

Appendix C

Meeting Summaries from Individual Coastal Fishing Community Meetings

The following pages provide meeting summaries prepared by staff for seven coastal fishing communities discussions, including:

June 21, 2017: North Coast – Smith River
October 11, 2017: Central Coast – Atascadero
October 18, 2017: South Coast – Ventura
November 8, 2017: Central Coast – Monterey
October 5, 2017: South Coast - San Diego
June 1, 2018: Central Coast – Montara/Half Moon Bay
June 27, 2018: North Coast – Fort Bragg *
(This summary is not currently available)*

Commissioners

Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville

Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach

Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa

Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director

1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870*

Fishing Communities Discussion Meeting Agenda July 21, 2016, 1:00 pm

**Petaluma City Schools Board Room
200 Douglas Drive, Petaluma**

Meeting Goals:

- Opportunities for coastal communities to share their concerns
- Share lessons learned
- Identify process for next steps, if any

NOTE: All agenda items are informational and/or discussion only.

1. Welcome and introductions

Participants welcomed by President Sklar and Executive Director Termini who introduced attending FGC staff. Meeting participants introduced themselves; over 40 members of the public were in attendance.

2. Background of Commission fishing communities discussion

Susan Ashcraft, Acting Executive Deputy Director provided an overview of actions that led to the development of the fishing communities public discussion.

3. Identify In-Depth Discussion goals from Commission and participants viewpoints

Valerie Termini, Executive Director, explained the day was an informal discussion opportunity for FGC staff to hear input, viewpoints, and observations facing California's fishing communities from social, economic, and biological. The discussion was not an opportunity to open new fisheries, ask for regulatory changes, or grant new permits but rather an opportunity to hear from peers, look for common ground, and if possible identify new paths forward. Elizabeth Pope, Acting Marine Advisor identified discussion goals the as outlined in the agenda and asked that participants use discussion topics to help

identify goals that could help inform the specific questions that would be asked throughout the day and discussion guided by the questions included below designed to have fishing communities hear directly from each other, find common ground, and help provide a new frame of reference for moving forward. This was intended not only to inform but to help generate thoughts, ideas and potentially identify paths forward in the face of changing fisheries and ocean conditions seen throughout the state.

Common themes were heard throughout the day and often time revolved around the existing permit structure within state managed fisheries. Each agenda question was timed with common themes noted and a summary of themes reported back to the group for real-time input. Common themes and summary of discussion are included below. The entire discussion was audio recorded and is available at the FGC WEBSITE.

4. In-Depth Discussion and Dialogue:

Key topics and/or themes from each question are summarized below. Not all questions were discussed due to time constraints and dialogue overlap.

PART A: Understanding California's fishing communities - a community-based dialogue

Discussion Questions:

- 1) What defines a fishing community (port, region, fishery, state)?

Discussion summary:

A fishing community can be defined by a number of variables and can be a single or multiple ports however, a key component in defining a fishing community is that it is self-identified and relies on the work of that self-identified community regardless of geographic location and should build on trust and shared values.

Key themes:

- Common denominators: access to fish, infrastructure, and markets
- Port, where you fish from
- Importance of fishing to locale
- The port defines the community, desire to support local ports by permitting fishing of multiple species
- Community of fisherman who belong to a port with access to larger city (see SF) without necessarily living in that city/port
- The body of business and persons who rely on the work of the fisherman
- Community may move based on seasons or resource availability (home port vs. away ports)

(ES) Include both residents and the group of people who travel to the port

- Should recognize the transient existence of fleets and fishermen

Thank you for participating!

- Discussion of the federal definition
- Trust is an element, its been eroded among govt and industry
- Group of people with shared value and goal, connectivity
- Import to define what a fishing community is not – permit access

2) What makes a high quality working waterfront for California? Does that vary substantially across regions and ports or are there uniform needs that you can identify statewide?

