

From: [Didden, Jason](#)
To: [COM - Squid Mack; Advisors - MSB \(minus Calomo\)](#)
Subject: FW: MSB AP Options
Date: Monday, November 28, 2016 3:07:00 PM

Fyi – see highlighted text below for another possible time-area closure option from AP member Steve Weiner.

Jason

From: Steve Weiner [mailto:weinersb@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 5:03 PM
To: Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org>
Subject: Re: MSB AP Options

Hi Jason

That is correct. But this closure would also protect spawning and juvenile squid.

I am blown away to be honest that some kind of closure hasn't already occurred. Bad enough that they are fishing in a known spawning area but towing through the mops is just wrong.

thanks

steve

On Tue, Oct 11, 2016 at 4:02 PM, Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org> wrote:

My summary of the AP meeting will be limited to the meeting, but when I provide the committee with the summary I can pass along other input received as well, and I have gotten a few other emails since the meeting.

My understanding is that you would like consideration of an alternative that:

Would close Stat Area 537 out to a 50m depth for all or part of trimester 2 to protect squid eggs/mops.

If this is correct I will add an appendix to the summary, with additional comments received...and include your suggestion & original email below.

Thanks,
Jason

Jason Didden
jdidden@mafmc.org
www.mafmc.org

[\(302\) 526-5254](tel:(302)526-5254) (direct)
[\(302\) 397-1131](tel:(302)397-1131) (cell)



[\(302\) 674-5399](tel:(302)674-5399) (fax)

From: Steve Weiner [mailto:weinersb@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:48 PM

To: Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org>

Subject: Re: MSB AP Options

Jason

Do you want my suggested option now?

Steve

On Fri, Sep 30, 2016 at 11:15 AM, Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org> wrote:

My current plan is to get back to this action after the Council meeting. I will follow up with you then.

Thanks,
Jason

From: Steve Weiner [mailto:weinersb@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 9:48 AM

To: Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org>; Lisa Hendrickson <lisa.hendrickson@noaa.gov>;
Weiner, Stephen B. <weinersb@gmail.com>

Subject: MSB AP Options

Hi Jason

It seems to me that the SMB Committee and the Council as a whole should look to have a time area closure in the Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard area during trimester 2. While closing areas 1 + 2 is an option it doesn't cover the whole area where the mops may be. It appears that the mops actually extend out to the 50 meter contour. So I was thinking that one of the options that should be discussed is closing Stat Area 537 out to 50m depth for all or part of trimester 2.

The benefit is not only to protect spawning and juvenile squid but even more importantly the squid mops. Given that the squid boats are towing on the bottom where the mops are, they are damaging the mops before the natural process is complete. There is plenty of data available to prove that this is happening and the fishermen freely acknowledge it.

While a total closure for all of Trimester 2 would be a radical step, I am not sure how you protect the mops if you don't. It seems the mops may be there starting in late April and could be there into July.

I would also push Mass DMF to adopt mirror regs for the state waters.

There is no question in my mind that the fleet should stay away from the mops as much as possible.

What do you think?

thanks

steve

Dear Jason and Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council Members,

My name is Dick Grachek, I am the owner and retired captain of the F/V Anne Kathryn out of Point Judith, RI.

I rely on access to the squid fishery off Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard every year. I have been fishing there since the early 70's. Harvest from that area can comprise up to 50% percent of my annual gross income. In fact if it wasn't for the June Squid run off of Nantucket this year, I'd be talking to a bankruptcy lawyer about now. Our offshore grounds have been squeezed off by Marine Monuments closures and our RI Sound and Cox Ledge grounds are slated for hundreds of windmills as are the Squid grounds off of LI: Moriches, Southhampton, Montauk all the way west to Cholera Banks off of NY Harbor---BOEM has plans for some 1,430 wind turbines, each 650' tall, to go in this area from NY to Nantucket.

Restricting access to the RI Sound fishing ground for that Spring run of Squid will devastate my business, and the four families that rely on it for their income.

We have been fishing off of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket in Federal waters for over 45 years, and this year fishing the Squid run has literally saved our business in an otherwise financially bleak fishing year due to Fluke TAC cuts and the devastation caused by catch shares ITQs cutting more than 70% of the fleet out of the groundfish fishery.

The Squid we catch in RI Sound in June have already spawned and so the next generation is already in the works. These fish coming out of Martha's Vineyard Sound are headed offshore to spend their final days having completed their spawn and their life cycle. We fish the entire RI Sound area for this Squid run from 5 or 6miles off of the islands out to 20 to 25miles offshore. The Squid usually disperse in late July or so until they show up offshore for the Winter fishing. This Squid resource is as healthy as I've seen it in over 50 years and there is absolutely no biological reason for any closure. It is a tightly regulated fishery which essentially lasted for one month before it was closed down after reaching the trimester quota in late June. But this one Squid run can, and often does, mean survival for local vessels.

I have already been closed down this year with a National Monument, am facing a major Squid closure with the NY wind area, am facing a potential squid closure of Hudson Canyon due to its nomination by the NY Aquarium as a marine sanctuary, and the Baltimore Canyon as well. We are facing multiple closures directly south of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard with over 740,000 acres slated to become wind facilities and therefore closures to more and more vital fishing areas. Three of these lease areas have already been leased and are undergoing site assessment. I cannot afford to lose any more area.

