participated in the management process. It would be fundamentally wrong to reallocate the scallop fishery based on post control date landings when the scallop resource was at very high levels.

Qualification Criteria

The November 1, 2004 control date should be used. I understand the council's preference to include a wide range of participants however; this choice will qualify to large number of participants.

Alternative 3.1.2.4.2 would be a good option providing lower landing limits for a tier of qualifiers between 1,000 and 5,000 pounds. This option can work well with allocations based on trips as well as pounds.

Any vessel qualifying for limited access under Amendment 11 with a dredge should only be able to fish under Amendment 11 with a dredge. In line with Amendment 10 to increase yield per recruit the council should set a lower possession limit for vessels not fishing with a dredge to protect juvenile scallops. Unrecorded or illegal landings should not count toward qualifying.

Stacking and Consolidating

Again in keeping with Amendment 11's vision statement "projecting a fleet of relatively small vessels" it should not allow, stacking or other forms of consolidation for the purpose of grouping poundage on to larger vessels planning to fish offshore.

Northern Gulf of Maine Exemption Area

I support the creation of an NGOM exemption area north of 40'20 to accommodate certain historical interest. The mortality from this NGOM exemption area should not count against limits set in this FMP.

Yellowtail Access Allocation

The General Category should receive a dedicated allocation of yellowtail for their access trips. This allocation should match the scallop allocation for each access area. This should not be based on the overall allocation of the scallop resource fishery wide.

Interim Period

Amendment 11 should not take years to complete. During this transition period General Category effort needs to be capped. Participants with no long term interest could cause considerable damage to the resource during this period. A 10% cap is too high for this interim period and will lead to more effort in the short term.

Amendment 11 should maintain current access area caps during this transition period.

Fishing Year

The fishing year should not be changed. Business plans and operations have been based on this schedule for years. The current fishing year matches the best scallop yields thus maximizing yield per scallop recruit.

Thank you
James M Gutowski
F/V Elizabeth
F/V Kathy Ann



comment
#12

TEL. (609) 884-3000

P.O. BOX 555
985 OCEAN DRIVE
CAPE MAY, NEW JERSEY 08204

FAX (609) 884-3261

Ms. Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service

June 5, 2007

RE: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11
Via e-mail to: Scallop.eleven@noaa.gov

Dear Ms. Kurkul and NEFMC Members,

Whereas the NEFMC has chosen to utilize limited entry as a keystone of management to control mortality from General Category fishing effort, the single most important decision the NEFMC must make in Amendment 11 is the percentage of landings to allocate to the new General Category Limited Access qualifiers.

The NEFMC and NMFS should allocate no more than 2.5% of the total scallop landings to General Category effort and 0.5% to Limited Access Vessels while General Category Scalping for a total allocation of 3%.

The NEFMC initiated Amendment 11 due to the 'Gold Rush' mentality of 'bubble' entrants that began in 2003 and peaked in 2005 (General Category effort is on the decline now due to their over harvests of the Open Area Beds). The NEFMC has already appropriately decided to utilize the November 2004 control date and to limit qualifiers to those vessels with sufficient landings before the control date.

With this in mind, it would be inappropriate to allocate to these qualifying 'historical' General Category participants more than had 'historically' harvested, especially in light of the fact that any allocation to these General Category participants in excess of their 'historical' catches must by definition 'reduce' the historical landings of the Limited Access Scallop vessels who have been the backbone of the scallop fishery. The existing Limited Access Scallop Vessel Owners' cooperative conservation efforts husbanded and rebuilt the Scallop resource to the point where catches were sufficiently good to attract opportunistic entrants by General Category fishermen. The NEFMC should not reward the General Category fishermen by taking from Limited Access Fishermen.

Referring to Table 1 in the Public Hearing Document – *Summary of scallop landings by general category vessels, limited access vessels under DAS and limited access effort for trips under 400 pounds* (copied on the next page) – the following analysis can easily be confirmed:

- The Average of General Category landings from 1994 to 2004 was 1.96%
- The Average of Limited Access effort under 400 pounds from 1994 to 2004 was 1.12%
- The sum of these (total General Category and Limited Access below 400 pounds historical landings 1994 to 2004) is 3.08% (3%).

The NEFMC current preferred alternatives for General Category effort is 5% and the NEFMC preferred alternative for Limited Access Scallop vessels when General Category fishing is 0.5%. This would total combined 5.5% for General Category effort if approved by the NEFMC. There is no logic or policy basis for these levels of allocation:

- None have articulated a credible, legitimate argument for why General Category should be allocated more than its historical average of 2%.
- None have articulated a credible policy basis should General Category landings be allowed to go up by 255% (from 1.96% to 5%)?

The historical average of both General Category and Limited Access landings combined was 3%. If Limited Access were allocated 0.5% of landings (a reduction of 64% of their historical landings) that would leave 2.5% for General Category landings (an increase of 27% of their historical landings).

Table 1 – Summary of scallop landings by general category vessels, limited access vessels under DAS and limited access effort for trips under 400 pounds.

Fish Year	Total scallop landings (LA and GC)	Total scallop landings by General Category vessels only		Total scallop landing by Limited Access vessels under DAS		Total scallop landings by limited access vessels outside DAS (on 400 lb trips)	
		LBS	%	LBS	%	LBS	%
1994	14,907,265	95,268	0.64%	14,713,046	98.70%	98,951	0.66%
1995	15,807,941	123,967	0.78%	15,603,104	98.70%	80,870	0.51%
1996	16,447,682	204,635	1.24%	16,175,248	98.34%	67,799	0.41%
1997	12,619,221	310,049	2.46%	12,122,375	96.06%	186,797	1.48%
1998	11,186,468	164,435	1.47%	10,528,707	94.12%	493,326	4.41%
1999	21,286,244	150,482	0.71%	20,713,733	97.31%	422,029	1.98%
2000	32,929,475	357,691	1.09%	32,259,404	97.97%	312,380	0.95%
2001	45,164,706	1,216,947	2.69%	43,659,686	96.67%	288,073	0.64%
2002	49,808,416	983,775	1.98%	48,641,573	97.66%	183,068	0.37%
2003	54,778,793	1,809,071	3.30%	52,781,614	96.35%	188,108	0.34%
2004	61,714,971	3,245,661	5.26%	58,106,020	94.15%	363,290	0.59%
2005	53,214,097	7,495,884	14.09%	44,917,224	84.41%	800,989	1.51%
2006	56,149,105	6,838,083	12.18%	48,886,653	87.07%	424,369	0.76%

I urge the NEFMC Scallop Committee and the full Council to fully look at the policy basis and implications of the allocation to the General Category fishery and to change their preferred alternative. I urge the NEFMC Scallop Committee and the full Council to adopt the following allocation of Scallop landings:

- 2.5% for General Category new limited access qualifiers
- 0.5% for Limited Access vessel which will qualify
- 3.0% total for the entire General Category fishery

Thank you for considering these comments.
Daniel Cohen, President

Subject: Amendment 11
From: BaileysOystersCo@aol.com
Date: Tue, 05 Jun 2007 14:36:22 -0400 (EDT)
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov

In reference to Amendment 11, Section 3.1.2.1.3, for the years 2000 – 2004, I support this proposal for a five year – five thousand pound minimum in order to qualify for permits. This would create a smaller number of permits with a more viable fishery for the participants who qualify. Giving a longer time frame for qualification means more permits with fewer trips per boats not making it feasible to maintain boat and make a living. General category should be set at 5% of the total quota of scallop stock and leave a quota cap at 10% for the interim in implementing limited entry. I also support possible future poundage limit as opposed to trip limits and support possible future permit stacking in order to remain active and economically feasible to remain in the fishery since it costs too much to maintain a boat if there is only 25 – 30 trips per permit.

As in this scenario of 3.1.2.1.3, I myself will forfeit a permit in order to maintain one permit of viable economic value and fishing days.

Thank you,
Scott R. Bailey
Bailey's Oysters, Crabs & Soft Crabs LLC

See what's free at AOL.com.



Nordic Fisheries, Inc
14 Hervey Tichon Ave.
New Bedford, MA 02740
508-993-6730

June 1, 2007

National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930


Attention: Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
Comments on Scallop Amendment 11


I would like to make a few comments on Amendment 11. First when the scallop management plan was formed to have limited access there was no thought of a general category fishery. The 400 lbs. was for by-catch thinking about draggers making a trip and getting a few scallops in their nets just the same as scallopers are allowed a little fish for by-catch. There is no legitimate reason to allocate more than 2 or 3 percent to general category. Historically they have only had very high landing the last couple of years. The limited access scallopers have developed this fishery and paid their dues over many years and deserve to have their fishery. It also seems to me that to allow general category 10% during the appeal process when the preferred alternative from the council is a very generous 5%, 10% makes no sense at all.

Sincerely yours,



Roy Enoksen
President





Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
NMFS
N.E. Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

Dear Ms. Kurkul,

These are my personal comments on the proposed Amendment 11. Regarding the DRAFT LIST OF MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES for Amendment 11 as provided through NEFMC website, I wish you to consider the following thoughts.

Under the qualification criteria I believe anyone who possessed a General Scallop Permit before the CONTROL DATE should retain access to the proposed new General Scallop Permit (limited access) and should not be exposed to losing it due to limited participation. Everyone who has made a financial commitment to pursue scalloping, should be able to continue to do so.

Throughout the literature provided over NEFMC website for the past three years a recurrent theme persisted to justify curtailing the General Scallop Permit allocation. This theme purported that the category was initiated to be used as a part time limited basis fishery to fill gaps in fishing seasons for smaller vessels and not to be used as full time. However, under the alternatives presented, if one used the permit on a limited basis part time as intended, one would now be penalized for not abusing the original purpose of the category by working fulltime. Those who did work full time and abused the original intended concept of the general category are now to be rewarded with higher allocations than those who did not. This is oxymoronic logic.

To reward those who abused the original intention of the category and punish those of us who abided by the original concept seems less than fair. Everyone who had a license before the control date should be granted a limited access General Category Permit and should receive an equal allocation. Equal allocation is the only way to be fair among permit holders.

A low allocation to general category vessels would prove to be uneconomical for the fisherman. The cost of the ever rising three dollar per gallon diesel necessary to make a trip in the Mid-Atlantic to the scallops grounds fifty miles off shore preclude a profit to be made without generous poundage allotment. If any action should be taken to adjust poundage per trip it should be to up the poundage to six hundred pounds per trip or more to make it more economical for fishermen to make a living and not starve themselves burning diesel.

In addition, since this is a Federal resource all states having waters adjacent to the scallop grounds should have a minimum number of participants to promote parity among those states with active fisheries. My state, Delaware, would be extremely restricted in eligible participants while other states would field ten times our number of participants.

The last item I wish you to consider is the apparent lack of concern for the misappropriation of a Federal natural resource. When day boat General Category Scallopers are paid two dollars per pound more for their natural, fresh, sweet product than their ten day at sea, preservative washing, bitter tasting, limited access vessel product,

monetary waste becomes apparent. Why wouldn't the Federal Government want to allocate more scallops to those who bring the highest value for the resource and discourage those who command less money for an altered product?

Please increase the General Category allocation to an acceptable percentage between ten to fifteen percent. There are plenty of scallops for everyone. It seems economical nonsense to curtail the General category allocation when they maximize the revenue generated for the same natural resource and present it in a fresher condition to market.

Let's be fair and honest in distributing this federal resource between all participants and give the smaller boats a larger piece of the pie.

Thank you for considering my thoughts,

Ray G. Trout Jr. / Scallop
President, Cape Henlopen Shellfish Inc.
F/V Emily Jayne
General Category Scallop Permit Holder

P.O. Box 637
Lewes, De 19958

Phone/Fax
(302)645-2318

Stanley(Buddy)Pritchett
100 Radcliffe Drive
Cambridge,MD. 21613
410-228-4725

Comments on Amendment 11 to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan

I attended the public meeting on May 29 at Newport News,VA. I listened to all the proposals being made and am very concerned because it sounds as though my livelihood as well as my sons is in grave danger. These proposals will surely end our scalloping careers.

I am a third generation commercial fisherman who has worked the last 40 years doing the job I love and my son has followed in my footsteps.I've worked the Chesapeake Bay and the Coastal Bays of Ocean City, but with the depletion of oysters, soft shell clams and the closure of the Coastal Bays in 2008, it led us to general catagory scalloping in the Atlantic.

I guess my main question is why did you keep issuing permits if there was already a control date on the table? We were issued permits and invested an extremely large amount of money, in excess of \$250,000. I guess to some that may not seem like a lot , but to us that is a huge investment.

As of 2004, only 19 boats held day scallop permits in the state of MD.How much harm can they do to the vast Atlantic Ocean?The bulk of the permit holders are from New Jersey northward. Don't take away permits just don't issue anymore, and let the fisheries continue for the current General Catagory Scallopers.

The smaller day scallop boats are ^{controlled} ~~controlled~~ more by the weather than the larger limited access boats. That in itself helps control the fishery. They have already closed a large area almost to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel leaving only a very small area off the MD.and DE. Coast.This closure along with the opening and closing of areas such as the Elephant Trunk were implemented to solve the over fishing and fishing mortality problems.

Why allow the limited access vessels to have their trip permits plus the general catagory scallop permits? They get both and just because I didn't have my permit in 2004 mine will not be reissued.Is it so easy for you to deny us the right to use these permits to make a living? We are honest, hardworking watermen who value our resources as much as you do, but we don't want to be kicked out of an industry in which we have invested so much while others can continue to work. How much influence have the limited access permit owners had over these proposals? Sounds like they are in a win win position, losing nothing and gaining almost exclusive rights to the Atlantic Scallop Industry.According to Table1 the day boats caught 12.18% while the trip boats caught more than 87% and according to your records the day boats are responsible for all the problems with the fishery.

It would be a travesty if the NMFS allows this to happen. Continue to monitor, and the

opening and closures of access areas, and allow the day scallopers with permits currently to stay in the fishery. This fishery should stay open for all of us.

If I am shut out of this industry I feel I should be reimbursed by the government for my investments. The government should buy out all of the day scallopers who will no longer be able to count on making a living in this fishery. Hopefully, day scalloping will remain open to all permit holders but, if not I think this would be the only fair alternative.

For one minute put yourselves in our place and consider the investments and possible loss of income and let your conscience be your guide and let things remain the same.

Stanley Pritchett



NMFS
One Blackburn drive
Gloucester MA 01930

Scallop Amendment 11 Comments

Dear Sir,

Draft Amendment 11 Scallop Fishery Management Plan. DO NOT CHANGE FISHING YEAR!

Yamaha Fishery Journal No. 34 October 1990 is scientific information presented to the Council first in 1995. Journal 34 was resubmitted in 2006 as management information. Scallops: Biology, Ecology and Aquaculture (Elsevier edited by S.E. Shumway) another scientific source of information have been ignored by the scallop Management PDT, along with the council. Amendment 11 does not protect small scallops. Since 1987 scallop production has increased in most producing nations by resource management & genetic selection. Amendment 4 to the present resource management has not occurred. Instead fishermen activities have been curtailed and ring size increased and closed areas randomly selected due to natural scallop settlement. Basically ring size increase results in target the fastest growing scallops of the year class thus creating reverse genetic selection over the long term.

Ring size increase created a market share for small imported scallops, eventually this will create market prices controlled by imports!

No effort was exerted to encourage aquaculture by the scallop industry, Sea Grant refused grants for scallop grant meetings with coast wide industry.


Scallops are not being managed by proposed amendment 11, (BEST SCIENCE,) Shumway page 864 references cyclicity in production associated with periodic tide phenomena. Journal 34 references a ten year cycle of production (solar cycles). Current utilized BEST SCIENCE; of amendment 11 does not mention cycles.

Predation from starfish referenced Shumway page 639 and Journal 34 has not been addressed in any scallop management. Scallop managers have not investigated how other countries have tripled scallop production. SCALLOP AQUACULTURE BEGAN AT THE MILFORD LAB, THE TECHLOGY WAS NOT UTILIZED IN MANAGEMENT ACTION! Science gained was not applied to sea scallops.

Amendment 4 should allow the day fishery to remain with the same number of current vessels as of the moratorium date Nov. 04.

BY REQUIREING GENERAL SCALLOP VESSELS TO LAND starfish as a portion of the 400# catch effort on small scallops can be eliminated (J34.) (In theory the number of small scallops consumed by starfish SHOULD be off set by the harvest by general scallop vessels. Moving day scallop vessels to Aquaculture would allow an increase in scallop production. Amendment 11 does not address any method to increase survival of small scallops except effort reduction.

The systematic rotation of harvest areas are supported in (Shumway) (journal34) but ignored in amendment 11. Science utilized by council in amendment 11 fails to address any method that allows for increased production or the harvest of smaller scallops to meet market demand.



OVERFISHED AND OVERFISHING ARE A RESULT of MANAGEMENT AND GEAR SELECTION WITHOUT REGARD TO KNOWN CYCLES.

AMENDMENT 11 REWARDS THOSE FISHERMEN THAT CREATED THE PROBLEM, (Made general category a sole source of income not a by-catch associated with other fisheries,) INCREASED DISCARDING OF SCALLOPS IN FLOUNDER AND RELATED FISHERIES, DOES NOT ADDRESS MORTALITY ON SMALL SCALLOPS FROM PREDATION OF STAR FISH.

Amendment 11 is not based on scientific information that can be replicated. The basis of Amendment 11, does not comply with the Manguson Fishery act. 101-627, 104-297 purpose (3) to assure that the national fishery conservation and management program utilizes, and is based upon, *the best scientific information available; involves and is responsive to the needs of, interested and affected States and CITIZENS; CONSIDERS EFFICENCY;* draws upon Federal, State, and academic capabilities in carrying out research, administration, management, and enforcement; considers the effect of fishing on immature fish and encourages development of practical measures that minimize by-catch and avoid unnecessary waste of fish; and is workable and effective;

The primary goal is to control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery, The secondary goal is to allow for better and more timely integration of sea scallop assessment results in the management process.