Discussion summary:

Common elements expressed across ports revolved around understanding land use and zoning and how that can impact the development and long term sustainability of individual fishing communities. Discussion encouraged that fishing communities look at using:

Key themes:

- Adequate zoning and land use protection
- Cultural and political support, econ base (market, tourism), access to resources, and infrastructure (ice, fuel, etc.)
- Identify or establish funding sources to support infrastructure
- Serves as a connective force for several communities, not just about the locale or servicing one group or persons
- Universality of regulations; some ports more amenable than others. Streamlined permitting processes, access to information.
- Pacific to plate legislation
- Misappropriation of funds to use govt \$\$\$ to support startup which don't prioritize infrastructure first
- Fishery on the way up (as opposed to way down) (Herring vs. squid)
- Access to local fish ,modify to permit greater access
- North Coast problems related to reallocation of ground fish (federal)
- FGC needs to write a strong letter to PFMC that increased quotas should come to community fishing markets
- Access to resource to put in the dock for storage
- Good resource managers, need in-depth knowledge of fishery management
- Lack of ability (time or money) to attend meetings

Wrap Up:

Common elements expressed across ports revolved around understanding land use and zoning and how that can impact fishing community development. Discussion encouraged that fishing communities look at using:

Thank you for participating!

- Diversified approach to development of ports and target species
 - Appropriate land use when developing waterfronts
 - Understand permitting requirements (work closely with local and permitting agencies)
 - Expand zoning to include mixed used waterfronts that can still encourage working ports
 - Build on existing cultural/ economic/resources/infrastructure
 - Diversify fishing opportunities (large and small ports)
 - Understand the correlation between waterfront and resources
 - Recognize the need for fishery management expertise for resource managers
- 3) What are the changes in your fishing community that have affected productivity (e.g., aging infrastructure, biological changes from ocean conditions, access)?
- Existing permits lack access to resources
 - Drought impacts
 - Disease impacts
 - PDO cycle makes management tough to do effectively
 - Flexibility needed
 - Adaptive management
 - Not enough fisherman to feed people (food security)
 - Is management necessary with a depleted force and access?
 - Farmer regulations versus commercial fishing regulation/oversight
 - Loss of docks to county or muni governments (Masons Marina) (Long Beach)
 - Masons Marina held by Community Fishing Association
 - Port redevelopment does not include commercial fishing enterprise
 - Access to Farallon Islands lost
 - Access goes hand in hand with a reasonable quota (too small)
 - Letter to PFMC to correct the absurdity of co-management (need adaptive management)

Wrap up:

- Access, when access is granted but fed restriction applies
- Enviro impacts
- Uncertainty of ocean
- Diversification and nimble
- Physical loss of access
- Regulatory uncertainty

Thank you for participating!

- Nexus between fed/state management of state fish travelling over federal waters

4) What traditionally available resources relied on by your fishing community have changed, and how?

Not discussed

5) What characteristics of fishing communities are most important to protect or are the most vulnerable to change?

Not discussed

6) What are the current and foreseeable barriers to success for fishing communities in the current management structure (e.g., costs, permits, biological changes)?

Not discussed

PART B: Continuing the Discussion - Looking forward

Discussion Questions:

- 1) What does success look like for the future of California fishing communities given the changes that have occurred?
- 2) What localized efforts have happened to promote fishing communities? Can they be shared across fishing communities and working waterfronts?
 - a. Monterey story (presentation)
 - b. Community effort is important, communication with elected officials
 - c. FGC should adopt regs for open access to fish different species
 - d. Squid quota for NorCal (proposal denied by FGC)
 - e. Call for community to be solution oriented
 - f. Needs are different in different locales requires flexibility
- 3) Suggestions on moving forward? How can your fishing community directly move forward to promote opportunities for development (e.g., sustainably caught seafood co-operatives, working waterfront models, shared permits, diversify fisheries, etc.)?

5. Identify Next Steps

6. Meeting Close and Adjournment

Thank you for participating!

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville

Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach

Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa

Peter S. Silva, Member
El Cajon

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870*

Fishing Communities Discussion

North Coast – Smith River

June 21, 2017 Meeting Summary

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff.

