From:
 McNamee, Jason (DEM)

 To:
 Duhamel, Peter (DEM)

Cc: <u>brian loftes</u>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] : FLUKE

Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 1:29:53 PM

Peter, the comment below is for the public record.

Thanks!

-J

From: brian loftes <bkloftes@live.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 1:20 PM

To: McNamee, Jason (DEM) <jason.mcnamee@dem.ri.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] : FLUKE

Jason I would like to express my opposition to a weekly fluke limit.

We went to great lengths to change last year's change, back to a biweekly limit so I hope we will remain with biweekly.

How ever the limit works out is fine as long as we have to weeks to catch them.

Thanks, Brian

From: BRENT LOFTES < bloftes@hotmail.com > Sent: Monday, November 9, 2020 5:12 PM
To: Lake, John (DEM) < john.lake@dem.ri.gov >

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] : Brent Loftes

Hi John, I am unable to attend the zoom meeting that is happening this evening. Regarding the weekly vs. biweekly proposal for the fluke aggregate this winter I am in favor of the bi-weekly opposed to the weekly possession limit. I know I spoke to you on the phone about it. The weather is usually an issue and sometimes takes 2 weeks to be able to get out so when we are able to get offshore safely we obviously want to catch as many as we're allowed to limit our exposure. And also due to the COVID situation, if prices are going to be lousy like they have been then we would want to catch as many as possible to compensate for lame prices. Thank you for your consideration. If there is a more formal place I should be posting my comments could you please let me know where to find it.

Thanks Again.

Brent Loftes F/V Asher & Ariana 401.363.6495 From: David Borden < <u>lizzy.2@charter.net</u>>
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2020 8:50 AM

To: Mcmanus, Conor (DEM) < Conor.McManus@dem.ri.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Multi state landing program

Thanks for answering my questions yesterday.

I would like to make one point in regards program administration and how it affects discards. If the Division intends to continue the multi-state landing initiative, I suggest you do so in a broader context than the current single species effort. Example: If RI and Conn agree to multi state landing program for summer flounder, it may also make sense to consider inclusion of other species like black sea or scup, as all three species are generally captured during the summer period. My concern is that you don't want to set up an incentive which encourages vessels to discard some species in order to meet the summer flounder landing requirements of the sister state. That could be avoided if you broadened the species in the program.

Obviously this needs to be discussed /negotiated on a state by state basis, so I think the Division should retain the authority to determine which species are included in the program.



RI DEM 235 Promenade Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Duhamel,

We would like to ask DEM to consider our suggestions for the 2021 trip limits for both fluke black sea bass.

We suggest:

Fluke: 4,000-pound bi-weekly limit starting January 1st 2021

Black Sea Bass: 750-pound weekly limit starting January 1st 2021

Starting with such limits will spread the quota out more and not leave the possibility of a glut of fish at the end of the fishery period, crashing prices.

Thank you for considering our suggested trip limits.

Sincerely,

Katie Almeida Fishery Policy Analyst





RI DEM 235 Promenade Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Duhamel,

We would like to ask DEM to consider the following requests to the RI permitting system:

- 1. Remove 90-day limit to apply Exemption Certificate to a new vessel. We do not feel that a time frame should be necessary when looking to replace a vessel. It can take years to find the right size/tonnage vessel to match the federal permit. If a time limit must be set that limit should be no less than 5 years.
- 2. Remove requirement that the Exemption Certificate be linked to vessel's federal permit. This would benefit the fishermen and the state of Rhode Island, by allowing the fishermen to keep the RI permit to put on their new vessel AND keep Rhode Island quota on Rhode Island vessels. This will allow the fishermen to retain the RI fluke permit history. Again, the 90-day limit needs to be expanded. Refer to my comments above.
- 3. Remove requirement that the Exemption Certificate be automatically transferred when change in vessel ownership occurs unless stated otherwise in a written agreement. For the same reasons above this will allow the fisherman to retain their RI exemption permit and keep RI fluke in RI.
- 4. <u>Baselines.</u> Requiring baselines for any of our fisheries would only add a burden on the vessel owner as they are not necessary due to the quotas that we have on our state species. I would like to request that the DEM consider removing the requirements for baselines altogether.

Thank you very much for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Katie Almeida Fishery Policy Analyst



TOWNDOCK.COM INFO@TOWNDOCK.COM PH 401-789-2200 | FAX 401-782-4421 Kenneth T Murgo Trident Fisheries LLC. RI MP License #001365 Kenneth.Murgo@gmail.com (401) 368-4397

Subject: Written Comments on Proposed Commercial Black Sea Bass Regulations for 2021

Dear RIMFC,

I am writing in support of the industry proposal which I made to adjust the summer and fall seasons and allocations for 2021 Black Sea Bass (BSB) management. The inspiration for my proposal came when this past summer the July sub-period ended without filling its allocated quota. I asked the Division of Marine Fisheries if there was any possibility of keeping the season open into August. I was informed that because August was closed by regulation that it would be difficult but not impossible to re-open the fishery to consume the un-used quota. The final conclusion was that because the leftover quota was only enough to support a short opening that it was not feasible.

