

Name: Michael Shepherd

Email: sheponfishing@yahoo.com

Topic: Summer Flounder 2021 Recreational Specifications

Comments: I am from South Jersey and I am requesting a change in summer flounder regulations for recreational fishing. Because current regs require the harvest of females, I am suggesting a reduction to 16 inches for the minimum to be a "keeper". The season should be extended. An earlier start would benefit fishers and stakeholders in South Jersey. It has been documented that bigger fish are here in S.J. as early as April.

ps: hopefully the comment format can be made easier to find and use to get more participation from fishers, stakeholders and general public.

Name: Stuart Fries

Email: stutag1@gmail.com

Topic: Summer Flounder 2021 Recreational Specifications

Comments: I have been a Fisherman for 84 years... I am a very active tagger for 35 years with the American Littoral

Society, having tagged over 11,000 fish, with about 9,500 being Summer flounder (fluke). It is not my personal concern in my keeping more and smaller size fish, but it is most unreasonable in my opinion to have so many unhappy recreational anglers, particularly the many occupants of party fishing boats. The current limits in New York State that provide for minimum size of 19 inches with maximum of 4 keepers,

should be changed! You might want to make a slot size, and if not, amend the minimum size to 17 or 18 inches. It is not necessary to have a maximum limit of 4 keepers. 17 or 18 inches would be preferred, and a maximum limit of 3 fish (or even 2 fish) to take home. I want the angler who spends his time and money enjoying the day, to go home with something!

Name: Harvey Yenkinson

Email: vetcraft@aol.com

Topic: Summer Flounder 2021 Recreational Specifications

Comments: I would like to comment on the proposed fluke/sea bass/ scup commercial/recreational proposed quota allocations. When the revised MRIP data was implemented, management adjusted stock status size, mostly from MRIP data (recruitment played a part too). After accepting MRIP changes for stock size status, the commercial sector was given a 49% (3.98 million pounds) increase in quota

It seems only logical and fair, that if NOAA is going to accept new stock size predictions based on new

MRIP data, and subsequently raise the commercial quota (and recreational RHL), that MRIP data be used to correct the allocation quotas based on the same MRIP numbers

As illustrated in the briefing comments, a decrease in commercial quota, can often be made up in ex vessel price which tends to increase with decreasing supply. Furthermore, the commercial sector just realized a 49 % increase in quota giving the sector an in poundage mentioned above.

If the commercial sector loses some poundage due to a change in allocation, the sector is still experiencing an increased quota over what it was prior to MRIP revisions. If the commercial sector were to lose 10% of allocation (1.1 million pounds), the sector has still enjoyed a substantial increase in quota over pre MRIP revision quotas.

I would further comment that a catch based allocation (like is currently used for scup) should be implemented for fluke and sea bass as well. This system penalized each sector for its' own dead discards. By utilizing this methodology, sectors would be more likely to adapt measures that would reduce the inefficiency in both sectors.

I further would suggest that quota allocation be based on similar years of inclusion to when the original quotas were established.

Based on all of these comments I would choose:

Fluke: option 1 a 2

Scup: option 1 b 3

BSB: option 1 c 2.

As far as phasing in the allocations, I would choose option 1 d 3 as I feel that is most fair to the commercial sector

As far as quota transfers, I would choose option 2a status quo. I choose this as I think quota transfers are a poor practice, causing maximum pressure on our species. When a quota is not used, it allows the stock to rebuild in that time frame.