Meeting Goals

- Opportunity for California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) staff to learn from coastal communities about their perspectives on observed changes in ocean ecosystems, marine resources and related harvest opportunities
- Discuss ideas for building stronger, more resilient coastal communities in the face of change
- Identify process for next steps, if any

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Commission Executive Director Valerie Termini convened the meeting at Howonquet Hall in Smith River at 3:00 p.m. Commission staff provided a welcome, reviewed meeting groundrules, and introduced Commissioner Hostler-Carmesin and Commissioner Williams, Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff, and introductions were made around the room. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussions was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) Current Concerns - Local Status Updates

- I. What are the changes in your coastal fishing community that have affected community productivity?
 - Discrepancy between sport fishing reporting and actual take from Cape Mendocino-north (extrapolation model is insufficient)
 - No credit for closures of yelloweye rockfish (constrains all other groundfish catch)
 - Marine protected areas (i.e., lack of access)
 - Aging and disappearing infrastructure

- Access to markets and buyers; buyers dictating markets
- Public health issues (harmful algal blooms, etc.) impacting marketability of products
- No young people in fisheries
- Worry about permit holders who aren't active who may start fishing again if their permits become transferable and lower the available quota per fisherman
- Competition with Oregon for processing capabilities, as well as market, mostly because of Oregon's Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification

II. What localized efforts have happened to promote your fishing community, if any? How can these efforts be supported by the Commission, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other agencies?

- Fishing community sustainability plans (referred to as "CSPs") happening in other fishing communities (Monterey, Eureka, Shelter Cove, etc.) could provide a model for other areas
- The port exists to serve fishermen, but is operating in the red; there is not enough processing infrastructure so product is trucked elsewhere
- MSC certification → when Oregon fisheries are certified but California fisheries are not, California is less competitive
 - Shrinking fleet means less money for the port (especially shrinking recreational fleet)
 - Consolidation problems
- How can the Commission support?
 - Institutional change → adopt a fisheries policy supporting fishing communities
 - Should access Pacific Fishery Management Council observer data to better manage fisheries
 - Manage a fishery by managing fishermen
 - Even small amounts of allowable bycatch can be very helpful/profitable

(B) Future Vision for Ports and Fisheries

I. What is your vision for what your port should look like in the next 5-10 years? What is in the way of accomplishing that vision?

- Community co-ops → state subsidized?
 - Fishers agree to sell all landed catch to one place, fishers are investors, profits get split amongst fishers who participate in the co-op
 - Commission sets boundaries but fishermen manage the resource as a community → case study of the lobster fishery out of Santa Barbara
- More regionally-focused permit structures

- More engagement with federal fisheries managers
 - Experimental fisheries permits (e.g., squid)
 - Improved buyer participation
 - Rebuilding waterfront infrastructure to support fishing activities
 - Need to pique the interest of the public in preserving the working waterfronts (need to be able to engage with them if they are going to care about the future of waterfronts)
 - As permits retire, take them under state control and re-allocate to young fishermen
 - Economic studies that account for impacts beyond the resources and include impacts to entire communities
 - More open access and less limited entry
- II. What aspects of management influence your ability to be adaptable or flexible in your fisheries?
- Need to streamline the permitting structure/procedure
 - Re-distributing “retired” permits to young fishers/new entrants
 - Managing access and entrants → set standards for entrants?
 - Difficult to diversify in fisheries
 - Physical access (beaches, etc.)
 - Addressing local governments takes too long; need to educate authorities of their duty to protect fishermen
 - Waterfronts that are being gentrified

(C) Actions Moving Forward

- I. How can your fishing community directly move forward to promote opportunities for development?
- Diversify fisheries
 - Develop community permits (co-ops)
 - Fishermen participation in tagging/collecting data, sampling
 - Need guidance on interacting and working with county fish and game commissions
- II. How can the Commission support these efforts?
- Marine protected areas (MPAs) should be examined for effectiveness and if they’re not working they should be removed
 - Develop a fishing community sustainability plan at state level
 - Adopt a fishing community policy
 - Permit transferability (in deeper nearshore)
 - Ability to pass licenses on to other fishers, family members, and apprentices
 - Make permits more easily transferrable within an apprenticeship program (e.g., no fees, lower fees)

- Create incentives for participation (in lieu of enforcement)
 - California Department of Fish and Wildlife could identify next generation and incentivize participation
 - Want ability to pass permits on to children
- Driver license-type test for fishermen for merit-based system
- Streamline/standardize permitting processes/structures
- Include fishermen in MPA collaboratives
- Look at regional science when setting restrictions (e.g., bycatch)
- Resource-based take instead of license-based take formulas
- Future projections should take into account geography/topography (e.g., conditions in the north versus the south)
- Regional fisheries committees
- Reward successful/responsible fishers
- Respect/support fishermen/women
- Support community economics
- Stock assessments for all fished species
- Re-examine historical policies and their impacts on coastal fishing communities

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that these meetings will be continued up and down the coast in order to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville
Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870*

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITIES DISCUSSION

October 11, 2017 Meeting Summary

Central Coast – Atascadero

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff. Input from participants on questions posed in the agenda is captured in bulleted format below each question.

