

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 7:49 AM
To: FGC
Subject: Fw: Transfer of Nearshore Permits

FGC members.....Please see attached email. These issues never were delt with as of date. Craig Shuman left his post with the FGC shortly after our contact.
Roger Cullen.

On Saturday, August 3, 2013 7:41 AM, [REDACTED]

Good morning Tom.....I never made it to the commission meeting, we did a back to back trip. This was the letter I sent Sonkie a while back. Two transferability issues here... I will forward Shuman's responce as well. Good fishing.... Roger.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: roger cullen [REDACTED]
To: "Sonke.Mastrup@fgc.ca.gov" <Sonke.Mastrup@fgc.ca.gov>; "paul.hamdorf@wildlife.ca.gov" <paul.hamdorf@wildlife.ca.gov>
Cc: "anita.biedermann@fgc.ca.gov" <anita.biedermann@fgc.ca.gov>; "marci.yaremko@wildlife.ca.gov" <marci.yaremko@wildlife.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2013 9:07 AM
Subject: Transfer of Nearshore Permits

I want to bring an unforeseen but what has now become a substantial problem to the Departments attention, the transferring of California Nearshore Permits as currently outlined in the Nearshore Management Plan. Shallow Nearshore Permits are currently transferable on a two to one basis until the capacity goal for each region is met with only one exception, death of a permit holder. This has been the practice now for several years with many transfers occurring at this ratio. We are at a juncture now where permit holding fishermen find it near impossible to sell these permits because of the unavailability to find another. I have talked to DFG personnel and this management practice was never meant to be a burden on our fishermen but at the time a precautionary measure for what was an unknown balance between resource and harvest effort. This is now not the case as harvest effort has reached consistent levels through the years and the TAC is consistently not being utilized. There is no mechanism for new entrants into the fishery at this time that is working.

Now here is an even bigger problem. Deeper Nearshore Permits are not transferable at all. Qualifying criteria still hangs in limbo. Many fishermen that have sold their Shallow Nearshore Permits over the years and still hold the Deeper Nearshore Permit. Many Shallow Permit holders do not have a Deeper Permit. Sounds confusing.....it is when we are really talking about one nearshore depth zone. I was involved in the development of the Nearshore Management Plan which started at the 1999 Rockfish Symposium in Monterey. The reason we have the Shallow/Deeper Permits was due to an act of omission of some nearshore species well after the process was underway. What this has lead to is a poor conservation practice that needs responsible action now. Nearshore fishermen that currently do

not have both permits regularly catch both groups species in the execution of their harvest effort. Depending on which permit they have allows which species can be retained. Mortality rates are high even when responsible release methods are practiced. This is particularly the case fishing waters 60 feet and beyond where I have seen an average 30 percent mortality of brown gopher cod. By the way, brown gopher cod like the black and yellow are in the shallow nearshore category but primarily in the deeper range of the nearshore zone. Other nearshore species are also commonly found in all depths of the tidal range depending on sea conditions. This to me is an inexcusable waist of a valuable resource.

I am going to suggest one potential solution that could be a win win for conservation and stakeholders alike. I am requesting that the Department take action to allow Nearshore Permit holders that currently have both shallow and deep permits transferability on a one to one basis. I am suggesting that fishermen that posses only the deeper permit be allowed to transfer that permit on a one to one basis to only single shallow permit holders. The same transferability rationale to be applied to the single shallow permit holder without the deeper permit. This may be the incentive to promote the combining of the majority of nearshore permits as it really should be and could clean up much of this problem. This hurts no current permit holders but allows flexibility in the sales of these permits as well as a mechanism for new entrants into the fishery. If one elects not to sell a permit under this criteria the two to one transfer requirement would remain.

I know the Department's time has always been a demanding recourse particularly with the recent MLPA MPA process, but the time to correct this problem is well overdue. I am willing to discuss any other solutions or ideas regarding the above. I look forward to your earliest possible response.

[REDACTED]