

Summary of Crab Disaster Relief Written Comments

Total of 67 written comments **between July 13 and July 18, 2018 5:00pm** and are organized by representative fishery sector.

For an overlook of the options being discussed, please reference the following presentation given by the Department during the webinar hosted on July 18, 2018:

Dungeness Crab and Rock Crab Disaster Relief: Overview and Options for Consideration

Proposed Distribution by Sector

Dungeness crab Commercial Fishermen:

1. Commenter supports majority of allocation go towards direct payments to fishermen.
2. Commenter supports 10% mitigation/research allocation go towards increasing laboratory capacity/sample processing, while at least 50% go towards licensed/permitted fishermen in disaster year. Participation during disaster season should not be criteria for or against eligibility. Supports distributing equally, but weighted by trap tier. Businesses should be eligible by filing a claim for losses, if this >40% then all claimants are awarded same percentage of claim.
3. Commenter supports basing landings history on the 2015-2016 season and the two years prior, and that only active permits in recent seasons and during disaster season should be considered for dispersal of funds.
4. Commenter supports that fund should be disbursed based on previous year's production and that a permitted boat who chose not to fish during disaster season should not receive compensation.
5. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier with at least one landing being made during the (disaster?) season.
6. Commenter supports that fund should be disbursed equally and not weighted by trap tier. If the decision to use trap tier is made, then the lower tier permits should be compensated more than the larger tier permits.
7. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier as simple method to calculate compensation.
8. Commenter supports option that does not use landings history in order to compensate those who just bought a permit during disaster season and entered the fishery, thus have no landings history associated with permit.
9. Commenter supports equal share be distributed across the active permits that participated in the fishery in the season prior to the disaster and those that participated

in the year of the disaster so as not to exclude any new entrants that just purchased a permit.

10. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.

11. Commenter supports disaster relief for permitted fishermen.

12. Commenter who is a permitted vessel and a Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel (CPFV) was impacted in both sectors of fishery and delay resulted into shortened time spent that season as CPFV. Supports Option 2 and that last three years/seasons be used to calculate average. Commenter doesn't support equal share as this would award inactive permits. Commenter seems to support distribution be either based on tier divisions and or previous landings history.

13. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.

14. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier as fair option as Option 2 gives preference to those permits that chose not to fish during affected season.

15. Commenter lost permit but is supportive of equal shares weighted by trap tier.

16. Commenter supports using mitigation funds to increase laboratory capacity and compensating fishermen for retrieving samples. Commenter is supportive of Option 2, and not in favor of Option 1 since it would award those that chose not to fish during disaster season and is not in favor of Option 2, sub-option A since it would penalize those that made landings during disaster year and had expenses.

17. Commenter does not support that fishing activity during disaster season be eligible criteria to receive disaster funds as they have had long history of fishing every season up until disaster season and delay was so long in their home port area, they had to take on other jobs as a source of income.

18. Commenter supports distribution of relief fund be based on those who held permit during disaster season and not compensate new permit holders who entered fishery after disaster season.

19. Commenter went Dungeness crab fishing during disaster season, but delay affected business decisions and prevented them from doing other jobs they normally would have conducted when season opened in spring months and doesn't want to be considered ineligible for disaster fund based on fishing activity during disaster season.

20. Commenter supports hybrid approach to options of equal share weighted by trap tier and landings history to arrive at fair and equitable calculation. Is supportive of helping new entrants who might have had larger expenses (i.e. loans) on newly purchased permits. Calculations should be based on permits not vessels. For these newly purchased permits, commenter suggests using recent season landings during 2016-17 and 2017-18 for new entrants to fishery.

21. Commenter support a minimum landings criteria to qualify (i.e. 5 deliveries of at least 500 pounds) prior to disaster season. Suggests that permit holders that hold out-of-state permits be excluded since they had potential to fish in other 2 states that had large crab seasons that year and buyers that import crab should also be disqualified.
22. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and thinks that landing history will complicate calculation.
23. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.
24. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and supports California Department of Public Health conducting domoic acid testing and establishing chain of custody. Other boats should be quickly brought in to do testing for those ports that don't want to test.
25. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and states this is simplest approach to compensating participants in sector.
26. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.
27. Commenter states that equal shares is easiest to determine, however using landings history is a more fair option.
28. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.
29. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier as least burdensome calculation and would not produce lengthy appeals process that might delay disbursement of funds. Not in favor of Option 2, sub-option A. Commenter states they were affected by delay in reduced dock sales during disaster season since they missed holiday markets.
30. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.
31. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and criteria to qualify if no landings during disaster season then qualify by a California landing in any one of three previous years or in any year after disaster year, while those permits with no qualifying landings would receive a smaller stipend.
32. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and if permit didn't fish during disaster season they are not eligible for disaster relief. Also, agrees with PCFFA representative's comments made during webinar.
33. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and requests 1% be set out and allocated for state wide associations/federations to better mitigate future disasters and that funding such entities would be in line with the proposed 10-30% mitigation distribution proposed.

34. Commenter supports equal shares, that all permits be compensated equally.

35. Commenter supports equal shares to all.

36. Commenter supports equal shares weighted by tier and that permits qualify based on prior 1-2 season landing history and/or 1-2 season post landings. States that this is the simpler option that should mitigate time-consuming, costly appeals. States that participating in disaster season should not negatively affect disaster relief so is not in support of Option 2, sub-option A. Also states that minimum criteria for eligibility should be fishing activity on the permit prior to disaster season.

37. Commenter supports equal shares weighted by trap tier or Option 2, sub-option B, and that this be based on an average using the 2 seasons of landings before the closure and 2 seasons after. States this option would help new entrants in the fishery that did not have a previous history of landings on their permit. Commenter also supports 10% allotment to mitigation/research.