Capacity control would not be necessary *IF* STARFISH WERE LANDES IN AN AMOUNT NECESSARY TO OFF SET HARVEST MORTALITY! Council need only implement requirements for starfish landing requirements for vessels targeting general category scallops as a sole source of income. Other General Category vessels would have a percentage of other catch plus additional pounds of star fish.

Assessment results not considering the above mention scientific cycles are not valid yearly, thus managing yearly can not be justified as best science. Current management by ring size **GIVES AN IMPORT ADVANTAGE TO SMALLER SCALLOPS, THUS UNDERMINDING** future price of the scallop industry.

Amendment 11 should be scraped in favor of landing limits on general category vessels requiring a portion of starfish. The council could have implemented yearly landing limits.

Amendment 11 will forever eliminate the ability of Citizens who shuck shell stock scallops to have employment, in the four boom years of the 10-11 year cycles. This for North Carolina will have economic effect in the lowest per capita Counties.

The assessment results must include the cycles that are known to affect scallop production. **NO NEED FOR TIMELY INTERGRATION OF SEA SCALLOP ASSESSMENT IF THE LONG TERM BEST SCIENTIFIC CYCLES ARE NOT**

UNDERSTOOD OR ignored! SCIENTIFIC IGNORANCE CONNOT JUSTIFY AMENDMENT 11 not including starfish management to reduce mortality.

Answers to focus comments on amendment 11 public comment!

1. Capacity should be limited to the Nov. 04 control date or VMS.
2. Require landing starfish as portion of GC targeting scallops with no other landings.
3. Having a permit prior to 04 all should be in
4. all qualifiers must have same access to resource. Why reward the cause of the perceived problem, with low prices and fewer scallops the GC fleet has decreased in 07.
5. no sectors should be allowed!
6. NO! The gulf of Maine should be the first introduced to aquaculture of scallops.
7. NO! limited access built the GC landings No vessel should be removed from GC fishing.
8. NO!
9. NO! ALL YELLOW TAIL CATCH SHOULD BE LANDED AND SOLD THUS AN ACCURATE AND HONEST BY-CATCH RECORD WOULD EXIST AND CATCH WOULD NOT BE WASTED! *(HOW DOES ESTIMATED BY-CATCH REDUCE BY CATCH? CONVERT YELLOW TAILS TO LANDINGS!*
10. INCENDITAL CATCH MUST BE LANDED WITH APPROPATE AMOUNT OF TARGETED SPECIES OR STARFISH!
11. NO! the data is flawed; an example graphs showing scalloping activity are not to scale giving a non-realistic impression of area scalloped; scientist have continued to distort the area scalloped by general category with charts that are not to scale. Showing the public and managers a distorted impression of area fished.
12. No to trawl sweep less than 144 ft, increased scallop possession east of line if forced out of closed area by yellow tail closure; load the vessel & leave attempting to reach 18000 #
13. Yes the GC fleet by landing starfish can be forced to eliminate the mortality GC vessels have on scallops. Limited Access vessels could increase production by landing starfish or installing dehydration equipment utilizing heat from engine, (GOOD SCIENCE)
Amendment 11 fails to mention the effects even in the open ocean of PESTICIDES, PHARMACEUTICALS, PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS, THUS IGNORING CHEMICAL AFFECTING REPRODUCTION OF SCALLOPS. (ST. LAWRENCE SEA WAY)
14. Amendment 11 should only put the control date number of vessels in the general category; close the open access permit. Match the number of starfish landed; to a number necessary so scallop landing mortality is less than the harvest mortality.

Sincerely, James Fletcher. 05-29 2007 123 Apple Rd Manns Harbor NC 27953



Developments in Aquaculture and Fisheries Science, 21

SCALLOPS: BIOLOGY, ECOLOGY AND AQUACULTURE

Edited by

SANDRA. E. SHUMWAY

*Department of Marine Resources and Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences,
West Boothbay Harbor, ME 04575 (U.S.A.)*



ELSEVIER Amsterdam — Oxford — New York — Tokyo 1991

SEA SCALLOP, *PLACOPECTEN MAGELLANICUS*

K. S. NAIDU

Science Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5X1 Canada

FISHERIES

From an economic viewpoint, the sea scallop, *Placopecten magellanicus* (also called giant scallop, smooth scallop, ocean scallop or Atlantic deep sea scallop) is by far the most important pectinid species in the world. Between 1976 and 1987, it alone accounted for some 30% of the mean annual global production of all scallop species combined (Table 1). In some years it contributed to more than half of global scallop production. Sporadic booms in natural production associated with temporal fluctuations in abundance in some species (e.g. calico scallop) and manipulated production through enhancement in some others, particularly the Japanese scallop, *Patinopecten yessoensis*, have in recent years relegated sea scallop landings to a seemingly secondary role. In 1986, for example, up to 60% (163,601 t out of 276,596 t. whole weight) of *Patinopecten* production was culture based, spuriously depressing the sea scallop contribution to world tonnage.

The Atlantic sea scallop is a relatively large mollusc commonly reaching sizes between 10–15 cm and frequently beyond. While large as contrasted with several other scallop species, the implied gigantism is not always characterized by unusual or disproportionate shell size. The largest sea scallop ever recorded measured 211 mm (shell height, tangential dorso-ventral measurement), a size a little larger than the previous recorded of 208 mm (Norton 1931) and had an adductor muscle (meat) weight of 231 g (0.51 lb.) (Naidu, unpubl.) Rock scallops, for example, are better endowed with shell heights approaching 250 mm (Hennick, cited in Kaiser 1986). Maximum age recorded for sea scallops is 29 years (Naidu, unpubl.). The shell of the sea scallop is almost circular in outline with symmetrical wings at the hinge (p. 875). Whereas the lower right valve is white, flat and smooth, the left valve is usually light to pale brown, convex and delicately ribbed. Occasionally, both shell valves are white. Concentric rings on the delicately ribbed surface of the left valve have been verified to be annual (Stevenson and Dickie, 1954; Posgay 1962; Naidu 1969) and are commonly used for age determinations. Oxygen isotope records have also confirmed that growth lines are in fact annual events, consistent with biological interpretation (Tan *et al.* 1988). Hurley *et al.* (1987) have shown that the number of growth lines in laboratory reared post-larval shells is related to the actual age in days. Growth rings are especially pronounced in northern shallow-water populations (Naidu 1975). Repeated encounters with fishing gear in heavily fished aggregations and the haphazard deposition of shock rings makes interpretation of annual growth rings sometimes difficult and frequently impossible. Under these circumstances it may be necessary to utilize growth bands on the resilium (Merrill *et al.* 1966).

Sea scallop beds of sufficient extent and density to support commercial fisheries occur from Virginia Capes (latitude 36°50'N) to Port au Port Bay, Newfoundland, Canada (latitude 48°40'N). Offshore, sea scallops have been exploited commercially on Georges Bank, the Mid-Atlantic Shelf, Browns Bank, German Bank, Larcher Shoals, Grand Manan, around Sable Island, Middle Ground, Banquereau Bank, and on St. Pierre Bank (Fig. 2). The Bay of Fundy (especially off Digby) and Gulf of Maine also have had a long history of production. A full 44 percent of the Canadian catch in 1989 (4,600 t meats), approximately equivalent to the total Canadian removals from Georges Bank in that year, came from the Bay of Fundy (Table 2). In the center of its range (Georges Bank and Middle Atlantic Shelf), scallops have been quite successful and have withstood moderate to heavy exploitation. The Mid-Atlantic area off Long Island and New Jersey (New York Bight) and Delmarva and Virginia-North Carolina regions has become more important in recent years, sometimes contributing to more than half of the USA total scallop production (Table 2). In the Gulf of Maine, the majority of catches come from inshore U.S. territorial waters. Georges Bank, where most of the offshore effort is directed, constitutes the world's largest, single natural scallop resource (Caddy 1989). Scallop production on Georges Bank has been attributed to the presence of a large gyre which forms during the summer and later helps to retain planktonic scallop larvae within the area until they are ready to metamorphose and settle to the sea bottom (Larsen and Lee 1978). Towards the extremes of their range, sea scallops generally have been less successful and have not withstood continued, heavy exploitation (Dickie and Medcof 1963). Fisheries in fringe areas such as the northeast coast of the United States (Serchuck *et al.* 1979) and St. Pierre Bank (Naidu *et al.* 1983b) typically are characterized by a disproportionate dependence on sporadic recruitment of a single or a few intermittent and, sometimes, well-spaced year-classes. Consequently, in fringe areas, fisheries must cope with wide and, sometimes, catastrophic temporal fluctuations. As in most scallop fisheries, sea scallop recruitment, even in the center of its range frequently is irregular and poses undue problems to an industry that is typically overcapitalized. In some other areas such as the Bay of Fundy (Caddy 1979; Dadswell *et al.* 1984; Robert *et al.* 1984) there is evidence of cyclicity in production which appears to be associated with periodic tidal phenomena. These departures from 'steady-state' have wide-ranging implications for the orderly development and judicious management of scallop fisheries.

NOTE

Table
produ

United

Geor
Mid
Gulf

Canac

Geo
Sabl
St. I
Mid
Bro
Ger
Bay

Hisc

State

fish

1882

Prer

two

recc

1921

Eng

offs

emc

193

mo

(Ar

wh

the

19:

ate

pr:

sh:

ue

not fully understood, but may include shading of *Zostera* beds (that might inhibit their growth), an incomplete food supply, or liberation of toxic metabolites.

Predation. The most widespread scallop predators are perhaps starfishes, as documented for *Pecten maximus* (Lecomte, 1952), *P. fumata* (Olsen, 1955), *Argopecten irradians* (Belding, 1910; Marshall, 1960), *A. gibbus* (Schwartz and Porter, 1977), *Placopecten magellanicus* (Dickie and Medcof, 1963; Medcof and Bourne, 1964; Caddy, 1968, 1973), *Patinopecten yessoensis* (Imai, 1971; Golikov and Scarlato, 1970), *Chlamys islandica* (Brun, 1968), *C. tehuelcha* (Orensanz, 1986), etc. Other invertebrate predators include sea anemones (den Hartog, 1986), gastropods (Belding, 1910; Davis, 1981; Dickie and Medcof, 1963; Marshall, 1960; Olsen, 1955; Orensanz, 1986), octopi (Orensanz, 1986), and crabs and lobsters (Elner and Jamieson, 1979; Jamieson *et al.*, 1982; Marshall, 1960; Pollack, 1988; Tettelbach, 1985). Populations inhabiting continental shelf areas are exposed to heavy fish predation (Caddy, 1968, 1973; Medcof and Bourne, 1964; Naidu and Meron, 1986; Posgay, 1953; Schwartz and Porter, 1977).

There are some known cases of scallop mass mortalities caused by starfish population outbreaks. Decline of *Argopecten irradians* in Buzzards Bay (Massachusetts) at the beginning of the century has been attributed to a starfish population outbreak (Belding, 1910: p. 68). Brun (1968) documented the complete kill of a *Chlamys islandica* bed by *Asterias rubens*.

Mortality due to predation is likely to be size dependent in most cases. Jamieson *et al.* (1982) found that the rate of predation of sea scallops by crabs and lobsters was significantly higher on small size categories than on large ones; size preferences were found to depend on the size of the predators (Elner and Jamieson, 1979).

Epibionts. Scallop shells are often colonized by a variety of epibionts, including algae, barnacles, tubicolous polychaetes, sponges, hydrozoans, bryozoans, other molluscs, etc. It has been postulated that epibiotic suspension feeders (frequently constituting a large fraction of the epibiotic load) compete with the colonized scallops for food resources (Belding, 1910: p. 71; Broom, 1976: p. 14, 16; Motet, 1979: p. 27; Sinderman, 1971; Allen and Costello, 1972; Wells *et al.*, 1964; Yamamoto in Imai, 1971: p. 320). This has never been experimentally demonstrated. Indeed, demonstrated effects of epibionts are in some cases advantageous to scallops, as discussed below. Demonstrated deleterious effects of fouling include entrapment (Leibovitz *et al.*, 1984), increased exposure to stranding (Orensanz, 1986), and deterioration of the shell and meats.

Shell borers. Spionid polychaetes of the genus *Polydora*, which are common borers of scallop shells (Blake and Evans, 1973), have been reported as causing the death of *Argopecten irradians* in Massachusetts (Turner and Hanks, 1959) and of *Patinopecten yessoensis* in Japan (Imai, 1971).

Stranding, usually caused by strong winds or storms, has been reported for *Argopecten irradians* (Belding, 1910), *Patinopecten yessoensis* (Kalashnikov, 1984) and *Chlamys tehuelcha* (Orensanz, 1986). The action of waves has been considered a main source of mortality of *Pecten maximus* in some areas of the Bay of Saint-Brieuc (Thouzeau and Lehay, 1988).

B. *CPUE as an Index of Abundance.* CPUE has been used to assess trends in population size in long-term ("between fishing seasons") and short-term studies, including seasonal trends (del Norte *et al.*, 1988) and within-season declines (see Section 1.1.2.C, below). The data needed are generally obtained through a "log program" (Fairbridge, 1953).

CPUE has severe limitations as an abundance index of scallop and other shellfish stocks. Bivalves and other shellfish—unlike fish—are sedentary. Individuals do not mix after each fishing operation (Baird, 1966: p. 43). The spatial structure of a shellfish stock is persistent, and fishermen do not fish at random over the fishing ground. Rather, once they locate a patch they fish it until density drops to some threshold level, and then move to another patch (Section 1.4.3:B). Given this sequential pattern of patch depletion, stock size is not reflected by CPUE.

C. *Fishing Success Methods.* Catch and effort data can be utilized to estimate initial abundance (ie, at the beginning of the fishing season or removal experiment), provided that the quantity of animals removed over the season (or experiment) is large enough to produce a detectable decline in abundance. CPUE is used as an index of abundance. An estimate of catchability, a coefficient that relates the CPUE index to actual abundance (see Section 1.4.3:B, below) is also obtained. These methods, known as "fishing success methods," are treated in detail by Ricker (1975: chapter 6) and Seber (1982: chapters 7 and 8). Two main families are of common use in fishery research: regression of CPUE on cumulative catch ("Leslie method") and of $\log(\text{CPUE})$ on cumulative effort ("DeLury method"). Dickie (1955), in the best known scallop application, obtained yearly estimates of the size of the Digby stock of *Placopecten magellanicus* over 10 years (1941–1951), using a modified version of the Leslie method. The DeLury method has been utilized to estimate stock size at the beginning of the season in several grounds of *Patinopecten* along the Japanese coast of the Okhotsk Sea (Ito, 1964).

Standard fishing success methods assume closed populations (no migration, recruitment or natural mortality), no competition between effort units, and constant catchability (q). Models, however, can be modified in a number of ways for specific purposes, as is well illustrated by Dickie's (1955) pioneering study. The basic Leslie model was modified to: (1) incorporate an independent estimate of natural mortality, (2) utilize only catch data from days defined as "fine" from meteorological records in order to satisfy the assumption of constant catchability, and (3) use effort information decomposed by segments of the fishing fleet (Ricker, 1975: p. 159–161). Natural mortality was incorporated by assuming that the ratio of catches and natural deaths remained constant over the whole experiment, and that effort level was known. Other, more flexible approaches exist that allow for variable fishing intensity (see Seber, 1982; Coomb, 1979; Sanders, 1988), and may or may not require effort information. Wolff (1987a,b) also modified the Leslie technique in an attempt to incorporate an independent estimate of natural mortality. He applied his method to estimate catchability and virgin biomass of the Peruvian scallop, *Argopecten purpuratus*. He assumed that total cumulative catch taken prior to each unit time period t was all taken at the middle of the time interval $[0,t]$. Wolff (1987b) contrasted the population trajectories predicted by his model against those obtained using the (better) approximation of Pope (1972), and found that errors introduced by his approximation

Comment #18

W. William Anderson

702 Dixie Road
 Moose River Cove
 Trescott, Maine 04652
 United States of America
 207-733-2179

June 01, 2007

Patricia A. Kurkul
 Regional Administrator
 United States Department of Commerce
 National Marine Fisheries Service
 Northeast Region
 One Blackburn Drive
 Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

Dear Pat:

I attended your public hearing on Amendment 11 to the Scallop Fisheries Management Plan. I hold a General Category Scallop Permit and I have a VMS on my boat. I would like to provide further comment on Amendment 11.

The focus of my attention has been lobsters in recent years though I have fished for Scallops in the winter and early spring in the distant past. I still own all my equipment and I could easily move into the scallop fishery. The reason I have an interest in scallops is if the lobster resource should fail to provide me with an income I would have something else to turn to.

I was informed that by a certain date I had to install a VMS on my vessel in order to maintain my ability to land 400# of scallops per trip. Those who met your demands by the given dates should be in the General Category 400# permit class whether they have landings or not.

I do agree that you have to manage the effort in all fisheries or we will have no fish, scallops, lobsters, etc.