This got me thinking; in every summer and fall sub-period in 2020 the daily limit was doubled to 100lbs per day early in the sub-period. However, if the daily limits were left at 50lbs per day there would have been un-used quota in each of those sub-periods that could have been allocated to August to keep the fishery open. I can personally attest that last August I caught BSB in the upper, middle and lower Narragansett Bay, as well as around the oceanfront, Block Island and Coxes ledge. It is not a stretch to say that every single RI commercial fisherman has access to BSB in August. Having the BSB season closed while the fish are so abundant and widespread in RI waters is inefficient, uneconomical, and causes unnecessary discards. With the increase in BSB quota RI received last year I believe having the fishery open the entire time BSB are plentiful in RI waters should be prioritized over increasing the daily limit. The warm waters of August bring on a natural lull in the lobster and whelk fisheries that many fishermen rely on; being able to land BSB at this time would be a boon to all RI commercial fishermen. Scup trapping is an option some of us turn to, but it really hurts our profitability to have to discard the valuable BSB that come up in the traps along with scup all August long.

What I tried to create with my proposal was a fishery that could be open from May 1st to Dec 31st at 50lbs per day without having any closures if the quota allows. I did not want to mess with the winter sub-period as that is the realm of offshore fishermen and I support their proposal to start that sub-period at 750lbs/day. That leaves us with 75% of the quota to allocate from 5/1 to 12/31. I am open to any suggestions as to alternative sub-period dates and quota allocations that accomplish the goal of having the fishery open while BSB are abundant in RI waters. In re-organizing the sub-periods to accomplish this goal I tried to make minimal changes to the existing framework while keeping in mind that the Division of Marine Fisheries needs at least 10% quota to properly manage a sub-period.

Thank you for your consideration, Ken Murgo

From: <u>Michael Matulaitis</u>
To: <u>Duhamel, Peter (DEM)</u>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Flounder exemption

Date: Friday, November 13, 2020 3:38:29 PM

November 10, 2020

Michael Matulaitis F/V Rose Marie 6 Sherwood Court Old Tappan, NJ 07675

Dear Mr. Lake and Mr. Duhamel,

My name is Michael Matulaitis 111 Wintergreen Ln., Brewster, MA. I have held a RI nonresident restricted finfish license for 27 years. Prior to this, I held an instate multipurpose landing permit for 9 years. The F/V Rose Marie has landed Summer Flounder in RI from May 1985-August of 2018.

My partner Frank Mazza and I owned the F/V Rose Marie before it caught fire in August of 2018. Rose Marie Inc. is a Rhode Island corporation and the federal permits are held there until replaced by another vessel or sold. My name and Rose Marie are on the current Summer Flounder certificate of exemption number 90, issued on 12/14/1995.

The Rose Marie's federal permits are held in Confirmation of Permit History (CPH). The vessel was a complete loss and the insurance company sold the vessel to another entity and it retains the same federal permit number but not the same Moratorium Rights Identifier Number (MRI). This is confusing. The application for RI Summer Flounder Exemption Renewal went to the new owner of the hull. I found out about the new process from another fisherman. Our exemption could have been in jeopardy had I not been notified.

I urge the DEM to consider using federal indentifiers such as CPH and MRI for vessel replacement and permit history for this renewal process. F/V Rose Marie fished for Summer Flounder exclusively in federal waters. I would also recommend dropping the gross and net tonnage requirements for vessel replacement as per federal regulations.

In closing, Rose Marie Inc. should not lose any fishing rights in RI with the implementation of these new proposed rules.

Sincerely,

Michael Matulaitis (508) 280-0490



November 19th, 2020

Peter Duhamel
DEM Division of Marine Fisheries
3 Fort Wetherill Road
Jamestown, RI 02835

Dear Mr. Duhamel,

I am writing to suggest the following for 2021 fishery regulations:

- 1. Black sea bass: We are in favor of the industry proposal that increases the Winter 1 starting possession limit to 750 lbs/vessel/week. We are not in favor of the industry proposal that increases the summer period, this would most likely result in an early shut down with the increased participation during that period. We are in favor of increasing the fall period possession limit to 100 lbs/vessel/day.

 We are not in favor of the option with removing the summer closure period, we do not believe there is enough fish to make it through the summer without avoiding a closure.
- 2. Fluke: We support the industry proposal that increases the Winter Aggregate program to 4,000 lbs/vessel/bi-weekly. If it seems as though the industry is going through the quota too fast DEM can always decrease the landings limit down to 2,000 pounds. Avoiding dropping below 2,000 pounds is important as it is hard to make a trip for 1,000 pounds at this time of year profitable.
- 3. We support the industry proposal removing the stipulation that an Exemption Certificate automatically stays with the vessel upon sale or transfer of the vessel. This will allow RI residents to keep their RI fluke permit. We also support the industry proposal that removes the requirement that an Exemption Certificate must remain attached to the federal permit on the vessel when it was initially issued.
- 4. We support the industry proposal that extends the time period for a vessel owner to apply their Exemption Certificate to a replacement vessel upon a sale or transfer. A five-year time frame would give the vessel owner ample time to search for and if needed schedule the repairs a vessel might need without the risk of them losing that permit. If the DEM is uncomfortable with that time frame perhaps the formation of a permit bank



or a CPH style program could be constructed to retain these permits to avoid their loss.

- 5. We would also like to recommend that DEM remove any baseline requirements. With the quotas that we have on the species the state manages, it seems that baselines are an unnecessary restriction.
- 6. We support Rhode Island participation with Massachusetts in a multi-state landings agreement for black sea bass.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our suggestions.

Sincerely,

Katie Almeida Fishery Policy Analyst