38. Commenter supports 1% of mitigation costs go towards PCFFA and their efforts.

39. Commenter supports equal shares option weighted by trap tier and states that this option would prevent costly appeals based on landings history that would hold up the disbursement process.

40. Commenter supports 1% of mitigation costs go towards PCFFA and their efforts.

41. Commenter supports 10% allocation to mitigation and supports Option 2, sub-option A as this takes into consideration actual loss. Suggests using 3-4 seasons prior and the season following the disaster for this calculation. If equal shares is chosen for commercial Dungeness crab permits then this should also be applied to processors and CPFVs.

42. Commenter supports hybrid option where 50% of the funds to fishermen be distributed based on equal share weighted by tier and the remaining 50% be distributed based on landings history. Recognizes that this is not a simple option, but would support the various interests within the fleet, small and large production permits.

43. Commenter supports equal shares across all qualifying permits, and supports 1%, under mitigation, be directly distributed to statewide fishery associations and federations, as they support fishing community and would serve to mitigate future disasters.

44. Commenter supports equal shares across all qualifying permits, and supports 1%, under mitigation, be directly distributed to statewide fishery associations and federations, as they support fishing community and would serve to mitigate future disasters.

45. Commenter supports 1% of mitigation costs go towards PCFFA and their efforts.

46. Commenter supports 10% allocation to mitigation/research and has specified that funds be used to purchase a new DA sampling machine for the CDPH Richmond laboratory facility and that domoic acid testing procedures (i.e., preparation and cooking) be systematically reviewed.

47. Commenter doesn't support 10% allocation to mitigation/research, but supports that oversight of these future projects go through industry and the DCTF. Commenter does not support funding fish processors/buyers since they had other fishery options available to them and fishermen did not. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier and suggests minimum landings qualification of 5,000 pounds per year for 2 years preceding the disaster year to qualify a permit for relief funds as the fastest way to calculate disbursement, and thus speed up processing time.

48. Commenter supports equal shares across all qualifying permits, and supports 1%, under mitigation, be directly distributed to statewide fishery associations and federations, as they support fishing community and would serve to mitigate future disasters.

49. Commenter supports Option 2, sub-option A.

50. Commenter proposes that distribution be based on landings during disaster season 2015-16, but that those vessels that began fishing in District 10 be weighted differently since they were also able to start fishing in parts of northern California after the 30 day fair start period ended. At the very least, eligibility should be based on at least one landing during the 2015-16 season. Doesn't support equal share weighted by trap tier since lower tiers can produce more than higher tiers. Also has question on who qualifies since their permit was purchased in 2016 permitting year.

51. Commenter supports that most of the funds be directed towards direct payment to industry and that 10% or less be spent on mitigation/research and that this portion of the fund only be spent on testing infrastructure. Commenter supports equal share weighted by trap tier.

Dungeness crab Processors:

1. Commenter supports Option 2, sub-option A that takes into consideration disaster season landings.

2. Commenter supports looking at last 10 seasons with December 1 start date in place since they consider the holiday markets that don't occur during those seasons delayed to crab quality, and supports 10% allocation to mitigation.

3. Commenter supports Option 2, sub-option B, and that this be based on the 3 years/seasons prior to disaster season.

4. Commenter supports Option 2, sub-option A, since this takes in to consideration the extent of the disaster impact on individual businesses and the piecemeal opening of the fishery during the delayed disaster season.

5. Commenter suggests production tiers similar to fisherman's tiers determine allocation among processor/buyer sector and that equal shares be weighted by these tiers. Offers these tiers as an example, suggestion:

a) Over 5 million; \$500,000

b) 1 million to 5 million; \$250,000

c) 100,000 to 1 million; \$150,000

d) Under 100,000; \$25,000

6. Commenter suggests that Department take in to account totality of market impacts and is willing to work on this framework. Commenter otherwise supports Option 2, sub-option B.

7. Commenter suggests that Department take in to account totality of market impacts as landing receipts alone are limiting to calculating loss and working with industry to provide input on this plan. Commenter disappointed in abbreviated time-period to review options. Commenter otherwise supports Option 2, sub-option B and for landings history be based on 3 or 5 seasons prior to disaster season. Supports 10% allocation minimum to mitigation/research.

Dungeness crab Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFVs):

1. Commenter supports looking at prior trip history based on daily landings especially in November and December months when they do combo trips (Dungeness crab and rockfish) and states they lost an entire recreational charter season since groundfish closes Dec 31.

2. Commenter supports Option 2. Commenter states that they had many reservations booked for the first 2 months of the season for combo trips (Dungeness crab and rockfish) for the first 2 months, more than any other season.

3. Commenter states that fishery closure hurt business that relies solely on Dungeness crab trips since rockfish closes prior to the start of the Dungeness crab recreational season and other charter trips within family were also affected (i.e. whale watching trips) by reduced tourism to area.

4. Commenter states they just started Dungeness crab trips during disaster season and proposes that past vessel log data not be used to determine this distribution among participants.

Rock Crab

Northern Rock Crab

1. Commenter supports Option 2 as this based on recent fishing activity for unrestricted permit.

Southern Rock Crab

1. Commenter represents Santa Barbara port and supports Option 2, sub-option B for licensed fishermen sector and Option 2, sub-option B for Processor/Buyer sector
2. Commenter supports fund being used to reducing renewal fees of rock crab permits.
3. Commenter supports equal share option for rock crab permits
4. Commenter does not support 10% allocation as this much more than rock crab sectors portion and shared further opinions on use of mitigation funds. Commenter doesn't support equal shares since many rock permits are inactive. Supports Option 2 and that payments be based on landings history for both the southern and northern rock crab permits while for new entrants using the two years of landings following the disaster year.