One of my biggest concerns is the consolidation or ownership of permits you are allowing in the permits that hold significant ability to land product (limited access permits). In scallops you have a little over 300 permits with rights to land the majority of the resource. Then if you start to look at actual ownership of permits the number of persons who actually own or control these permits. Your numbers will shrink to a smaller number of people holding most of the landings rights to this resource. Then if you were to look at this and then who own groundfish permits with any landings ability and herring I wonder what the picture would look like. I believe from what I have read consolidation has been occurring and it will continue. My concern is that in time you could end up with a few or one large corporation holding all the limited access permits. I believe in the latest authorization of Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, National Standard 4 of Magnuson-Stevens states that if it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various U.S. fishermen, it should be carried out in such a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges. While it does not actually spell out what an excessive share is it does address the consolidation and indicates that we should be sharing rights to our publicly managed marine resources.

With the conflict of interest laws in this country and other anti trust laws and I wonder whether people or corporations who hold such a majority share of the permit should be allowed to hold a voting seat on the New England Fisheries Management Council because of possible conflict of interest issues. While it would be all right for one of these large corporations to hold a voting seat if you have several of these large corporations on the council this could possibly represent some conflict of interest problems.

It is the shaping of and distribution of effort and landing abilities that makes me wonder about conflict of interest at the council level in the past. It is what was done in the past that has gotten us to where we are today.

I was appalled to learn that when a limited access vessel had used up his days as a limited access vessel he can then join the general category fleet and fish the rest of the year as a general category vessel. This allows even further consolidation of landings ability by multiple permit holders. This is one of the areas where I start to think about possible conflict of interest in past council decisions. There are other areas in fishers issues where I wonder

about conflict of interest and if it played a role. Conflict of interest may be or have been helping shape fisheries management decisions and be aiding the depletion and hindering the rebuilding of our nation valuable marine resources. I raise these issues because I see the general direction of management measures in place and new measures being proposed and it all leads to further consolidation for the big players while making it more difficult for others to continue to hold the right to fish.

General category was set up for the small boat fleet like myself who needs to have access to other fisheries to make it through the year. Weather alone will limit our days at sea. While most of those holding limited access have vessels that can stay at sea and fish in most any weather. It is my opinion that if you already have a limited access permit you should not be allowed to also hold a general category permit. Pick one not both. This should especially be the case if your corporation hold 7 limited access permits. If you hold one limited access permit and no groundfish or other limited access permits then this indicated that scallops are your business and you own one boat and you possibly could be allowed to participate in general category under general category rules but your participation could be limited in some way different than a person holding only a general category permit. You could give these boats a General Category C class permit to separate them from the rest so you know how many there are and what their landings are.

When I learned of the limited access boats using general category as well it has occurred to me that this could have a significant impact on the increased landings/effort by general category permits. This should be separated out and then we could be talking about the small boat general category fleet for New England using a 10 foot dredge or smaller and allowed to land 400# per day, which should be separate from the Mid Atlantic.

When you have addressed the issues listed above then I suggest you look at what is needed to manage effort in the General Category Scallop Fishery for New England.

I will make no further comments on Amendment 11 until these issues are addressed. When these issues are addressed then I think it could be appropriate to develop a new amendment to deal with effort in the General Category Fishery. You could look at separating A and B permit holders and closing access to the B category of the General Category permits after you have separated out those who also hold Limited Access Permits. Then The B category would represent what General Category was created for. The small boat fleet with 10ft. dredges. Possibly creating a C category permit with limited days, 400#s per day, etc. For single boat owners with single limited access permits.

There were many others at the hearing I attended in Ellsworth, Maine who said take no action and raised some of my concerns. I have gone further after listening to testimony.

Effort in the Lobster fishery has been growing and landings have been declining. This is not a good situation and there has been talk of the need to reduce effort in the lobster fishery though no action has been taken. Some of the growth in effort in the lobster fishery has come from effort reductions in other fisheries as they are being rebuilt. These fishermen have moved into the lobster fishery but they are going to be locked out of what was their primary fishery, after it is rebuilt. This is why I am bringing up this consolidation issue and the importance that resources be shared after they are rebuilt while realizing that effort needs to be managed to keep a fishery sustainable. Effort also needs to be shared in a fair and reasonable way.

Sincerely,



W. William Anderson

Subject: Scallop FMP comments
From: mwelch@jerseyshoreclammingcorp.com
Date: Wed, 30 May 2007 21:31:49 -0400
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov

My name is Michael Welch. I have been a commercial fisherman since shortly after I graduated high school in 1973. It was always my dream to own my own boat and fish for scallops. Even though I was aware of the talk of the Amendment 11 changes, I decided to take the only opportunity I could ever afford and purchased my own boat a couple of months ago. I realize that I will be out of business once the decisions are passed; however, I would like to say that I wish NMFS would have limited the access to boats from this area and not allowed boats from the south to come here to New Jersey and fish our waters. I presently am docked in Point Pleasant and it amazes me that in a situation where NMFS is realizing our waters are being over-fished that over 50% of the boats tied up at the dock are from the south -- the Carolina's to Alabama. I feel that if NMFS would not have allowed these boats to come into our waters, since they had over-fished the shrimp in their area, a person like myself may have stood a chance to continue to fish for scallops in the general category. I realize that it is probably too late after attending the meeting this evening in Manahawkin, but I wish to express my hopes that NMFS would look at removing these boats from our waters and allowing the local boats to retain their permits and continue fishing.

Thank you for your time and courtesies.

Michael D. Welch, President
Jersey Shore Clamming Corp.
F/V Annie Wilder

Deirdre Boelke

From: Scallop Comments [Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 11:24 AM
To: Deirdre Boelke
Subject: [Fwd: Super Ridiculous Bureaucracy]

----- Original Message -----
Subject: Super Ridiculous Bureaucracy
Date: Wed, 06 Jun 2007 19:46:41 -0400 (EDT)
From: CLevites@aol.com
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov

To amendment 11 council members,

I just downloaded 42 pages of unbelievable nonsense that somebody paid a lot of people to compile, complete with charts and diagrams, (Luckily no pictures) aimed solely at forcing small fishermen out of business and ending a traditional way of life for anyone who would hope to live life with a little bit more freedom than Manhattan stock broker. I mean really, were talking about a industry of General category fishermen with TAC of less than \$5 on average during a control period of technological miracles. Why should big corporate boats that can fish in almost any weather condition be allowed to force people to alter their life styles and lead less romantic lives so that they can have all the catch. GREED! It's the only answer that makes sense to me. Should I, as a person that was born in one of Maine poorest regions, not be allowed to make in a year what those boats make in a trip? They should be giving some of their allotment to potential young fishermen who are from rural coastal areas that would like to follow traditional pursuits. I for one believe there should be no changes in the general category permits.

Ralph Dennison

See what's free at AOL.com <<http://www.aol.com?ncid=AOLAOF00020000000503>>.

Comment
#21

Michael Skarimbas
145 Ames Avenue
Leonia, NJ 07605

May 31, 2007

Patricia Kurkul
Regional Administrator
NMFS
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

Dear Ms. Kurkul,


I would like to give my comments concerning Section 6.0 "Questions to help focus public comment on Amendment 11".

1. YES I believe capacity and mortality should be controlled.
2. I am in favor of limited entry.
3. I do not support the preferred alternatives. 1,000 lbs. over eleven years will water down the pool of permit holders so that vessels that are making 100% of their living in the general category TODAY and qualify for a permit will NOT be able to survive. 5,000 lbs over 11 years is ok, but over 5 years is more realistic.
4. A tier system is the only equitable solution.
5. Dredge only 10.6 for everyone everywhere.
6. Undecided.
7. Limited access boats fishing under a general day should come out of the limited access TAC.
8. 5% of the TAC is an unreasonably small amount. We are people with mortgages and families to feed. If a limited access fishery is to be created at the expense of many, it should be a viable one, not one that leaves us unable to sustain our families and with worthless boats and equipment.
9. See answer #8.
10. 40 lbs.
11. We all have V.M.S. Let's use them.
12. No.
13. No comment.
14. Additional comments: Speaking for myself and my crew I would like to say that the notion that this is some sort of "fill-in" or part time fishery is totally incorrect. Since giving up my groundfish permit, my vessel has made 100% of its income scalloping for the last seven years. You have the power to create a viable category with a healthy future and your abilities should not be swayed by owners of fleets of limited access vessels counting up small percentages of increase (due to our impending demise) that translates to big money for them.

Sincerely,

Capt. Mike Skarimbas
F/V Endangered Species
Montauk, NY





DENIS LOVOKEN
306 SUDBURY RD.
PT. PLEASANT, N.J.
08742
F.V. KAILEY ANN

* COMMENT # 22 *

DEAR MS. KURKUL,

I AM A THIRD GENERATION COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN WHO HAS FISHED OUT OF PT. PLEASANT, N.J. FOR 35 YEARS. I HAD A 70 FT WOOD VESSEL (F.V. LEAH) THAT I UPGRADED TO A 78 FT STEEL VESSEL IN 2006.

I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON SOME OF THE PROPOSALS ON ADDMENTMENT II. I AM IN FAVOR OF LIMITED ENTRY TO CONTROL CAPACITY. I THINK THE ALLOCATION FOR THE GENERAL CATEGORY SHOULD BE 7-10 PERCENT WHEN LIMITED ACCESS WAS IMPLEMENTED IN 1994 ONLY 2 YRS 1988-9 WERE USED AS BASE YEARS LEAVING ALOT OF PEOPLE OUT OF THE FISHERY. I THOUGHT AT THAT TIME THE GENERAL CATEGORY FISHERY WOULD BASICALLY BE A PART TIME AND BYCATCH FISHERY WHICH I STILL THINK IT SHOULD BE.

WITH THAT IN MIND I THINK BOATS THAT HAD LANDING OF 100lbs OR MORE BEFORE THE CONTROL DATE SHOULD QUALIFY. I ALSO FEEL THAT A

FLEETWIDE HARD TAC BY QUARTER, WOULD WORK BEST. THE HARD TACS WHETHER QUARTERLY OR TRIMESTER HAVE WORKED VERY WELL IN MID-ATLANTIC FISHERIES SUCH AS FLUKE, SCUP, SQUID AND OTHERS.

WHEN I BOUGHT MY NEW BOAT REPLACING MY OLD ONE I ALSO INVESTED IN DREDGES TO GO SCALLOPING PART TIME, FIGURING MY PERMIT WOULD STILL QUALIFY, BUT NOW I AM CONCERNED ABOUT HOW THIS PLAN ENDS UP.


THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATIONS.

DENIS LOVGREN

Comment #23

Woneta M. Cloutier

From: Peter Christopher [Peter.Christopher@noaa.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2007 9:35 AM
To: Deirdre Boelke; Chris Kellogg; Woneta M. Cloutier
Subject: [Fwd: [Fwd: [Fwd: [GEN. CAT. SCALLOPERS]]]]



Comment on Amendment 11

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

Subject: [Fwd: [Fwd: [GEN. CAT. SCALLOPERS]]]
Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2007 09:31:54 -0400
From: George Darcy <George.Darcy@noaa.gov>
Organization: NOAA NMFS
To: Hannah F. Goodale <Hannah.F.Goodale@noaa.gov>, Peter Christopher <Peter.Christopher@noaa.gov>

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

Subject: [Fwd: [GEN. CAT. SCALLOPERS]]
Date: Wed, 06 Jun 2007 16:47:00 -0400 (EDT)
From: pirate@midmaine.com
To: Pat.Kurkul@noaa.gov
CC: George.Darcy@noaa.gov

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

AS A SCALLOPER MY WHOLE LIFE, WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE UPS AND DOWNS OF ALL THE RULES AND REGULATIONS THEY'VE THROWN AT US. WE ARE GENERAL CATEGORY, WHICH WE ACCEPTED 13 YEARS AGO INSTEAD OF GETTING THE BLACK BOX (WHICH LIMITED ACCESS LICENSES ARE WORTH UP TO \$1,000,000.) LAST YEAR THEY MADE US GET THE BLACK BOX ANYWAY, ALONG WITH A PERMANENT MONTHLY BILL TO PAY FOR BIG BROTHER TO TRACK OUR EVERY MOVE. AT THAT TIME, THEY CUT THE GEN. CAT. BOATS IN HALF, BECAUSE SOME BOATS JUST DIDN'T WANT THE AGGRAVATION.

NOW WE SMALL BOATS ONLY DRAG 5-8% OF ALL TOTAL LANDINGS AND THEY ARE TRYING TO KNOCK US OUT THE REST OF THE WAY. THE TRIP BOAT (LIMITED ACCESS FISHING GEN CAT PERMIT ARE FIGURED INTO THIS NUMBER)

MY STAND IS, IF YOU GOT THE BLACK BOX, THAT'S IT. YOU SHOULD BE IN THE FISHERY THAT YOU COMMITTED TO. THERE'S PLENTY OF ROOM TO DROP LANDINGS OTHER WAYS. LIKE STOPPING THE TRIP BOATS FROM FISHING GEN. CAT. (THEY PURPOSELY USED UP THE TRIPS IN THE ELEPHANT TRUNK THIS SPRING TO KNOCK US OUT OF THE BUSINESS, OVER 1/2 THE TRIPS ALLOCATED). THE BIG TRIP BOATS ARE RUN BY PEOPLE WHO COULD CARE LESS ABOUT THE RESOURCE. OWNERS ARE NEVER ON BOARD. CREWS ARE OFTEN ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO PAY NO TAXES, OR JUNKIES. FOR THEM TO BE PICKING ON THE MINORITY FOR THEIR REDUCTIONS IS

ABSURD. WE USUALLY DON'T EVEN FISH WHERE THE BIG BOATS DO. THEY CAN'T MAKE MONEY FISHING 400# IN 24 HOURS...


ONE MORE
THING I'D LIKE TO SAY IS I HOPE EVERYONE WHO LIKES SCALLOPS IS LUCKY ENOUGH TO EAT THE ONES CAUGHT ON THE LAST COUPLE DAYS ON THESE TRIP BOATS BECAUSE THE REST OF THEM SIT ON ICE FOR 8-10 DAYS BEFORE THEY EVEN HIT THE MARKET. ALL THE RESTAURANT SCALLOPS COME FROM DAY BOATS. I HOPE YOU CAN HELP US SINCERELY, JOHN, MARY & AJ
PS IF THIS GOES THROUGH OUR BOAT WILL BE USELESS EXCEPT FOR A CABIN CRUISER.

Comment #24

F/V RAYNA & KERSTIN

INSHORE & OFFSHORE CHARTERS, INC.

400 Wood St.
Little Egg Harbor
New Jersey, 08087
Capt.lars@verizon.net



June 8, 2007

Ms. Patricia Kurkel, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

"COMMENTS ON SCALLOP AMENDMENT 11"

Dear Ms. Kurkel,


My name is Eric L. Lundvall owner/operator of the F/V Rayna & Kerstin, Barnegat Light New Jersey. My vessel is a current participant in the general category fishery and has history of participation in that fishery since 1994.

I support limited entry for the general category scallop fishery using the control date of November 1, 2004. Allocation for the general category fishery should be implemented. I support an allocation of the projected TAC at a minimum of 5%, to a more appropriate 11% of the TAC. Even with the higher general category landings of 14.09% and 12.18% in 2005 and 2006, the limited access fleet continues to prosper in the Mid-Atlantic.

Please also note that the same open bottom area off of New Jersey that some limited access scallop vessel owners say are being depleted by the general category fleet is the same open bottom area where they have produced some of their biggest trips in years. I would question who is doing the damage.

Landing criteria for qualification for limited entry should be 5,000 pounds between March 1, 2000 and the control date of November 1, 2004. This is the only alternative that would keep the pool of vessels receiving permits to a lower level to sustain a viable fishery with a TAC of 5%. The 1,000 pound, 10 year criteria would work, if there was a higher TAC in the range of 10%-11%.

After reviewing the amendment 11 scoping hearing summary for Manahawkin, NJ, I believe I was not clear or misquoted at what I stated at that hearing. I stated that I have two vessel permits that have general category history that would qualify under the preferred 1,000 pound, 10 year criteria, but only one would qualify under the 5,000 pound criteria. I then stated that I would rather see the 5,000 pound criteria used for qualification and in turn qualify for only one of my vessels. I was trying to point out how



too many qualifying participants would dissolve a fishery into a few days or pounds to make the fishery economically feasible.

I believe there should be absolutely no re-rigging clause in this amendment to qualify vessels for a permit.

The access to qualifying vessels should be allocated on a tiered system, possibly part-time and full-time. ITQ's are very complicated and would further extend the transition period. If an ITQ alternative was chosen, I believe leasing and permit stacking should go along with that alternative.

I believe limited entry provisions should include preferred alternative: 3.1.2.5.1.2. One vessel potentially qualifying more than one permit.

An interim measure of a hard 10% TAC during the implementation period would be acceptable. A TAC lower than this would hurt legitimate qualifying vessels due to boats trying to buy time through an appeal and limited access vessels that might choose to "help burn up" a interim TAC in lieu of using their DAS at the beginning of the fishing year.

I agree that a separate limited entry program for the NGOM, with an allocation derived from the overall total allowable catch.

Limited access fishing vessels meeting the same qualifying criteria as general category vessels should receive a permit to land scallops under the general category. Landings outside their DAS should come from the overall TAC.

Table 19, impacts of the general category TAC on limited access vessels (Sec. 5.4.17.4 of the DSEIS) clearly shows that if Amendment 11 allocated an 11% TAC to the general category there would be a 0% change in limited access net boat share in the full range of scallop TAC scenarios from 40 million through 70 million. In other words, the limited access fleet is doing just fine at status quo.

Unfortunately, there is a fair percentage of limited access participants who have chosen to wage a war against the general category, in an effort to eliminate it as any form of a directed fishery. They appear to have an upper hand in trying to influence this management decision; they are highly organized and have plenty of money for attorneys, lobbyists and scientists. I keep hearing the same general statement from them: "the sacrifices that we endured through the 1990's to rebuild the depleted scallop stocks and now that we rebuilt the stocks, the general category wants to reap

the benefits of our suffering." I believe good fisheries management should be credited for rebuilding the scallop stocks to what they are today not the limited access vessels that depleted the stocks in the first place.

