

Bob: The catch shares policy does not mandate the implementation of catch shares programs if they are not appropriate. I believe that you are providing constructive criticism when you point out the problems in trying to introduce such a program in the Southeast, and if the data is not sufficient, then that could be a reason for rejecting efforts to implement such a program.

Have you submitted your written input on the catch shares policy yet? Your points should be considered by the people working on the plan, and you have until April 12 if you have not submitted comments.

I appreciate hearing your perspective on this issue.

Andy Winer

Director of External Affairs

NOAA Communications & External Affairs

(202) 482-4640

andrew.winer@noaa.gov

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

Sent: Friday, March 26, 2010 8:02 AM

To: andrew.winer@noaa.gov

Cc: Susie_PerezQuinn@billnelson.senate.gov; josh@aol.com; Roy.Crabtree@noaa.gov; Steve.Bortone@gulfcouncil.org; robert.mahood@safmc.net; Bonnie.Ponwith@noaa.gov

Subject:

Andy,

Below is a copy of a Q & A article from the April 2010 *Smithsonian Magazine*. Dr. Lubchenco gives answers about catch shares. Once again it's clear she intends to force catch shares on fishermen because she thinks catch share is the answer. Whether catch shares are the answer and become the law of the land I don't know. What I do know is if she uses the questionable low TACS on fisheries, it would be a great injustice to the fishermen who harvest fish and fishermen who catch fish for pleasure. Anyone closely associated with the stock assessments in the southeast knows the lack of empirical data, the lack of independent fisheries data and the absence of spawning aggregation measurement are reasons we have such low TAC's. The whole scientific basis on which our fish are managed is incomplete. To award catch shares before basic data is available would be a disservice.

The response from the ENGO's will probably be, "you people always say you need more data but we have to go with what we have to save the earth." Why

don't the wealthy ENGO's raise funds to do research in which they and others could be part of from start to finish? Why not cooperate with all the stakeholders not just a selected few?

Why is it always the fishermen who are targeted with environmentalist's slogans that we are killing the planet? Why is it always the fishermen who are hammered and disrespected by so many people in government? The answer is we are a handy target, mostly unorganized and not sophisticated enough to fund legions of lobbyists, lawyers and spin-doctors to spread our message.

But a strange thing recently occurred. Most, not all, commercial and recreational fishing groups have joined forces for the pursuit of honest science and the common good. This partnership was vividly manifested on the snow-covered grass near the US Capitol on February 24th. It was an emotional event for those who joined thousands of their brothers and sisters in a massive, non-confrontational exercise of our First Amendment rights and our right to assemble and express our grievances. It was historical for the recreational and commercial fishermen to stand shoulder to shoulder and say enough is enough. It gave special meaning and a feeling of hope for any fisherman standing in the cold who had ever been disrespected by government officials whose salary he helps pay.

We don't need any more catch share programs considered in the southeast until and unless new stock assessments are adequately funded and peer-reviewed. If NOAA wants to get serious about management, they must first get serious about science and change their paradigm toward fishermen.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Jones

www.seafoodsustainability.us

Marine ecologist Jane Lubchenco recently spoke at the Natural History Museum on restoring the bounty of the world's oceans.

The Heinz Awards

Q and A: Jane Lubchenco

The marine ecologist and administrator of the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration

discusses restoring the bounty of the world's oceans

- By Erica R. Hendry
- *Smithsonian* magazine, April 2010

Read more: http://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/Q-and-A-Jane-Lubchenco.html?utm_source=magrefer201004-April&utm_medium=referrals&utm_campaign=SmithMag&utm_content=lubcheno#ixzz0jHNGYEW1

Q. You've mentioned "holistic approaches." What do you mean by that?

A. The way we typically manage activity in the ocean—as well as on coasts—is sector-by-sector, issue-by-issue. One agency regulates water quality, another regulates fishing, another regulates energy extraction and another regulates shipping. We need a cohesive national policy and a mechanism for integrating activities across the different branches of government.

The holistic approach also entails aligning conservation with economic incentives. New approaches—such as dividing up the total allowable catch among fisherman into shares—provide incentives to reduce wasteful practices that harm the environment and reduce profits.

There's a lot of new information from both the practical world as well as the scientific world that is coming together. I think there's an emerging appreciation that healthy oceans matter and that we all have a responsibility to protect and restore the oceans so that we can continue to benefit from their bounty as well as their beauty.