Even partial closure will create a safety hazard, because too many vessels will be constrained to too small an area to maneuver, which is already going to be a problem if wind facility construction goes forward.

Please consider the biological realities and the consequences for local small fishing business---not the political pressure from a well-funded few---when you are considering any action on this very crucial issue. Crucial not only for my business but for the other CT, RI, and MA family fishing operations that depend on access to this area for the Spring Squid run---often in order to stay viable.

Sincerely,
Dick Grachek, Point Judith RI

November 30,2016

Dear Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council Members,

My name is Mark S Phillips and I am the captain/owner of the F/V Illusion and I have fished for squid in the Nantucket/Martha's Vineyard area for the last 36 years and it is a significant part of my income.

Creating another restrictive area will set a bad precedent for the whole coast where one gear type is given precedent over another, and in doing so we are arbitrarily saying one gear type is better than another an example of that is clam dredging will be allowed which is basically a 1000 hp pressure washer obliterating everything in its path.

If the council decides to go forward with this amendment they will be claiming that one fishery is more valuable than another. They will now be deciding stiped bass is more important than the squid fishery even though striped bass are not harvested in the EEZ.

Last summer was a phenomenal squid occurrence not only was there squid off Nantucket/Vineyard area, Georges bank was paved and would have produced more squid than the Nantucket/Vineyard area, the balls of squid were huge, only problem is this is a large mesh area of 6.5 inch twine. Not many squid stay in that mesh. One trip we landed 1200 lbs with a 6.5 inch square bag this was squid shaken out of the twine as much as 200 lbs shaken out in a tow. In 2012 that same phenomenon took place off of Long Island all because of environmental conditions.

This is a made up conflict to satisfy a small vocal user group who dislike commercial fishermen.

Thank You,
Mark S Phillips
210 Atlantic Ave
Greenport, NY 11944

Enclosed please find a photo of squid on George Bank.
[see below]



From: [Didden, Jason](#)
To: [COM - Squid Mack; Advisors - MSB \(minus Calomo\)](#)
Subject: FW: Maine Permit Issue
Date: Monday, November 28, 2016 10:06:00 AM

Please see below for some communication with GARFO/NOAA Fisheries on the Maine/northern permit issue in regards to a few questions I asked Peter Christopher...

Also, here is a draft agenda in terms of timing during the day:

Draft Agenda 12/1/2016 – Squid Amendment

10am – Introductions
10:10 am – Goals and Objectives Alternatives
11am – Capacity Reduction Alternatives
1pm – Lunch (brought in)
1:30 pm – Massachusetts Conflict Area, Trimester, and other Alternatives
5pm – Adjourn

From: Peter Christopher - NOAA Federal [mailto:peter.christopher@noaa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Didden, Jason <jdidden@mafmc.org>
Cc: Jennifer Anderson - NOAA Federal <jennifer.anderson@noaa.gov>
Subject: Re: Maine Permit Issue

On Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 9:11 AM, Peter Christopher - NOAA Federal <peter.christopher@noaa.gov> wrote:

My thoughts:

Q: For the Dec 1 meeting, my understanding from Carly was that allowing just one state to apply for new squid permits would not be possible under MSA ...

A: True. We discussed a very similar issue for Scallop Amendment 11 (LAGC and IFQ program) for the Northern Gulf of Maine (NGOM). We could not approve a program that limited qualification to residents of a particular state because it would very clearly violate National Standard 4 ("Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states..."). The Council could consider a limited access permit for specific areas (like we did for NGOM), but the application/qualification would have to be open to all and the landings criteria probably cannot link to the specific area. For example, the qualification could be a lower catch threshold, or a different period of time, and it would qualify a vessel to fish only in a specific area.

Q: ... but that if the Council wanted to generally split the quota into areas to ensure a certain amount of quota was available in different areas, that could be a possibility (but would likely substantially complicate the Amendment). Also, new entrants could buy a vessel or permit/permit suite if they wanted to enter the squid fishery.

A: This would look like the Herring FMP then, where vessels would qualify for an area-specific permit? I think that would be fine, as long as the qualification criteria aren't so area-specific that it would qualify only vessels from neighboring states. Herring qualifications, for example, were landings amounts that qualified them for area-specific permits (All Areas, Areas 2 and 3, and Incidental Limited Access), but there was no requirement that landings came from a certain area. And a non-limited access qualification thought on Q2: It would be fine to break the quota into different areas, but that runs a big risk of diluting the longfin quota and making it more difficult to manage and monitor. Without a doubt, some of the areas would have very small quotas (unless you break it up evenly) and its hard enough monitoring the whole quota when the fishery is going strong. This really seems to be outside the scope of the amendment. However, creating one new area for squid fishing for new entrants without undermining the goal of the amendment to reduce capacity, is in-line with the current purpose and need.

Q: Also, allowing some new permits would seem to run contrary to the main idea of the Amendment, reducing the numbers of vessels in the fishery.

A: It does seem to be contrary to the main goal, but I suppose someone could argue that if a fishery is emerging in a different area, consideration of additional qualifiers is warranted. In my experience in limited access programs, some vessel owners will argue that they held on to the permit so that they could fish for the species if it every came around in their area. To protect against undermining the purpose of the amendment for the broader squid fishery, it would be wise to consider new "entrants" only for limited fishing opportunity, either in amount, area, or both.

Hope that helps! Let me know if you have followup questions or would like to discuss before Thursday.

Pete