I believe strongly, that qualifying general category vessels should be permitted to continue a full time directed general category fishery. There is now a strong seafood consumer demand for "day boat" or "sushi grade" scallops that has developed with the general category fishery. Consumers have come to know the difference between trip boat scallops and day boat scallops. There needs to be a consistent supply of these high quality day boat scallops that for the most part, the general category scallopers have been supplying.

Thank you for reviewing my comments.

Sincerely,



Eric L. Lundvall, President



Amendment 11 Scoping Hearing Summary
 Holiday Inn – Manahawkin, NJ
 May 30, 2007

Almost 30 individuals attended the public hearing in Manahawkin, NJ, and about a dozen gave oral comment. David Simpson, Chair of the Scallop Committee welcomed the audience and gave an overview of the process and purpose of the meeting. Deirdre Boelke, NEFMC staff then reviewed the public hearing document and explained the preferred alternatives the Council has identified for Amendment 11. The meeting was held from about 6:00-7:45 PM.

Overall the majority of comments at this meeting were about the allocation decision for the general category fishery. Unique to this meeting compared to other public hearings, there was general consensus and support of the preferred alternative of 5%. Several speakers argued that 5% is too high, and it is inappropriate for the Council to support an allocation that is above the historical average of this fishery, especially when limited access effort was reduced during the same time period. One general category vessel owner added that 5% is reasonable, but is only workable if the qualification criteria are more restrictive; he argued that the 1,000 pound and 11-year criteria would qualify too many vessels and no one would be able to make a living.

Measures to control capacity and mortality in the general category fishery

Very few speakers addressed this issue directly, but most that did supported limited entry alternatives. One argued that unless controls are put in place some general category vessels will just move to areas of concentrated scallops and fish them out. He explained that some of the general category vessels that used to land in Cape May, NJ have moved north to Point Pleasant because the inshore areas around Cape May have been fished out. Another explained that the limited access boats did the same thing when the resource was in bad shape – they fished out areas until there was nothing left because they did not have incentive to move. He argued that without constraints on the general category fishery aside from a possession limit, they too have little incentive to move out of less productive areas. One individual said that he is happy the Council is finally addressing the general category fishery and wished it could have been done sooner. Another added that he was around in 1994 and we should do everything we can to avoid getting in that situation again. One commenter added that this fishery as a whole has to do everything it can to prevent overfishing. He added that if this resource approaches overfishing all the “eco-friendly” markets will disappear and the price will drop having negative impacts on both fisheries. No one voiced support for the No Action alternative or a hard-TAC as a preferred strategy for controlling capacity and mortality in the general category fishery.

Qualification for limited entry

Several speakers supported more restrictive qualification criteria, specifically 5,000 pounds and the five-year timeframe of 2000-2004. They argued that the preferred alternatives for qualification would create too many permits and no one would be able to make a living, particularly if the Council was serious about the 5% allocation. One limited access vessel owner added that the preferred alternative may estimate 459 vessels now, but when it is all said and done that number is bound to go up. *One speaker added that he has two vessels that will only qualify under the 1,000 pound alternative but he supports the 5,000 pound alternative because

* my comment that I referred to, is

~~1,000 qualifies too many and there is not enough to go around for 500 vessels.~~ Another argued that the 11-year time period is just too long and another commented that he understands why the Council wants to be inclusive, but in his opinion the preferred alternatives would qualify too many. Furthermore, he supports the alternative that would index a vessels contribution based on the number of years active in the fishery.

Several commented on the access strategy for qualifying vessels. Some supported an individual allocation in trips or pounds. However, several supported a tier system arguing that an individual allocation would be overboard for this fishery. Another voiced support for a tier system if it was easier to implement, but suggested that an additional tier should be considered above the 20,000 pound tier in the document for more directed vessels (i.e. a fourth tier at 40,000 pounds and above).

Allocation of scallop TAC to the general category fishery

Several speakers noted that the general category fishery has increased as a result of controls and innovative changes in the limited access fishery such as crew limits, minimum ring size, and DAS effort controls. One argued that the limited access fishery has made sacrifices and it would be fundamentally wrong to base this allocation decision on post control date landings data. Another argued that it would be a mistake to allocate more than historical contributions; he added that the general category has experienced a bubble in the last few years and it should not be rewarded. Another added that if the Council wants the general category fishery to be more of a mom and pop operation then 2.5% is more reasonable. One speaker voiced support for 5% because that is about the level of total general category landings when the control date was put in place; he argued that would be consistent with the qualification alternatives that are through the control date.

Limited access fishing under general category


Not many speakers spoke to this issue, but most that did agree with the preferred alternative. One speaker noted that the Council is considering an allocation to the general category that is over 200% of the historical average but the 0.5% allocation for limited access vessels under general category would be over a 50% reduction, based on historical landings. Several speakers voiced that the allocation should be in line with each other, and be based on historical averages.

Interim measures for transition to limited entry

The majority of commenters spoke to this issue in disbelief that an 18-24 month transition period would be necessary; they did not understand how it would take so long or why the Council and NMFS would support continued overfishing of inshore areas. Several suggested that NMFS and the Council should be more creative about measures that can control capacity until Amendment 11 can be fully implemented. For example, it was suggested that NMFS can send out letters now requesting individuals to get their landings history in order. In addition, NMFS could identify the potential qualifiers and allocate an interim individual access (in number of trips or pounds) until the final universe of vessels is known. He added that NMFS could allocate one amount the first year, and then a higher or lower amount the following year after the final pool of qualifying vessels is known. Several argued that a derby for two years would have negative impacts, and several commented that 10% is way too high. Another suggested that based on the analysis in the document, NMFS must have a pretty good idea of who is going to qualify and it should not take 18 months. Another voiced support for the interim alternatives, but wished Amendment 11 could be implemented faster. Lastly, another commented that for the interim period the percent of access general category vessels are allocated in access areas should remain at 2%.

Comment #25

Walter Jessiman, Captain
F/V Dreamcatcher
P.O. Box 273
Cutler, Maine 04626
(207) 259-3640



April 11, 2007

National Marine Fisheries Service

Subject: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

To Whom It May Concern,

I, Walter Jessiman, would like to register my adamant disagreement with any changes with/in the General Catch permit being currently considered.

I have attended meetings/forums at which these proposed changes were discussed and to my knowledge every local (Maine) fisherman registered strong objections to changes. Changes, as presented, would discriminate against Maine scallop fisherman and favor those from the southern region of the district.

Let me briefly present my personal issues. My lifetime dream (adult) has been the ownership of a scallop dragger. To accomplish that goal it became necessary for me to temporarily relocate to Connecticut. In 2001 I laid the keel for the vessel of my dreams. At that time I was notified that there was open access and did not need to acquire a license. As soon as the status changed I did apply and acquire necessary licensure.

Every aspect of the construction has been documented by photos and material receipts. I personally laid every weld and did the entire construction. After the boat was launched I did all of the electrical, hydraulic, and mechanical work on it.

As soon as the construction was completed I steamed the vessel to its' home port in Cutler, the place that has been home for me all during my adulthood. Since last December I have fished the boat every day the waters permitted for safe passage.


On several occasions the US Coast Guard has boarded the vessel for safety checks. On every boarding comments were made on the excellent craftsmanship and it being "state of the art" in safety and technology.

Several times during construction, and since, I asked advice regarding permit issues and was consistently informed that the construction time counted as landings and not to worry. This vessel was constructed as a scallop dragger and very impractical for any other purpose. It would be highly unfair for the rules to change after I have invested my life and resources into the boat understanding that I would be able to fish with it.

Please allow me to express another concern. Under proposed changes the fishermen of Maine would lose further control over their livelihoods. I, like most or all Maine fishermen, want to be good stewards of the marine resources.

Thank you for accepting my written comments.


Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Walter Jessiman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Walter Jessiman

Comment #26

F A X



1862 cutler rd
cutler, maine 04626

To: NEFMC
 Fax number: 1 978 281-9135

From: Troy Ramsdell
 Fax number:
 Business phone:
 Home phone: 207-259-7748

Date & Time: 6/9/2007 9:34:03 AM
 Pages: 1
 Re: Scallop License

Hi,
 My name is Troy Ramsdell of Cutler, Me. I'm writing in response of the Amendment 11. Me and my dad had a boat in 2004 with the scallop license. The boat burt off the Cape in 2005. All doc's were on the boat so they didn't get sent in. I also had another boat that I had the license on but didn't show any landings because their were no scallops off Cutler to get. I bought a new boat to go scalloping in state and federal waters , but i was just told I would loose my license if I got it. I didn't get it because of the required VMS. I was afraid of buying it and not able to get my license and be out of \$1500. All I want to do is day trips out off Cutier Harbor. I believe something has to be done but not to keep out the people that that are still willing to work for a living.

I think for the gulf of Maine region licenses should given to people who held a license up until the upcoming decision regardless of what they had for landings or ever if they had none. It's not fair to people that gave up everything and invest all they have into scalloping to have it taken away for a few greedy fisherman. Even if you issue a 150 -200 lb day license would all we ever need. I'm not asking for the 400 lb. I think they should be some compromise for us. The 1994-2004 is rediculous. What about recent fisherman, do they sell or try sell their boat just because you wont let them work. I've recencently heard from fisherman in other towns talking of a class action lawsuit if they don't get their license. I'm not part off this. I just want to work and pay my bills with out worrying of my license being takend away. Please make an exemption for people like us. 1. Have the license so it can't be sold. 2. Have the license whom it is given to, be on the boat that's registred to the license. So they can only have one license not multiple. Thanks for your time and efforts.

Troy Ramsdell


comment #27

Woneta M. Cloutier

From: Robert Maxwell
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2007 3:38 PM
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov
Subject: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
 NMFS
 One Blackburn Dr.
 Gloucester, MA 01930

6/10/07



Re: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the General Category Amendment 11. My name is Robert Maxwell and I am a day scalloper and have been day scalloping full time since 2001 to date. Unfortunately the General Category is over fishing open bottom inshore beds – for this reason the control date of November 1, 2004 was implemented and should be used as it states, “control date”. It is important that Amendment 11 be completed as soon as possible and not take 2 years longer or the entire scallop fishery will suffer.

Overall Allocation & Qualification Criteria:

The control date should be mandatory! I support the allocation of **5.5% to 7%** for the time period of **2000-2004 with a qualification criteria of 5000 pounds..** Should the time period of 1994-2004 be used, the allocation should be increased to 11%. According to the DSEIS, the number of qualifying boats for the 2000-2004 time period would be 188, the lower allocations would be acceptable, however if the preferred alternative is used (1994-2004/ 1000 pounds) the number of qualifying boats would increase to 459 this would be unacceptable, as of 2004 the limited access fleet total was **323 vessels landing (59,494,630) pounds ! this is 94.5% why would we give 459 vessels only (3,272,204) pounds 5.5%** We cannot allow this to happen, please think of the fishery as a whole and what you are doing to the new participants. Do not over qualify and under allocate. !

Stacking & Consolidating:

I support stacking and consolidating of permits to the 60,000 pounds or 150 trips to be adjusted annually and be consistent with the total TAC as of 2004. This will allow flexibility in the GC fishery for those participants that do not have enough allocation to make a living. This will also allow other participants to lease and purchase as necessary. This will also make for a more efficient access fishery.

Individual Allocation

I support individual allocation based on your best year from 2000-2004, this would be the fairest way to allocate to all qualifiers (your effort would equal your history in the fishery)

Vessel upgrades

I support no upgrade restriction, if stacking and leasing is acceptable vessel upgrades etc, would not be necessary.

Interim measures

I do not support the 10% tac or it extended for 18-24 mon, 2010-FY this will make a derby style fishery.

Appeals

06/12/2007

I do not support appeals but if you have history on or before the control date **nov,1 2004** this would activate an appeal –with a 90 day qualifier window
NGOM

I support the Gulf of Main Exemption area 43 degree N.


Thank you,

Robert W. Maxwell
Miss Halie LLC
Debbie Sue LLC
Robert Christian LLC

Comment 28

OUELLETTE & SMITH
ATTORNEYS AT LAW AND PROCTORS IN ADMIRALTY
A Professional Association

127 EASTERN AVENUE
SUITE 1
GLOUCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01930



Stephen M. Ouellette*
David S. Smith*

*Also Admitted in Maine

Telephone: (978) 281-7788
Facsimile: (978) 281-4411
E-mail: fishlaw@aol.com
<http://www.fishlaw.com>
<http://www.maritimelawusa.com>

June 11, 2007

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

BY HAND AND BY EMAIL

Re: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

Dear Ms. Kurkul:

I am submitting comments on the proposed Scallop Amendment 11 on behalf of general category vessels fishing from the Barnegat Light, New Jersey area. My clients are supportive of the proposed Amendment and options implementing a limited access program with individual allocation, in trips or pounds, based on a vessel's landings in its best year from 2000 to 2004. We encourage adoption of such a plan as soon as possible, and make suggestions to streamline the process.

Recent growth in the General Category Scallop Fishery has obviously placed new stresses on the scallop stocks, particularly within inshore areas, and my clients recognize the need for implementation of new conservation measures, including limited access to slow growth in the fishery and protection of the resource. At the same time, measures should be designed to protect the nature of the General Category fishery, taking into account developments leading up to the control date. Entrants into the general category fishery prior to the 2004 control date did so with the expectation they could continue to fish in an open access fishery. As such, we believe that the best approach to the issue is to start with an assessment of the fishery as it existed leading up to the control date of November 2004, and to establish an allocation and rules that essentially allow fishermen participating at that time the opportunity to continue fishing. Some consideration should be given to the potential for reductions in effort based on stock considerations, particularly if measures are implemented in inshore areas to protect local concentrations of scallops.

Vision of General Category Fleet

The General Category encompasses a wide variety of vessels, fishing at greatly differing levels depending on their participation in other fisheries. Most General Category participants are

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007

--2-

smaller vessels, and are thus able to operate profitably on as little as 400 pounds per day, as a primary species, or as a supplemental seasonal component of their overall fishing activity. My clients seek preservation of this diverse fleet and this level of fishing, through adoption of a plan based on individual fishing history as the best means of preserving the fleet as close to its present form as possible. This also includes allowance for vessels with a history of landing scallops as a bycatch to continue to do so. My clients are not supportive of a plan that simply results in another small sub-category of the limited access fleet by limiting entry to very few vessels through initial allocation or eventual consolidation.

Limited Access Vessels Outside of Scallop DAS

Limited Access vessels fishing with a fishing history outside of their scallop DAS should also be given individual allocations to do so. A number of vessels, particularly occasional and part-time vessels, rely on the open access days as an important component of their income. Some full-time boats use this open access as a means of maintaining crews, by affording some fishing opportunity when limited access vessels would otherwise be tied up. These vessels should be permitted to continue these practices in accordance with their individual history. As noted below, landings for the limited access vessels should be charged against the limited access vessels' allocation of the total TAC.

Limited Entry

There is no question that the general category fleet needs to be governed by a limited entry strategy. Continued growth after the control date has placed an extreme burden on the stock, and traditional general category fishermen are now faced with declining catch rates, making profitability elusive. Leaving the sector open will force either more restrictive trip limits, thereby eliminating profitability, or require hard TAC's, with resulting derby style fishing. Neither option is acceptable. We recommend adoption of a limited access system based on individual vessel's participation in the fishery in the years leading up to the control date.

The issue of minimum qualification criteria depends on the manner in which allocations to vessels are made. We strongly urge individual allocation based on the best year between 2000 and 2004, while granting some additional weight for vessels that have more time in the fishery. If trips are to be allocated on an individual basis, then there needs to be no threshold qualification-any vessel with landings prior to the control date will qualify, however its allocation will be based on its activity. By adopting a "best year" strategy in the 2000-2004 time frame, vessels will be able to participate in the fishery at the highest level they had achieved prior to the control date, with the General Category using about 5% of the total scallop TAC.

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007

--3-

-

Percentage of TAC to Allocate to the General Category

We urge the adoption of then allocating 5-7% of the total scallop allocation for the general category. The intent of the allocation is to allow vessels to continue at the level they achieved in their highest year from 2000 to 2004. Since it is generally assumed that most vessels had their best year in 2004, and the General Category landed approximately 5% of the total TAC in 2004, this percentage should allow the general category to achieve this level in years when the TAC is also at that level. Any extension of the qualifying period, however, without an increase in allocation for the overall General Category would most likely result in a downward adjustment for all individual allocations, and as such would require a larger General Category allocation to sustain vessels at that level they had reached prior to the control date. As such, if the Council extends the qualification period to a period earlier than 2000, more of the quota should be allocated to the General Category to account for the additional vessels that will qualify.

The TAC attributable to Limited Access vessels fishing outside of their scallop DAS allocation, and any bycatch, should be charged to the limited access TAC, or should be an additional quota that does not diminish the allocation of TAC to the General Category.

Qualifying Period

My clients support implementation of the limited access program for General Category vessels based on a vessel's fishing activity prior to the control date. The period of 2000-2004 reflects recent history and identifies those currently invested and participating in the fishery. Since activity in those years was increasing, it is difficult to imagine vessels that would benefit more from earlier years, but the potential exists to activate effort that is truly dormant. Activation of this latent effort, again, would either reduce opportunity for current participants, or require a higher allocation of quota to the General Category. For these reasons, we recommend limitation of the qualification period to the 2000-2004 time frame.

Minimum Qualification Criteria

We urge the adoption of a minimum qualification criterion of 2500 pounds, in conjunction with an individual allocation strategy. Vessels that fish only a few trips per year, based on seasonal access and rely on participation in other fisheries should be allowed to continue to do so. Thus, vessels that have only a few hundred pounds landed should qualify for a permit, and should be able to lease or acquire access if abundances in their region support limited

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator

June 11, 2007

--4-

-

participation in the fishery at another time. If the Council adopts a tiered system, or a means of allocation access other than individual allocation based on individual fishing history, then a minimum qualification of 5,000 pounds should be used to limit entry.

Best Year and Individual Allocation Strategy

Since my clients desire to preserve the General category as it had come to exist through 2004, we recommend adoption of individual allocations based on individual fishing activity. This best allows vessels to continue to fish at levels they have become accustomed to. The concepts of tiered allocations present significant problems for full-time participants, who would most likely see their effort reduced to a mean or average. Vessels with more history would see a reduction in opportunity, while vessels with less history would receive a windfall at the expense of those with a longer participation in the fishery. My clients strongly believe allocations should be reflective of individual fishing activity, and that this best preserves the nature of the General Category fishery and avoids the potential for negative impact on larger producers. Individual allocation offers the best chance of each vessel's survival under the new Amendment, as if 5% or more of the quota is allocated to the General Category, these vessels will most likely continue to have the access they have become accustomed to, at least through the control date. If additional effort reductions are required, leasing or transfer of access offers vessels the opportunity to remain viable.

Because of the broad variations in fishing activity among the diverse sectors of the general category, we strongly urge adoption of an individual allocation system, based on pounds or trips landed, so that vessels' allocation will reflect their activity.

Extension of Qualifying Period

My clients oppose extending the qualification period to the pre-2000 fishing years. Most vessels dependent on the fishery would have had sufficient activity in the 2000 to 2004 time frame to qualify to fish at a sustainable level. A longer qualification period creates the danger that dormant permits may be resurrected and result in an increase in potential permits. This will effectively dilute any allocation of TAC to the point that vessels dependent on the fishery for some or all of their income, can no longer survive without buying out the latent effort.

If the qualification period is extended, the TAC allocated to the General Category should be increased to account for the additional qualifying vessel. Additionally, a recent history requirement should be added, so that individuals who sold vessels and who did not replace them,

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator

June 11, 2007

--5-

-

can not now seek to speculatively activate latent effort, to the detriment of active participants in the General Category fishery.

Effort Control

Landings in the new limited access category should still be controlled through the same 400 pound landing limit, with no additional limits on gear, vessel size, etc. With an individual allocation in pounds or trips, the manner in or speed at which scallops are harvested or shucked is inconsequential. Vessels engaged in multiple fisheries will remain bound by any upgrade restrictions on their other permits. We discourage developments that will allow landings of multiple trip limits, as this essentially changes the character of the fishery.

We are aware that a small number of General Category vessels target scallops using trawl gear, either as a directed fishery, or as a bycatch fishery, while using multispecies DAS. This activity is already limited by the use of DAS, and we see no reason why it cannot continue.

Vessels should be afforded some time to determine whether they can safely complete a trip, and should be allowed to terminate a trip, before crossing back over the demarcation line, without any scallops on board. In such event, the vessel should not be charged for that trip.

Transferability

Since there will likely be some reduction in each vessel's fishing activity based on the proposed allocation, and future TACs, vessels should be permitted to consolidate their DAS and to lease them to account for reductions based on stock fluctuations, but not to create a new, lesser, category of limited access vessels. Vessels should be governed by daily limits of 400 pounds, subject to possible adjustment when the TAC increases.

Gulf of Maine Exemption

My clients do not oppose the effort to maintain open access in the Gulf of Maine. If this can be accomplished, however, the rationale for extending qualification to the early 1990's disappears. If the Gulf of Maine exemption is approved, the qualification period for General Category vessels should be limited to the 2000-2004 time frame.

Effect of Retention of Permit History

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator

June 11, 2007

--6-

-

We support the proposed measures that allow vessel owners who retain and utilize fishing history, even where they have transferred their vessels with other limited access permits-a position directly contrary to the limitations in the recently amended herring FMP. Contrary to statements in the herring FMP documents, vessel owners have never been advised that open access history remained inextricably attached to limited access fishing and permit history. NMFS regulations expressly provide that only "limited access" permits may not be split, and NMFS vessel replacement forms only provide for transfer of limited access permit history. Vessel owners have long believed that they could retain open access history upon sale of a vessel to apply for any future limited access permit. As such, we urge adoption of an explicit provision that sellers of vessel who retained their history be allowed to qualify a replacement vessel. If a Seller did not acquire a replacement vessel, then he should be given a confirmation of permit history. Retention of such history should be limited to history accrued in the years 2000-2004.

Implementation should be accelerated

We were disappointed to hear that NMFS believes implementation of a limited access plan for the General Category may take as long as two years following adoption of the Amendment. We strongly urge NMFS to impose the plan as soon as possible. Current permit holders should be advised to review their NMFS landings history to determine if they will pre-qualify for a limited access general category permit, and begin to gather their own records and confirm that their landings were properly reported by dealers. Vessels that do not pre-qualify, or contest an individual allocation, should be denied permits, or limited to landings based on NMFS' records, unless and until permit holders present actual landings records to NMFS, along with a verification that the information is accurate to the best of their knowledge and belief. Such vessels should then be given a Letter of Authorization to fish to the level justified by the proffered materials. This will prevent vessels from fishing based on a groundless appeal.

Conclusion

We thank the Council, Council staff, PDT, NMFS, advisors and industry participants for the hard work in putting together the proposed Amendment. We believe that through adoption of a limited access program, based on individual allocation, with sufficient quota, the General Category can remain a viable fishery, both for its full time participants, and for those who rely on it as a component of their fishing effort, with adequate protection of the resource, and without unfairly impacting the current limited access participants. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Amendment.

OUELLETTE & SMITH

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007

--7-

-

Very truly yours,

/s/ Stephen M. Ouellette
Stephen M. Ouellette

Comments submitted on behalf of:

Rebait Commercial Fishing, Inc.
Miss Halie, LLC
F/V SNOOPY II
Sea Dog Commercial Fishing, Inc.
Salty Knight
Brewster Fishing
F/V RESOLUTE, Inc.
F/V RETRIEVER
Coppa-Setic, LLC
H&H Fisheries-Blair Hansen
Native Sun
F/V CASSIAR
F/V PRETTY LLADY
Gipper Seafood
Island Blue, Inc.
Inshore and Offshore Charters, Inc.
Fishing Vessel Vivian, III, Inc.
Rebait Commercial Fishing, Inc.
Mandy Ness, LLC
Robert Christian, LLC
KJK Fishing, LLC

Comment # 29

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

3050 K. STREET, N.W.

SUITE 400

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007

(202) 342-8400


NEW YORK, NY
TYSONS CORNER, VA
CHICAGO, IL
STAMFORD, CT
PARSIPPANY, NJ
BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

FACSIMILE
(202) 342-8451
www.kelleydrye.com

DIRECT LINE: (202) 342-8848
EMAIL: dfrulla@kelleydrye.com

AFFILIATE OFFICES
MUMBAI, INDIA

June 11, 2007



VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930

Re: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11

Dear Regional Administrator Kurkul:

We represent the Fisheries Survival Fund ("FSF"), which is comprised of the bulk of the limited access full time scallop fleet. The FSF has a critical interest in Amendment 11 and we appreciate the opportunity to provide public comment.

Consistent with Amendment 11's Vision Statement, the Fisheries Survival Fund has always recognized a discrete, historical, in-shore, small vessel, day-boat fishery along the New England coast, as well as that scallops were caught incidentally in other fisheries. The fishery was prosecuted from existing vessels and generally seasonally.

FSF continues to support the Amendment 11 Vision Statement, and the alternatives for Amendment 11 that promote the Vision Statement. Almost all of the preferred alternatives the Council has selected for Amendment 11 support the Vision Statement.

Executive Summary

The Public Hearing Document ("PHD") Amendment 11 Vision Statement summary states, among others, "Amendment 11's overall intent is to ... maintain the diverse nature and flexibility within this component of the scallop fleet, and preserve the ability for vessels to participate at various levels. The Councils' vision for the general category fishery ... is a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Two

this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities.” PHD, at 1.

The Vision Statement can best be realized with a five percent allocation, and other long-term problems with creating a limited access sector (such as latent effort and disproportionate shares) can be avoided. Such a five percent share may be most effectively divided among General Category qualifiers under the Vision Statement if: (1) the control date is maintained; (2) directed day boat scallopers landing over 5,000 pounds in their best year are provided with allocations limiting them to 400-pound trips; (3) a “contribution factor” should be used to recognize multi-year participation during the qualifying period (Alternative 3.1.2.3.2); (4) General Category fishery qualifiers landing between 1,000-4,999 pounds in their best year (most likely these are incidental catches) are limited to 200-pound trips under Alternative 3.1.2.4.2; (5) General Category qualifiers directing on scallops with a net should have a reduced possession limit of 250 or 300 pounds so as to equalize mortality in recognition that scallop trawls demonstrably catch smaller scallops (Alternatives 3.1.2.6.3.1; 3.1.2.6.3.2); (6) provision of “dredge-only” permits for vessels qualifying and fishing with dredges during the qualifying period (Alternative 3.1.2.6.2); (7) the Consistency Amendment should be maintained and only one permit should qualify per vessel (Alternative 3.1.2.5.1.1); (8) illegal and unrecorded landings should not count toward qualifications or allocations; and (9) a Northern Gulf of Maine exemption area makes far more sense for that very episodic fishery than an additional overall allocation of scallops, especially in terms of not creating latent effort.

Responses to Questions in Public Hearing Document

Do you agree that capacity and mortality in the general category fishery should be controlled?

Yes. FSF supports a General Category limited access regime, but not one that is set up to favor new entrants to the fishery who have turned to directed scalloping in recent years as a full-time pursuit, often because of conservation problems in their main fisheries. Accordingly, the Council should create a new limited access dayboat permit that would be allowed to prosecute the in-shore scallop fishery at no more than 400 pounds per day. The 400-pound limit should apply whether allocations are made in trips or pounds.

If limited entry is adopted, which qualification alternatives would you support and why? Do you support the preferred alternatives for qualification: 1,000 pounds and 11-year time period for qualification?

First, the Council should apply the November 1, 2004, control date.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Three

Second, FSF understands the Council's preference, so far, to include a wide range of participants via the 1994-2004 qualifying period and the 1,000 pound catch standard. That choice is consistent with the Vision Statement's goal to maintain a diverse fishery, but it would qualify a relatively large number of vessels (459). It is important to recognize that increasing the landing criterion to 5,000 pounds could substantially reduce the number of qualifiers (from 459 to 203). (Public Hearing Document ("PHD") Table 11.) However, increasing the poundage threshold would narrow the types of General Category participants post-Amendment 11 to directed dayboat operators, many of whom are late entrants into the fishery.

FSF notes two two important issues with such a large qualifying pool of 11 years and 1000 pounds. First, in general, allocations to individual qualifiers will be somewhat reduced. That said, the Council's preferred alternatives, including individual allocations, will mitigate the impact of these reductions considerably for "highliners." Indeed, Table 17 of the Public Hearing Document explains that, with a 50 million pound overall total allowable catch and the preferred 5% allocation, the average "highliner" (that is, a vessel landing over 20,000 pounds in any year¹), would be allocated approximately 20,500 pounds or 51 400-pound trips. Significantly, moreover, this figure represents an average, which will increase for both: (1) above-average qualifiers in the 20,000 pound-plus segment; and (2) those who had these levels of landings in several years. Under the Council's preferred alternative, vessels with scallop landings in four or more years during the qualifying period will see their individual allocation increased using a "contribution factor" (Alternative 3.1.2.3.2). Further, on June 6, the Scallop Committee opted to allocate opportunity in pounds (subject to a 400-pound per day cap), rather than trips, which will further ensure that complete allocations are available to qualifiers.² Finally, Amendment 11

¹ This contingent of "highliners" has been, understandably, well-represented in the Amendment 11 development process (including among the General Category Advisors), but they are not a large group. Only 37 General Category participants landed over 20,000 pounds of scallops in the control date year of 2004. This number of "highliners" was 23 in 2003, only 9 in 2002; and 19 in 2001. (PHD Table 7.) Certain of them were present, in particular, at the Hyannis public hearing.

² FSF had advocated for Alternative 3.1.2.4.2, which would provide for a lower landing limit (perhaps a 200-pound trip limit) for a tier of qualifiers between 1,000 and 5,000 pounds. In any year, the General Category fishery is about evenly split between those landing over and under 5,000 pounds. In 2004, 114 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, and 109 vessels landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2003, 71 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 58 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2002, 55 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 72 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. In 2001, 60 vessels landed over 5,000 pounds, while 45 landed between 1,000 and 4,999 pounds. (PHD Table 7.) As would a poundage-based allocation system, a tiered system would help these lower level qualifiers better utilize their allocation. More specifically, most such lower-level participants likely landed scallops incidental to other directed fishing operations. A lower daily limit would allow them to spread out their individual allocations over more trips, particularly if the Council selects allocations in trips,

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Four

would improve the prospects for any directed Cape-based General Category participants by allocating most of the General Category permits to New England, although the large majority of recent landings are from the Mid-Atlantic. *See* footnote 3, within.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, coupling a large group of qualifiers with individual allocations presents the risk of creating significant latent effort. The Public Hearing Document shows the General Category to include many very episodic participants. In fact, of the 459 estimated qualifiers under the 1994-2004/1,000-pound option, only 234 (or roughly half) of the qualifiers had any recorded scallop landings at all in 2005, the year after the control date. (PHD Table 11.) If the preferred alternative of individual allocations is chosen, then there is a strong likelihood that up to half of the General Category quota could go unused by these episodic participants. This would be a huge loss of sustainable scallop yield—yield that the Limited Access fleet would fish each year, because scallops are their fishery, and dependently so, ever since Amendment 4.

In fact, the Scallop Committee and Council will need to be careful not to end up creating the same kind of latent effort that plagues the groundfish fishery, via significant, permanent, individualized allocations of scallops to vessels that will not regularly harvest them. Thus, if the Council does opt for individual allocations, it should not allocate a disproportionate share of the overall resource (that is, any more than 5% to the General Category).

The potential for such latent effort from a disproportionate overall allocation is even more evident when potential Maine qualifiers are considered. According to the Public Hearing Document, 130 Maine vessels would qualify under 11-year timeframe, but only about half that number, or 70, would qualify under a 5-year period. Put differently, 60 projected Maine qualifiers under the preferred alternatives have not landed even 1,000 pounds of scallops in any qualifying year since 1999, but they would get a dedicated, individual allocation of scallops under the Council's preferred alternatives. (PHD Table 13.)³

("continued")

rather than pounds. Such an approach could also work well with poundage-based allocations, to help ensure that incidental scallop fishing permits are not used for directed activity, for instance, if stacking and leasing is ultimately allowed. Further, such a tiered approach is consistent with Amendment 4. That amendment specifically stated that, if the General Category grew, the Council should reduce the General Category trip limit, as opposed to re-doing the allocation of the fishery established in Amendment 4. *See* Amendment 4, at 30.

³ To provide some scale, the Public Hearing Document projects that 310 of 459 qualifiers (or about 32% overall), under the preferred approach will be from New England. (PHD Table 13.) By contrast, in recent years, about 70% of General Category landings have come from the Mid-Atlantic. (PHD Table 10.) Of the 310 projected New England qualifiers, 130 are from Maine, 168 are from Massachusetts and New Hampshire, but only 12 are from Connecticut and

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Five

In order to maintain a reasonable number of qualifiers, the Council may wish to reconsider its preferred alternative of allowing landings from one vessel to qualify for more than one permit (Alternative 3.1.2.5.1.1).

Finally, FSF strongly believes that unrecorded landings should not be permitted to count towards qualifying. Nor should illegal landings be permitted to count towards qualifying.

**How should access be allocated to qualifying vessels if limited entry is adopted?
Do you support the preferred alternative for individual allocation in number of trips?**

FSF has supported allocations based in trips, as opposed to pounds. As explained above, the Scallop Committee voted on June 6 to change its recommendation to a poundage-based allocation system to ensure maximum flexibility for vessels to catch their respective allocations, without recourse to broken trip provisions or tiering of trip limits. FSF participants, like Council members themselves, have mixed views about ITQs.

However, FSF's participants all agree that, if the Council does opt to allocate the fishery by pounds, then it must also maintain the 400-pound trip limit. The Council staff's summaries of the public hearings reveal that many General Category participants favored maintaining the 400-pound daily limit even if allocations are in pounds. The 400-pound limit's maintenance will help ensure that individual General Category allocations are not consolidated onto a new group of directed off-shore trip boats—a result that FSF strongly opposes. The Amendment 11 Vision Statement likewise states that, "The Councils' vision . . . is a fleet made up of small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities." (PHD at 1.)

Do you believe any of the additional permit provisions or additional alternatives under a limited entry program should be adopted?

For the reasons set forth directly above, Amendment 11 should not allow, through stacking, the creation of sectors or other forms of consolidation, for the grouping of poundage onto larger vessels capable of and planning to fish offshore. Maintaining a maximum trip limit of 400 pounds per day should ensure that the character of the fleet is not changed.

("continued")

Rhode Island. And, regarding the Mid-Atlantic's 149 qualifiers, 88 are from New York and New Jersey, and 61 are from other Mid-Atlantic states. (PHD Table 13.)

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Six

FSF understands that certain directed General Category fishermen would like to stack trips on their vessels to seek to reasonably maintain their operations. In support of these wishes, the preferred alternatives in the Public Hearing Document allow for a substantial amount of consolidation of individual allocations. The Public Hearing Document sets a range of 1-5% of the overall allocation as a cap on the amount of total permits that one vessel could own. While the percentage chosen may depend on the number of permits that ultimately qualify, a cap at 5% would allow for a fairly significant concentration of ownership, especially in light of the Amendment 11 Vision Statement to maintain a diverse General Category fleet.

Do you agree that a separate system should be adopted to manage the general category fishery in the Northern Gulf of Maine (NGOM)?

Yes, to the extent that the NGOM exemption area program would create a partially separate system. (However, under the preferred alternative, landings limits are somewhat integrated for those who might participate inside and outside an NGOM program.) As explained above, the fishery in Maine is very episodic. Individual allocations to vessels that have not landed over 1,000 pounds of scallops during the 1999-2004 period (that is, 60 of the 130 Maine qualifiers), will create significant latent effort. The potential for such latent effort is especially high in the NGOM, where the scallop abundance is very uneven from year to year. Moreover, many of the participants in the Ellsworth public hearing wanted to remain in the scallop fishery but had not had 1,000 pounds of landings in any year, even during the 11-year qualifying period, with some claiming an interest in the fishery, but stating they had not landed scallops since the 1980's.

Do you support the preferred alternative to implement a separate limited entry for general category fishing in the NGOM?

FSF supports the creation of an NGOM exempted area north of 42° 20'. Creation of such an exempted area should accommodate concerns expressed by vessels fishing in the Gulf of Maine about being excluded from fishing for scallops because of the episodic nature of Gulf of Maine scallop abundance. FSF is not particularly troubled if the NGOM allows qualification at 100 pounds of landings in that area, provided that: (1) such low level qualifiers are not permitted to fish outside the NGOM area unless they meet the general 1,000 (or 5,000) pound qualification criterion for the Amendment 11 fishery as a whole; (2) this NGOM exempted area is and should be confined to an area outside the surveyed area for the Atlantic scallop resource currently managed under the FMP, so that mortality from the NGOM area can be accounted for separately; and (3) landings from the NGOM are not counted in a way that would require a change in the overall allocation of the coast-wide resource from the Council's preferred 5% allocation to the Amendment 11 General Category fishery. Creation of an NGOM exempted area would better accommodate certain professed historic (but clearly episodic) fishing interests than a disproportionate allocation of the overall total allowable catch.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Seven

Finally, in this regard, FSF is troubled by the comments from the Regional Administrator regarding the proposed NGOM management area. Contrary to the assertions of NMFS, the NGOM management area is consistent with the conservation of the scallop resource. The scallops in the NGOM are considered a separate stock from the scallops managed under Amendment 11. Under the NGOM exemption area approach, this separate stock would be managed under a separate regime with a hard TAC and limited entry. The NGOM would be analogous to a special access area, which is commonplace in current scallop management. The State of Maine has stated that it will continue its effort to survey the scallop resource in the NGOM, and this survey can be used to set TAC levels consistent with conservation standards.

Should the current privilege for limited access vessels to fish under general category rules change as a result of Amendment 11?

Do you support the preferred alternative to allow limited access vessels to fish under general category only if they qualify under the same criteria?

Yes, to both questions. FSF believes Limited Access vessels should be able to participate in the post-Amendment 11 General Category fishery to the extent that they qualify to do so. Their allocation should be limited to their historical share as well.

Do you support an allocation of a percentage of the total projected annual scallop catch to the general category fishery?

Yes.

Do you support the preferred alternative to allocate 5% of the total projected annual scallop catch to the general category fishery?

Yes, Amendment 11 should not fundamentally reallocate the scallop fishery. The new General Category limited access program (not including current Limited Access vessels that might qualify or incidental landings) should be allocated no more than 5%. In 2004, the year of the Amendment 11 control date, these landings were 5.26%. In 2004, scallops were abundant and General Category effort wide-spread.

An allocation above five percent would represent a windfall and would credit overfishing by the post-control date fleet to the historical General Category fleet. Such a result is not only unjustifiable as a matter of policy, but defeats the purpose of establishing the control date in the first place. Notably, many General Category participants at the public hearings, especially the directed New Jersey fleet that participated at the Manahawkin public hearing, support the 5% overall allocation.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Eight

Certain participants in the modestly-sized (*see* comments at page 3, above) directed day boat fishery contingent from New England have been steering the Amendment 11 process toward individual allocations so they can maximize their personal shares.⁴ Significantly, however, especially if the Council chooses to accede to the requests for individual allocations, the overall General Category allocation should not exceed 5%. As explained above, an allocation of greater than 5%, when coupled with an individual allocation system, would create significant amounts of latent effort and unused optimal yield. (According to PHD Table 11, of the 459 estimated qualifiers, only 234 had any recorded scallop landings in 2005, the year of the General Category fishery explosion and the year after the control date.)

Further, the General Category should maintain its historical character and share of the fishery, as the Amendment 11 Vision Statement prescribes. From 1994-2004, the eleven-year qualifying period selected by the Council as a preferred alternative, General Category landings by non-Limited Access vessels averaged 1.96%. For instance, in 1999, landings by non-Limited Access vessels were 0.71%, and in 2001, they were 2.69%. The 1994-2004 time period includes periods of high and low scallop abundance, as well as different points in the abundance cycle for a range of other New England and Mid-Atlantic fisheries. (Even adding in 2005 and 2006, General Category landings by non-Limited Access vessels averaged 3.68%.) The Council's preferred 5% allocation alternative thus represents a 255% increase over average 1994-2004 landings.

Finally, reallocation of the fishery via a disproportionate allocation would not be consistent with Amendment 4. Amendment 4's primary purpose was to include essentially the entire scallop fishery so that it would be easier to control fishing mortality. Amendment 4, at 13. The Council created the General Category in Amendment 4 as a compromise to allow some modest scallop landings for those vessels which could not meet these limited standards, did not or could not document their landings history, or otherwise decided not to accept the burdens of a scallop limited access permit, including limited opportunities to participate in other fisheries.

⁴ Some in their number have been claiming, in the public hearings and at the Scallop Committee, that the General Category needs an average of 4.0 million pounds to be "satisfied." An allocation at that level would provide every qualifier with virtually his or her best year as a dedicated allocation, notwithstanding the episodic nature of most of the General Category fishery. (*See* PHD Table 11, which reports "total best year landings" for preferred option qualifiers as 4,187,916 pounds.) It is worth noting in this regard that individual allocations will ensure they maximize their shares (*see* PHD Table 17, and FSF's discussion of this table, above) and that Amendment 11 will allocate 70% of the permits to New England, even though its participants have only amounted to 30% of the fishery in recent years.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Nine

For its part, the Limited Access fishery provides thousands of jobs at sea, as well as many more in processing, marketing, and other shore-side businesses in communities from New Hampshire to North Carolina. These businesses chose to invest in and rely on the scallop fishery during lean times. Those who opted to participate in the Limited Access fishery have made conservation sacrifices, invested in organized activity and cooperative research, participated constructively in the management process, and advocated for new and creative regulatory approaches, such as area management, that have rebuilt and helped sustain the scallop resource. All scallop fishermen, including those in the General Category, have benefited.⁵

It would be bad resource management, horrible precedent for the Council, and unfair to fundamentally reallocate the scallop fishery based on post-control date landings from a time when the scallop resource was at its high point. Moreover, in recent years, Limited Access effort has been substantially cut back by regulation, but the General Category effort has increased in the absence of regulation.

Do you support an allocation of a percentage of the available yellowtail flounder bycatch TAC for access areas to the general category fishery equivalent to the percentage of scallop catch that may be allocated to the general category fishery?

FSF agrees that the General Category should receive a dedicated allocation of yellowtail flounder for their access area trips. Any yellowtail access area allocation for the General Category should match the allocation of scallops that the General Category receives for each such access area, rather than being based on the overall allocation of the scallop resource fishery-wide. Amendment 11 does not set an overall scallop allocation to the General Category for every subsequent access area program. Thus, it is not appropriate to set a one-size-fits-all yellowtail flounder access area allocation for each access area program. Instead, the yellowtail access area allocation and scallop access areas allocations should match.

⁵ Further, the full-time Limited Access fleet has grown by over fifty permits since the late 1990's. Opportunity has been expanded in two ways. First, latent permits have been activated. Second, part-time vessels using a single 10-1/2 foot dredge have been able to upgrade to full-time. With high levels of scallop abundance, and in trip limit-based access areas, these upgraded permits are very valuable. Notably, moreover, Amendment 4 created this upgrade provision for "Gulf of Maine fishermen [who] commented that their historical practice of scalloping in state waters and occasionally at Fippennies Ledge and Georges Bank with smaller dredges was not taken into account." Amendment 4, at 4. This is yet another way Gulf of Maine fishermen have already been accommodated through the existing program.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Ten

How should incidental catch be addressed in Amendment 11?

FSF does not, in theory, oppose allowing vessels landing scallops during 1994-2004, but not meeting the landing criteria, to be allowed 40 pounds of scallops for sale, to accommodate historical fishing patterns and prevent discarding of scallops in directed fishing for other species. However, the Scallop Committee did correctly recognize that such a result would create a new permit regime for only a small amount of scallops per vessel.

Do you support any of the alternatives in Amendment 11 related to better and more timely integrations of recent data into the management process?

FSF reiterates its participants' long-standing opposition to changing the long-standing fishing year, upon which they have based their business plans and operations. The current fishing year matches well with the best scallop yields, with fishing commencing in the spring. Amendment 10 likewise seeks to maximize yield per scallop recruit. In addition, scallop inventory management and marketing have been set up over the past fifteen years to have fishing concentrate in the spring and summer when the season starts, and weather and yields are good. These successful business models should not lightly be discarded.

Significantly, moreover, new surveys are being designed for the scallop fishery that might better match the current fishing year, to the extent that there is a concern by managers. The Council should not change the fishing year, only to have to change it back (or again) to accommodate the new survey.

Do you support any of the "other measures" included in Amendment 11 (i.e. trawl sweep alternative and increased possession limit seaward of the demarcation line)?

In line with Amendment 10, the Council should factor in gear selectivity in setting qualification and participation standards under Amendment 11. Scallop netting is demonstrably less selective than scallop dredging. Further, increased possession limits present the opportunity for deck-loading and discard mortality if too many scallops are deck-loaded.

Do you have any other comments for the Council to be aware of when considering final action for Amendment 11?

NMFS should work quickly to implement Amendment 11. It should not take two years to implement a limited access regime. It only took months for Amendment 4, and the records were far less systematically maintained in 1993-1994 when that amendment was implemented for several hundred qualifiers. FSF thus supports the Scallop Committee's motion to limit the application period for Amendment 11 permits to 90 days after the start of the 2008 fishing year.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Eleven

Further, notifications of this application period can be made, via NMFS Notices to Permit Holders, even as Amendment 11 is being finalized.

Amendment 11 will need to cap General Category effort during this transition period. It would be terrible management to allow many General Category vessels, with no long term interest in the fishery, to file baseless appeals and then get to keep fishing for up to two years (or even up to one year). Such participants with no long term interest in the fishery could inflict considerable damage to the resource.

That said, a 10% cap is too high for this interim period. NMFS should be able to sort through frivolous appeals quickly enough that a cap more consistent with a long-term allocation and historic landings levels should be able to be selected.⁶ In fact, as non-qualifiers are sorted out, a 10% cap might end up allowing the remaining General Category qualifiers to inappropriately increase their individual (and perhaps overall) landings from current levels. It is worth noting that overall General Category landings decreased from 14% in 2005 to 12% in 2006.

Amendment 11 should also confirm that existing access area caps will be maintained during any transition period. The Elephant Trunk General Category derby shows how intensely General Category access area effort can ramp up. By contrast, the Limited Access fishery has sought to conserve this extremely important access area by calling for an emergency cut-back in trips for 2007.

* * *

FSF appreciates this opportunity to comment on Amendment 11. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any additional questions about our comments.

⁶ Moreover, of four alternatives in Amendment 4 to control fishing effort and create a tiered permit system, three had no allocation for General Category landings. Alternative 3, the only alternative mentioning such landings, stated there should be "a 5% reserve for appeals and boats landing under the 400-pound trip limit." Amendment 4, at 5. That less than-five percent reserve for appeals applied to the entire Amendment 4 scallop fishery rationalization program, so it would not be consistent to reserve what would amount to a full five percent just for General Category appeals in Amendment 11.

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
June 11, 2007
Page Twelve

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "David E. Frulla", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.


David E. Frulla
Shaun M. Gehan
Andrew E. Minkiewicz

Counsel for Fisheries Survival Fund

DATE: 10 June 2007

TO: Pat Kurkul, Regional Administrator, NMFS Northeast Regional Office

FROM: Richard Taylor, Box 7002, Gloucester, Mass 01930



RE: Comments regarding public hearing document for Amendment 11 to the Scallop FMP.

While the increase in General Category fishing in the Mid-Atlantic was widely known as early as 2002, the options presented in the public hearing document for Amendment 11 are significantly off target as potential solutions. Overall my recommendations are to select the NO ACTION alternatives for all but one of the options in the document as presented as the remainder ignore the basic reasons for the progress made during the last twelve years of management changes to the scallop FMP, particularly those of Amendment 10. The presented options also do not develop the effective tools that avoid a repetition of the earlier influx of General Category vessels off New Jersey (see attached graphics of VTR reports), a recurrence of which is in progress at this time in the Hudson Canyon scallop access area. We have not learned that lesson and are concentrating on solutions that do not enable us to effectively and rapidly address this and other problems. For example we do not require the Scallop PDT, Advisors, and Committee to monitor General Category (or Limited Access) fishery in a more real time manner or provide the tools for rapid meaningful action, leaving only those available to the Regional Administrator.

The single option that seems worthy of development, though not entirely fleshed out, is presented in section 3.1.4, establishing a Gulf of Maine management area, that might, in final form, be structured to preserve distributed access to the scallop fishery by this and succeeding generations of General Category participants. This approach is the only one that is in line with the principles developed over 3 years of work in Amendment 10 to the scallop FMP, which focused on area management with rotational fishing opportunities based on stock assessment in the area, with area TACs, and trip limits to hold catch to ~25%. This option should have been developed and presented for all of the more inshore areas along the entire coast in order to prevent the type of unmonitored General Category fishery that occurred off New Jersey.

Background

The adoption of the US Exclusive Economic Zone 1976 and MSFCMA had central goals of removing the foreign fleets, promoting development the US fisheries, and establishment the Fishery Councils with the structure, methods, and processes that would be used to administer the fisheries. However by 1980, just 4 years later, it was clear that the massive investment in the larger offshore capable vessels in the hands of experienced skippers along the US east coast was leading to further rapid depletion of the remaining stocks. In the scallop fishery this situation was brought to an end in late 1994 with the implementation of Limited Access permits and DAS allocations with the vessel history qualification period retroactively fixed to the years 1985-1990, a mere 9 to 14 years after implementation of the MSFCMA.

In 1995 and 1996 approximately 12 million pounds of scallops were landed by the Limited Access fleet working 204 DAS (total ~50,000 DAS). In the last 12 years we have made great strides at turning things around. Sweeping changes have been instituted including an increase in ring size, limits on crew size, closed areas for growout of smaller scallop identified in the annual NOAA survey, and area management. In each of the fishing years of 2005 and 2006 over 50 million pounds were landed with the fleet fishing less than 100 DAS (~25,000 DAS total) implying an increase in daily production of 800%. Best estimates of fishing mortality are in the 25 to 30% range, implying that 2 to 3 times the amount landed remained on the bottom each year (100 to 150 million pounds) or that total biomass on the grounds was 150 to 200 million pounds. The overall implications are that the scallop population is at least an order of magnitude larger than it was in 1994, and that the overall biomass is significantly larger than it has ever been since

the scallop fishery began. Significant secondary benefits have realized in the areas of bycatch reduction and gear effects with a 50-75% a reduction of bottom time and swept area by the gears, along with corollary fuel savings.

Careful analysis of the contribution of the various management changes to the rebound in scallop biomass and landings suggests that maintaining large spawning stocks and increasing the yield per recruit have had the greatest impacts. For many years meat counts were mandated at 33-36 and routinely exceeded. In the open area portion of the fishery 4 inch rings alone bring the meat count to the mid to low 20s, an increase in yield per recruit in the 50-100% range. Average landings from the closed areas have averaged near 15 count, an increase of well over 200% of pre-1994 average size, and well beyond the growth allowed by 4" rings, suggesting that the rotationally fished areas have been the greatest source of the landings increases.


It is against this background that the options presented for Amendment 11 have been developed.

Overall the options presented do not include further development of the methods that have helped to increase the overall scallop biomass which in turn have led to a stable, profitable, and "sustainable" offshore scallop fishery. This oversight is especially troubling in light of the progress exhibited to date where increasing the biomass and landings has been significantly more beneficial to both the fishing communities and the overall economy than limitation of the number of participants. While no absolute linkage between the large spawning biomasses in the mid-Atlantic closed areas and new recruits appearing down current has been proven, it is certainly evident that area closures are a significant improvement over previous management methods, and should be not only continued but expanded. Transfer of the most successful techniques, specifically by widening the scope of area management to include the more inshore areas within the more limited range of smaller vessels, stock assessment, and limited removal offers the only clear path to continue the increase in biomass. The option establishing an inshore management area along the Gulf of Maine coast is the only one that might move us in that direction.


NO ACTION is preferable to assigning a fixed percentage of landings. Nowhere in the original or successive iterations of the MSFCMA does it specify that the Limited Access participants identified in the first 9 to 14 years of the regulations should have perpetual rights to a large fixed share of the clearly renewable and, more importantly, expandable scallop resource. Attempting to further solidify the situation that we found ourselves in in 1994 by fixing the share of all further entrants to the fishery, at least for the limited 2 to 11% options presented here, is confiscatory to both existing and future participants. While it is clear that measures including Limited Access were required to develop effective management, it is not at all clear that the benefits of the considerable investment of public funds expended in stock assessment and management of the scallop resource over the last 30 years should perpetually accrue to a small number of citizens. Put another way, granting of perpetual rights to enhanced future scallop populations to a select few that happened to be fishing from 1985 to 1990, or in the present case of the current General Category participants, will not survive thoughtful scrutiny over time.

Below are plots of General Category Vessel Trip Reports for the years 2001 through June 2005, though containing significant errors and omissions were the best data available at the time. The expansion of effort to the west of Hudson Canyon scallop growout area was quite evident by 2002, yet these reports were not a part of the management discussion until June 2005. The last image at lower right is a plot of all NMFS scallop survey tows for the years 1982 to 2005, and gives indication of how lightly sampled the area of greatest General Category impact has been over time. It seems likely that the large biomass in the Hudson Canyon Access Area had a successful spawning event and that we missed it in the surveys. We need both access to data and the tools to be able to rapidly react to this type of situation. Without them we will fail.


2001




2002




2003




2004



2005 jun



NMFS Scallop survey
1982-2005




© NMFS Scallop Survey 2005
© chart data for 1982-2004

Comment #31

FUTURE FISHERIES, INC

June 6, 2007

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
NMFS – Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930



SUBJECT: "COMMENTS ON SCALLOP AMENDMENT 11"


Dear Ms Kurkul:

I would like to express my thoughts on the Public Document for Amendment 11 of the Scallop FMP.

I do agree that the capacity and mortality in the General Category fishery should be controlled. Allocating number of trips (whether it is one or two tiers) per qualified vessel should control it. It allows opportunities for the vessel owners to use them at will, without encouraging derby style fishing which is not safe. As for those vessels that do not qualify, I would continue the current regulations regarding to the incidental catch of scallops for all vessels. The two issues that I disagree with which are the allocation percentage and the transition period.

First, I am not comfortable with the recent New England Fishery Management Council's (NEFMC) position on the preferred alternative for the allocation for the General Category, which is proposed to be 5%. Historically it has been a lot less than 5%. The public hearing document even states that the average is just below 3%. The allocation percentage should not be on the recent "best" years. It is just last few years that at the expense of the conservation measures applied on the limited access vessels since 1994, the scallop biomass rebounded. The limited access scallopers have their overall fishing days reduced more than 50%. It is down to about 50 open days and several access area trips subjected to by-catch Total Allowable Catch (TAC), gear restrictions and a reduction in size of crew. Most of the limited access scallopers (especially in New Bedford/Fairhaven area) do have extra fishing permits but it is primarily for incidental catches which makes us depending on revenue from scallops close to 100%. During the last few years the General Category vessels who have been part of the explosion in fishing are being displaced from their traditional directed fishery at the expense of the gains on reductions and cut backs on the limited access scallopers. I would like the Council to consider using the historical percent, if not then stop at no more than 5%.

Second issue is the allocation percentage (10%) hard TAC to use during the two year transition period. This increased percentage and longer length of transition period to cover the appeal process is beyond in scope of what NMFS and Council has done in all previous implemented FMPs whether it's scallops, groundfish, or monkfish etc. The appeal process will determine the qualifying vessels rapidly, that could translate into substantially larger landings by the smaller pool of qualified vessels. If a hard TAC is needed during transition then use the final percentage selected before allocating fishing opportunities per qualified vessel.



Respectfully,



Ronald Enoksen

Phillip Michaud Jr.
 Scout Fisheries
 Wellfleet Mass

Comment #32

John Pappalardo, chair man

New England Fishery Management



Re: Scallop Amendment 11

Dear Council members the traditional dayboat scalloper, dependent on the resource will suffer the greatest with the preferred alternatives, 11 year, 1000 lb, 5% TAC.

I refer to table 17 included with letter
 Best year landings per vessel

20,000 lbs or greater	41.36%	cut in effort
5,000 lb to 19,999	37.63%	cut in effort
under 5,000 lb	17.17%	cut in effort

To determine my percentage cut I used
 Best year landings per vessel 20,000 lb or greater. The Average allocation in pounds per vessel is 20,522 lbs. Divide this number by Average pounds of scallops per vessel 35,000 lbs (history) $20,522 \div 35,000 = 58.63\%$ minus 100 equals 41.36% cut

Our advisory panel recommended
 5 yr 5000 lb resulting in a 29% cut.

Increasing percentage TAC to 7%
 with 11 year 1000 lb represents a 17.9%

cut. Include best year indexed (option B) there will be no cut back for boats that have depended on this fishery for 5 years or more.

Allocating in 400 lb trips only can be a serious problem. Many vessels in my area do not land the maximum possession limit day fishing, bad weather and breakdowns are a factor also. Perhaps a cost recovery program. Perhaps allocate in units of 100 lbs, allowing up to 4 units per trip declaring how many units through VMS before crossing demarcation line (100, 200, 300 or 400) This would provide flexibility and can be monitored and enforced.

Sincerely

Phillip R Michaud
F/V Susan C III
508 776 8569

Table 17 - Distributional impacts of qualification criteria and time period alternatives combined with % TAC, assuming 50 mil. total scallop catch.

Best year landings per vessel (lb)	11 Year period			5 year period				2 year period			
	100 lb. Criteria	1000 lb. Criteria	5000 lb. Criteria	Stand alone-ITQ	100 lb. criteria	1000 lb. Criteria	5000 lb. Criteria	100 lb. Criteria	1000 lb. Criteria	5000 lb. Criteria	
>=20,000 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel were about 35,000 lb.)											
Number of vessels	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	44	44	44	
% share of TAC	49.7%	50.9%	59.1%	53.6%	53.8%	54.9%	61.4%	51.1%	52.0%	58.1%	
% TAC	GC TAC (Mil.lb.)	Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest									
2.50%	1.3	10,419	10,871	12,398	11,241	11,276	11,508	12,867	15,084	15,376	17,170
5%	2.5	20,037	20,522	23,842	21,617	21,685	22,131	24,744	29,008	29,569	33,019
7%	3.5	28,052	28,730	33,379	30,264	30,360	30,983	34,641	40,612	41,396	48,226
10%	5.0	40,074	41,043	47,684	43,235	43,371	44,262	49,488	58,017	59,137	66,038
11%	5.5	44,081	45,147	52,452	47,558	47,708	48,688	54,436	63,918	65,051	72,642
5000 lb. to 19,999 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel were over 10,000 lb.)											
Number of vessels	141	141	141	126	126	126	126	99	99	99	
% share of TAC	34.3%	35.2%	40.9%	33.8%	33.9%	34.6%	38.6%	36.8%	37.5%	41.9%	
% TAC	GC TAC (Mil.lb.)	Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest									
2.50%	1.3	3,167	3,243	3,768	3,482	3,493	3,565	3,966	4,832	4,925	5,500
5%	2.5	6,090	6,237	7,246	6,597	6,718	6,856	7,666	9,292	9,471	10,577
7%	3.5	8,526	8,732	10,145	9,376	9,405	9,599	10,732	13,009	13,260	14,807
10%	5.0	12,179	12,474	14,492	13,394	13,436	13,712	15,331	18,584	18,943	21,153
11%	5.5	13,397	13,721	15,942	14,733	14,780	15,084	16,864	20,442	20,837	23,269
<5000 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel ranged between 1,300 lb. with 100 lb. criteria to 2,300 lb. with 1000 lb. criteria)											
Number of vessels	502	256	None	489	360	181	None	256	134	None	
% share of TAC	16.0%	13.9%	0.0%	12.6%	12.4%	10.6%	0.0%	12.2%	10.5%	0.0%	
% TAC	GC TAC (Mil.lb.)	Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest									
2.50%	1.3	572	980	No allo.	465	618	1,049	No allo.	855	1,404	No allo.
5%	2.5	1,113	1,905	No allo.	904	1,202	2,041	No allo.	1,662	2,731	No allo.
7%	3.5	1,558	2,667	No allo.	1,266	1,683	2,657	No allo.	2,326	3,823	No allo.
10%	5.0	2,226	3,809	No allo.	1,809	2,404	4,081	No allo.	3,324	5,461	No allo.
11%	5.5	2,449	4,190	No allo.	1,990	2,644	4,488	No allo.	3,656	6,007	No allo.


Preferred alternative for allocation and qualification shaded, assuming total scallop catch of 50 million pounds



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 4
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960

SF
comment # 33

June 11, 2007



Patricia A. Kurkul
Regional Administrator
Northeast Region
NMFS, NOAA
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

RE: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Amendment 11
to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan CEQ No. 20070160

Dear Ms. Kurkul:

EPA is providing the comments to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) on the referenced document. These comments are offered in accordance with EPA's responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, Section 102(D)(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA.

The DEIS was prepared to explore strategies needed to control scallop fishing capacity and curb mortality resulting from fishermen who presently have open access to the scallop fishery. "Open access" means that any boat owner that wants his vessel permitted for scallop fishing may do so; there are no specific qualifications needed to receive a general category permit. While allowed under Amendment 4 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan, open access has probably contributed greatly to exceeding current scallop fishery mortality objectives.

The document evaluated a series of "valued ecosystem components" (VECs) which represent both the scallop resources and human communities that will be affected by proposed management actions. Various VECs were assessed to determine the direct/indirect effects and cumulative impacts that resulted from past regulatory actions and their impacts on the basic sea scallop resource, their physical environment, fishing impacts on protected species, and fishery-related businesses and communities. New management options being considered include: limiting entry for general category fishing permits; a hard total allowable catch limit for the general category fishery; the establishment of a separate limited entry program in the Northern Gulf of Maine; incidental catch (meaning scallops taken while targeting other species) provisions; and

JUN 11 2007

other measures to more quickly integrate recent scallop harvest data in the management process.

The document was well-written, rationally organized, and had clearly summarized past management actions that had, according to the DEIS, contributed to excessive scallop mortality in the fishery today. We have commented on two preferred alternatives that were discussed in the Management Plan.

1) Catch Limits - The proposed management plan recommends limiting scallop harvesting by general category fishery boats to 5% of total annual catch permitted to the fishery as a whole. While the DEIS acknowledges that limited access, by itself, will not entirely eliminate unsustainable scallop mortality, it will help reduce the risk of overfishing by preventing new entry to the general category fishery.

2) Limited Entry - The proposed Management Plan recommends limiting entry to the general category fishery, with entry qualifications based upon a license-holder's past years landing activity in the scallop fishery. The number of fishery participants would be selected based upon previous years scallop landing qualification criteria data within the qualification time period.

While EPA defers to NOAA/NMFS to determine the best management techniques that will achieve fishery objectives, we suggest that for the health and safety of fishermen, the Council select strategies that avoid "derby" type fishing. Derby fishing occurs when an annual total allowable catch (TAC) is established without daily catch limitations. Unrestricted TACs encourage risk-taking behavior such as going out in bad weather and working excessively long hours which increases the risk of accidents from operator fatigue.

Fishermen in local hearings (see Scoping Comments, Written Comments Received) suggested that scallop catch limits be assigned to vessels without regard to their size or capacity. EPA notes that this would place smaller-sized boats at a disadvantage because larger boats can generally travel faster and work during more dangerous weather thereby harvesting a greater percentage of TAC. Assigning future daily catch limits to individual vessels based upon their past history of scallop landings seems to be an equitable management plan.

Others suggested assigning catch limits to individual fishermen, rather than the boat, which is now the current practice. There is some risk, however, that assigning pound allotments or catch limits to individuals would create a "harvesting right" which itself could become a commodity to be sold or traded. We can easily envision an individual fisherman who, rather than going fishing, sells or trades his harvesting rights onshore, an undesirable outcome in our view. It is unlikely that creating a secondary paper market in un-harvested scallop meats would achieve fishery resource management objectives.

It is possible, however, that assigning catch limits to an individual (creating harvest rights described above) might be effective if fishing "sectors" and harvesting cooperatives were created, and TAC shares were awarded to each sector within the fishery. Groups would be formed around common fishing practices, common homeport, and common marketing arrangements. Eligibility criteria, operational plans, monitoring, enforcement of TAC, and allocation rules would be controlled by the fishermen themselves. According to previous EISs on the lobster fishery in the northeastern U.S., Maine lobster fishermen heavily depend upon mutual cooperation and self-governance in the management of local lobster resources.

Editorial Comments-

Pg 164, end of first paragraph - The Error note should be deleted and reference source included.

Pg 165, last paragraph, line 5 - The draft EIS states that... "The alternatives under consideration would reduce the potential pool of participants from 143 to around 705..." perhaps was intended to read... "The alternatives under consideration would reduce the potential pool of participants from 705 to 143..."

EPA rates this action as "LO" that is, lack of objections. The alternatives that were examined, impacts on threatened and endangered species, bycatch issues, and public participation processes were satisfactorily addressed in this document. For more information, please contact John Hamilton at (404) 562-9617.

Sincerely,



Heinz J. Mueller, Chief
NEPA Program Office
Office of Policy and Management

WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT
TENTH DISTRICT, MASSACHUSETTS

2454 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3111
www.house.gov/delahunt

SOUTH SHORE
1-800-794-9511


1250 Hancock Street
Suite 802 N
Quincy, MA 02189

CAPE COD & ISLANDS
1-800-870-2638

140 Main Street
Hyannis, MA 02601

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-2110



June 7, 2007

Comment #34

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEES ON:
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN
RIGHTS AND OVERSIGHT
CHAIRMAN
WESTERN HEMISPHERE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEES ON:
CRIME, TERRORISM AND HOMELAND SECURITY
IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP, REFUGEES, BORDER
SECURITY, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW
COMMERCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

CO-CHAIR:
CONGRESSIONAL COAST GUARD CAUCUS
OLDER AMERICANS CAUCUS

Dear Administrator Kurkul:

I am writing regarding Amendment 11 and the proposed changes to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan which seeks to control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery.

I have been contacted by Bob Keese who is a third generation fisherman from Chatham. He is concerned with how the recommendations of the New England Fishery Management Council will impact the general category scallop fishery and their livelihood. I have attached a copy of a guest column that Mr. Keese wrote in the May 2007 edition of *Commercial Fisheries News*.

I would appreciate your taking into account his concerns as you reach a final decision.


With kind regards.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill Delahunt".

William D. Delahunt

Administrator Patricia Kurkul
Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930



Gen Cat scallopers deserve larger quota share

In an attempt to control fishing mortality, the New England Fishery Management Council is developing Amendment 11 to change the general category (Gen Cat) scallop fleet into a limited-access fishery.

Qualification criteria, coupled with a November 2004 control date, will be used to identify future participants in this Gen Cat fleet and a portion of the total allowable catch (TAC) for scallops will be allocated to the general category.

It is this portion of the scallop TAC that has caused much controversy throughout Amendment 11. The limited-access fleet believes the allocation should be 2%-3%. This basically would leave the remaining 97%-98% of the TAC for the limited-access fleet. The rationale behind this logic is that the Gen Cat was never meant to be anything more than a bycatch fishery.

For the past seven years, the scallop resource has been at levels higher than anyone ever imagined. Consequently, landings by both the limited-access fleet and the general category fleet have grown significantly.

While the growth of the limited-access fleet has been heralded as the greatest success story in fishery management history, the growth within the Gen Cat has been perceived as nothing more than a threat to the success of the limited-access fleet.

It has been argued that if the Gen Cat is left unchecked, it could lead to the downfall of the limited-access fleet. While there is merit to this concern, general category landings have not even come close to undermining the success of the limited-access fleet.

Equity issue

In 2005, when the general category harvested an all-time-high 14% of the scallop TAC, the limited-access fleet managed to land 45 million pounds of scallops valued at about \$360 million.

It is true that for every scallop that the Gen Cat lands there is one less scallop that the limited-access fleet can land. Each fleet needs to be assured a certain percentage of the harvest. The need to divide the resource between the two fleets has become the focal point of Amendment 11.

The legislation that directs NMFS on how to manage the nation's fisheries is the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). National Standard 4 of the MSA states that if it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various US fishermen, it should be carried out in such a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.

Although the argument could definitely be made for a much higher allocation, the Gen Cat fleet needs only enough to satisfy those who have an investment and/or history in the fishery before the control date.

Instead of adopting this allocation, which would be no higher than 15%, the council has chosen 5% as its preferred alternative. This would leave 95% of the scallop resource to approximately 351 limited-access vessels.

Although there are 351 limited-access vessels, a much smaller group of individuals own these vessels. In fact, some limited-owners legally own 5% of the entire scallop harvest by themselves. Setting the maximum allotment for the

entire Gen Cat fleet to the same level as that of one person from the limited-access fleet raises some serious questions about fairness and equity.

GUEST COLUMN

by Bob Keese

Bycatch fishery?

The limited-access fleet is one of the most lucrative and politically powerful fishing organizations in the world and they have spent much of their effort in the last few years justifying giving the general category the smallest allocation possible. The limited-access fleet's lawyers,

lobbyists, and consultants have come up with the notion that the general category was established as a "bycatch" fishery only and should never have been allowed to be a successful, directed fishery for scallops. Therefore, their argument goes, an allocation should be chosen to keep the general category from ever becoming more than a part-time income source. This is the rationale behind the motion to allocate 95% to the limited-access fleet.

Furthermore, they contend that anyone who used this fishery for anything other

General category landings have not even come close to undermining the success of the limited-access fleet.

—Bob Keese

than a bycatch or "supplemental income" fishery was abusing a loophole in the system and so no consideration should be given to this group of fishermen in Amendment 11.

See GUEST COLUMN, page 21A

catch-share systems.

New sector allocation proposals (i.e. fishing cooperatives) using sector guidance that hopefully will be updated through Amendment 16 are an important means for the groundfish complex to get back on the road to biological recovery while retaining important social and economic components of the fishery.

Also, the Northeast Seafood Coalition point system proposal includes some of the valuable components of catch-share systems, including important accountability measures, incentives to target healthy stocks and avoid depleted stocks, as well as flexibility for the industry to improve economic returns.

Catch-share systems are the ultimate win-win-win situation providing conservation, economic, and regulatory benefits. The New England council will do well to consider these approaches in this latest groundfish amendment.

Sally McGee

Sally McGee is a marine conservation advocate for Environmental Defense and a member of the New England Fishery Management Council, Environmental Defense's report, "Sustaining America's Fisheries and Fishing Communities," is available online at www.sustainingfisheries.com.



Guest Column

Continued from page 7A

After hearing this for several years, many council and advisory panel members have adopted this belief that the general category was never meant as anything but a "bycatch fishery" and the council should keep the general category at this bycatch level forever.

Amendment 4

Since the general category was established in Amendment 4, we should all look to this document if we want to know the truth about the origins of this fishery.

After reading Amendment 4, you will see that the general category was clearly made for two reasons. It was made to provide for a bycatch fishery and it was made to accommodate a directed fishery for scallops with a 400-pound daily trip limit.

Amendment 4 reads as follows: General permit vessels may fish for scallops or potces and land them as bycatch if the meat weight does not exceed 400 pounds or the amount of shell stock does not exceed 50 US bushels.

People involved with Amendment 4 assure us that the general category was made, at least in part, to accommodate a directed fishery for scallops. They recall that, in the early stages, two scallop management areas were proposed to be used exclusively for a directed, day-boat fishery on scallops. One area was the

The Gen Cat fleet needs only enough to satisfy those who have an investment and/or history in the fishery before the control date.

—Bob Keese

Gulf of Maine Exemption Area and the other was off the North Carolina coast.

These areas were never adopted due to enforcement issues. Instead, the all-encompassing general category was developed.

High landings

The scallop resource has changed significantly since 1994 and both the general category and the limited-access fleets have evolved accordingly. In 1994 the total scallop catch was 15 million pounds. In 1994, NMFS believed that the highest long-term sustainable yield would be 29 million pounds.

In the last six years, total scallop landings ranged from 45 million to 61.7

million. This rapid growth in the scallop biomass is the result of the new rotational management measures in use today.

Instead of allocating according to current resource conditions and the guidelines set forth in the MSA, we are using a false interpretation of a previous amendment to steer this decision.

We need to put aside the myth that the Gen Cat was never meant to be anything but a bycatch fishery. Once this is done, we can allocate in a manner consistent with the MSA and allow a small-boat fishery to continue to benefit from this enormous public resource.

The 5% that the council is currently considering will make the Gen Cat into a part-time income fishery for a group of fishermen. Currently, there are 459 vessels that will meet the proposed preferred qualification criteria.

This small allocation will not even allow the qualifying fishermen the opportunity to make a living from this fishery. Amendment 11 is out for public comment. The final vote for the amendment will be in June. Hopefully, enough comments will be sent to the council to convince its members of the need for a more fair allocation scheme.


Bob Keese



Bob Keese fishes the Beggar's Banquet out of Chatham. He can be reached at (774) 263-8702.

June 6, 2007

Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
1 Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930



Dear Patricia Kurkul, Regional Administrator,


SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON SCALLOP AMENDMENT 11

Attached are my comments concerning the Scallop Amendment 11, Scallop Fishery Management Plan. If additional information or explanation is needed, please contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stanley C. Sargent".

Stanley C. Sargent
207-546-7100



- 3.1 Measured to control capacity and mortality in general category fishery.**
Limited Entry.
- 3.2 Allocation between limited access and general category fisheries.**
Allocation for General Category Scallop boats is 50,000 pounds per boat a year.
Non-transferable.
- 3.2.1 Allocation of 5% of the total annual projected scallop catch to the general category fishery.**
Allocation of 5% over the long term of general category may be an average. But compared to the limited access boats the average of poundage per boat, per trip, has gone up a lot more than 5% since 1994.
- 3.3 Additional alternatives related to a limited entry program for the General Category fishery.**
1. Vessel with a permit from 1994 – 2004.
 2. By poundage per year; 50,000 pounds.
 3. Owner, Operator only.
 4. Yes
 5. Probably Not
 6. No
- 3.3.2.1 Allocation of access for qualifying vessels would be an individual allocation in trips maintaining the 400 pound possession limit.**
Allocation of Scallops should be X number of pounds, not trips.
Example: 50,000 pounds and additional 3% for the cost of enforcement and monitoring.
- 3.3.3 Should additional limited entry permits be included?**
Only if they were between 1997–2004 with landings.
General Category permits shouldn't be allowed to be stacked. The total number of poundage per permit is 50,000 pounds. One General Category permit per boat only. In addition to that, General Category should be owner, operator only.
- 3.3.3.1 Specific permit provisions for limited entry general category permits.**
No stacking of permits.
- 3.3.4 Should measures to reduce incentive for qualifiers to use trawl gear be included?**
Yes, 40 pounds maximum per trip.


- 3.3.5 Should qualifying vessels be permitted to form voluntary sectors?**
No action.
- 3.3.6 Interim measures for transition period to limited entry.**
No action.
- 3.4 Establish a northern gulf of Maine scallop management area.**
Yes.
Northern gulf of Maine should be a separate permit and a separate quota per boat. A hard tact will lead to derby style fishing and the smaller boats will be put to a disproportionate disadvantage.
- 3.6 Limited access fishing under General Category.**
Prohibit all Limited access boats from fishing with General Category.
The word Limited only seems to apply to the vessels that have the smallest access to the fishery.
- 3.7 Allocation of Yellowtail Flounder bycatch in access areas.**
General Category can't have any bycatch.
- 3.8 Incidental Catch**
40 pounds per trip. With one trip equaling 24 hours.
- 3.9 Better and More timely integration of recent data.**
Change the fishing year.

Comments:

General Category was made up for small boats, about 75 boats total, half were from Maine that were actually scalloping at the time. Since then, General Category has been exploited beyond anyone's ideas at the time of the making. Now we have the task to decide who has the right to fish and who does not. Those who qualify must have been there in the beginning. There can only be one set of rules for General Category: Owner, operator; One dredge, 10' 6" maximum; No targeting scallops with trawl nets; Fishing season April 1st – November 1st. ect.. This also has to apply to Northern Gulf of Maine. Northern Gulf of Maine tac is broken down per boat, per season, not per trip.

Comment #30

Subject: Comments on Scallop Amendment 11 (Attn. Patricia Kurkul Regional Administrator)
From: my gray <rose_bud83@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 30 May 2007 07:39:06 -0700 (PDT)
To: Scallop.Eleven@noaa.gov



1. Yes, I believe capacity and morality should be controlled in the general category fishery.
2. I am in favor of limited entry.
3. I feel that 5,000 lbs must be used. In reality 5,000 lbs is only a little over 12 days fishing. That should cover even the fishermen who only fish part time. As far as years, 5 or 11 year plan wouldn't make much difference.
4. I believe a tier system would work the best, possibly a 3 year tier.
5. Should be dredge only. 10'6" for everyone.
6. Undecided on a Northern Gulf of ME. fishing area.
7. Limited access vessels should be allowed to fish under general category rules as long as what they catch comes out their tac.
- 8+9. I conciser this is a very important issue. 5% has been thrown out of many meetings. I believe it must be at the 10-11% level. Many reasons drew me to this conclusion. One is we don't know the average size of vessels that is going make up the general category fleet. If it ends up being more smaller vessels, we will be at a disadvantage trying to get all closes area trips in before they get closed for by catch. For one example: plus, it is not set in stone. How many vessels are going to be in the fishery. Referring to table 19 at 11% limited access vessels would stay at present levels, which is stated in your document at an average of 1 million dollars a vessel. I believe a 10-11% Limited Access vessels would stay at present levels, which is stated in your document at an average of 1 million dollare a vessel. I believe a 10-11% TAC at this point of forming the criteria of the Gen. Cat. fleet is necessary to ensure you have enough resource to work with to let us have a viable chance of staying in business. I believe if we don't get this much of a percentage you'll have succeeded in putting a lot of us out of the fishery completely. I seriously believe that it is on the minds of most people in the Limited Access fleet. I hope it is not the councils view.
10. Leave it at 40 lbs..
11. Let us as a fisheries use our VMS' to do the trip reports. It would be easier for us and let you receive our data quicker.
12. No
13. Mostly
Comments
14. We must have the option to stack permits in this Amendment. I have fears that we will not get a large

enough TAC to go around. We will need this option. I believe there is enough resources to support a healthy Limited Access fleet plus a Gen. Cat. fleet. I have been a Captain in the Limited Access fleet and I presently own my own General Category vessel. I believe we could be an asset to each other. For example: My son has fished and trained under me for 3 years and now is a deckhand on a Limited Access vessel. I think in the future you will see a lot of deckhands on Limited Access vessels will be getting to an age they won't be able to or want to still do their jobs on a Limited Access vessel. It would be nice that they still could fish the Gen. Cat. fleet could be the answer. I hope the council thinks long and hard before any decisions are made that will affect so many people. Please, note that this is not just numbers or fishing vessels, peoples lives are going to be affected by your decisions forever!!

Sincerely,

Wallace A. Gray
F/V Foxy Lady II
Stonington, Me.
04681

Comment # 37

Woneta M. Cloutier

From: jack stormy [stormyseasllc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2007 8:20 AM
To: stormyseasllc@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Fwd: comments on amendment 11

Hahn <hammersportfishing@yahoo.com> wrote:

Note: forwarded message attached.

The fish are biting.

Get more visitors on your site using Yahoo! Search Marketing. Date: Mon, 4 Jun 2007 21:33:03 - 0700 (PDT)

From: jack stormy <stormyseasllc@yahoo.com>
 Subject: comments on amendment 11
 To: hammersportfishing@yahoo.com

Dear Council:

MY QUESTION TO THE COUNCIL IS? If the general category was deleted from the fishery would the mortality rate decrease? If the answer is anything but yes the vision statement is false and this amendment 11 should be thrown away written to be fair to the general category not the limited access boat that catch 89% of the quota and want 95% of the quota.

My name is Jimmy Hahn I am a owner of 2 general category boats out of Ocean City Maryland. One has no history before the con troll date. Then I purchased another boat that has little history because I was told by NMFS and North England council that as long as I had landing before the control date I would not be out of business. In all of my phone calls and the scoping meeting I was never told about qualification requirements. I would not have bought this boat if I had known. I do not consider getting 10 to 20 trip a year being in business. No where in the proposals for the control date did it say any thing about IFQ or days at sea. I only fish for scallops I do not have any other Limited access permits to fish.

I know the council want to control capacity and mortality. With using the control date it should control capacity but instead of using the preferred option of 1000lb since 1994 it should be more current like 1000lb since 2003. If you did not fish when the scallops were at highest population level and highest price, why would you fish for them in the next couple of years when they are in the down side of there cycle. All a individual quota is going to do is let the people that hold a meet the criteria weather they fish or not make a profit off a permit. The quota should go to real fishermen. What happens to the quota that is given to people that do not use it? Is it saved for the next year or lost?

After listening to the amendment hearing I did not hear many people in support of the preferred

actions of the council. Most people wanted the opposite, the only people in support preferred action were limited access boat owners. Was amendment 11 written to control capacity and control mortality or to push the little fisherman out of business and give the quota to the limited access boats.

The council should give the general category at least 10% hard tac fleet wide. The preferred 5% is to little. With only 5% the preferred option for allocation would be exceed. How is this make good sense! If we are only allowed to catch 20% of the biomass how can giving us extra 5% increase mortality. With all of the closed areas along the coast how can the fishery be over fished? If the scallop are over fished why did the Elephant Trunk area even open. When it did open why didn't you use the science to catch the least amount scallops possible. You open the season right when they were about to spawn. Three more weeks and they would have all spawned at least once. The distance the spat could a floated would have repopulated some of the Delmarva area. Also the number of bushels to catch 400lb was around 50 one month later it only took 35 bushel for 400lb that's 15 bushels less. In the general category alone that's 12000 bushels less and about 1,620,000 scallops less. With the limited access boats catching 18000lb per trip in 300 trips it would have saved 202500 bushels and over 27,337,500 scallops. Who decided to open the season a month to early. Instead you didn't use the science to protect mortality. Now who to blame for the extra mortality? Not the general category! The general category didn't deplete the scallop in the 1990s it was the limited access boats. They didn't bring the fishery back. More laws and rules were put in place to keep the mortality at a controlled level. The scallops that we are allowed to fish on now were not put there by limited access boats, mother nature put them there. They are on federal bottom that is owned by the citizens of the United States. My tax money is used to study, protect and regulate, why shouldn't I be allowed a percentage of that resource. I have learned that 5 boat owners, currently own 118 limit access boats, that over 27% of the quota. How is that fair, that 5 people own more of the quota then the whole general category can catch in two years at 10%. I really feel the fishery's people should wake up.

My comments to the Questions?

1. IF THE GENERAL CATEGORY WAS DELETED WOULD SCALLOP MORTALITY CHANGE? The answer is NO so how could regulating the general category change mortality. Mortality can not be controlled on the 10% level it must be controlled on the 90% level!

2 and 3 . Capacity is going to be controlled by the control date. I think people currently in the fishery should be allowed to continue to fish. I think the option 1994 and 1000lb is to general, it should be given to fishermen who are currently fishing 2003 to 2004 with a 1000 lb is much better. What about a rigging up clause? We were told by NMFS that if you had a permit before control date with landing you would qualify.

I think consideration should be given to people who fish only for scallops. Those that are after the control date should not be complete pushed out of this fishery. For example if you fished over 200 days since the control date, it your primary fishery and you should be given something.

Mortality should not be blamed on the general category. We are only catching 11%. If you want to control mortality it should be done on the 89% the limited access catch. If you completely deleted the general category the limited access boat would catch 100% instead of 89% so whats the different? I think the limited access boat can afford to give 10%. I think it

would be fair to give the general category a 10% hard tac fleet wide.

4. I think that it should be a hard tac of 10% fleet wide. Let the fishermen who fish get the quota. Why should somebody who fished 10 years ago and is not fishing now get a quota to sell or lease and make money without fishing. What happens if you give out trips and the trip don't get taken?

5. I think we should be able to continue and a 10% hard tac until the in term measures are straightened out.

7. Limited access boat should not be able to fish under general category quota. In 2005 they landed 1.5% 800000 lb and in 2006 they landed .76% 424000 lb after landing there quota of 87% and 89%. How much extra mortality is that. It should be one category or the other not both. Many limited access boat fished the elephant trunk opening under general category first then started the limited access trips. Double dipping.

8. yes Why can't we have at least 10%? That's what the average has been over the last couple of years without being over fished.

9. yes. we should get a 10 % of the total quota.

10. I think there should be another permit for incidental catch, you should be able to sell the catch.

11. I think we should use more science and less political power to regulate and control.

12. increase limit to 100 bushels. Also increase the trip limit to 800lb for a 48 hour period to save fuel. Use vms to regulate hours and trips

13. yes i believe the whole impact to the environment section was written by the limited access boats for the limited access boats. Nowhere does it have a negative statement about limited access boats. How can that be, when they catch 89% of the quota.

14. I think I have made my feeling very clear general category is not the problem for mortality.

3.1.2.1.

Agree with control date and 1000 lb

3.1.2.2

agree with march 1 2000 - 2004 Quota should go to boat currently in scallop fishery. If you did not work in the best years you never will.

3.1.2.3

none Should be a hard tac fleet wide. Not to somebody who does not even own a boat any more just holds a permit. Quota should be given to people who want and only fish for scallops not draggers who only fish for scallop occasional. 2000 - 2004 allows only 369 boats.

3.1.2.4

agree with 3.1.2.4.6

3.1.2.4.1

is not what NMFS told everybody would happen. Some of us bought boat with little history because Pete Christor told us not to worry as long as it is before the control date and has landing before control date nothing would change.

3.1.2.5

agree with 3.1.2.5.1.1 One vessel one permit. Many boat owner sold the boat to family members to be able to get 2 quota out same vessel and permit.

3.1.2.5.4.3

not sure

3.1.2.5.8.1

A limit on the number of permits and boat you can own.

3.1.2.6

No trawl gear

3.1.2.8

agree with 3.1.2.8.1

3.1.4.3.

not sure

3.1.6.1.

disagree with 3.1.6.1.1 Limited access vessels should not be able to fish under general category. They already get 89% how much more do they need. Double Dipping

3.1.7.3

not sure

3.1.8

agree with 3.1.8.2

3.2

agree with 3.2.1.1

3.3

agree with 3.3.2.2.

If the vision statement is false for amendment 11 then how can the council use it to regulate the fishery. The council and NMFS needs to take a better look at the overall status of the fishery, use better science and more common sense. How can controlling 5% - 10% of a fishery reduce mortality. Amendment 11 was written to put the small boat owner out business and increase control and profit for the limited access boats with no regard for the mortality levels of the scallops. The scallop quota should not be owned by 334 limited access boats but shared by all the citizens of the United States.

If you have any comments or questions please feel free to contact me at 410 310 4296

Thanks

Jimmy Hahn

Take the Internet to Go: Yahoo!Go puts the Internet in your pocket: mail, news, photos & more.

The fish are biting.

Get more visitors on your site using Yahoo! Search Marketing.