Meeting Goals

- Discuss challenges and opportunities facing fishing communities
- Discuss how the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) can contribute to more resilient fishing communities
- Identify priorities for your fishing community

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Commission Executive Director Valerie Termini convened the meeting at Spring Hill Suites by Marriott in Atascadero at 4:00 p.m. Commission staff provided a welcome, reviewed meeting ground rules, and introduced Commissioner Silva and Commissioner Hostler-Carmesin, Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff, and introductions were made around the room, where there were over 22 members of the public in attendance. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussion was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) What are the biggest challenges to long-term resiliency that you and/or your fishing community are facing?

- Retailers and commercial fishermen are struggling to achieve annual catch limits and are facing potential allocation cuts
- Marine Spatial Planning: Proposal by Trident Winds for the offshore wind energy development project
 - Potential impact on fishable area, especially when combined with marine protected area (MPA) closures
 - Fishing between windmills is a safety issue
 - Impact of wind energy cables on fishing
 - Input on environmental community is split between green

- energy and protecting habitat
 - Wind farms in Rhode Island have been problematic: installation was challenging, scallop grounds were encroached upon, harbor travel and sonar were negatively impacted, they work inconsistently and are inefficient
- Marine mammals (more specifically, sea otters) that prey on abalone species have slowed recovery and have prevented reopening of commercial fishery

(B) What aspects of state fisheries management impact the sustainability of your community?

- Fishery closures
- Over-regulation and difficulty in deciphering regulations
- Commercial aquaculture impacts on port dynamics
- Marine mammal predation on finfish populations
- Sea otter predation on abalone populations
- Fish farm failures
- Small bait fish commercial fishing fleet utilized as a release opportunity (Buddhist community in Marina del Rey)
- Difficulty in obtaining a trap endorsement for nearshore permit

(C) What actions can the Commission realistically take to address these concerns short and long term?

- DFW should support for fishermen
- Establish a year-round fishery with more areas to fish, and open up hatcheries/new technology for local salmon fisheries
- Request for the State to use its leverage to ensure large corporations/companies assist in mitigating impacts to fishery communities
- Partnerships with key agencies are necessary to evolve infrastructure
- Regulate the current increase in marine mammal populations
- Augment profitability of commercial fisherman
- Rotate fishery closures to open areas to fisherman for access
- Consider opening the recreational red abalone fishery south of San Francisco

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that these meetings will be continued up and down the coast in order to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

The meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville
Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITIES DISCUSSION

October 18, 2017 Meeting Summary

Southern Coast – Ventura

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff. Input from participants on questions posed in the agenda is captured in bulleted format below each question.

Meeting Goals

- Identify priorities for your fishing community
- Discuss challenges and opportunities facing fishing communities
- Discuss how the Commission can contribute to more resilient fishing communities

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Commission Executive Director Valerie Termini convened the meeting at the E.P. Foster Library in Ventura at 4:00 p.m. There were over 21 people in attendance. Commission staff provided a welcome, introduced Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff, reviewed meeting ground rules, and introductions were made around the room. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussion was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) What are the biggest challenges to a successful fishing/ocean-dependent industry in your area? (e.g., infrastructure, limited seasons/catch, complexity of regulations, etc.)

- Seasonal closures limiting access to markets
- Cheap foreign fish are brought in for live fish market
- Challenges with directing/alternative marketing access
- Lack of clarity in permits and licenses involved in direct markets
- Decreased business profitability with increased fish taxes

- Retaining docking and shoreside access within ports and harbors
- Redevelopment processes that reduce commercial and recreational fishing to the harbor (e.g., Channel Islands Harbor)
 - Fishing is a low priority for budget with the California Coastal Commission (CCC)
 - They are not taking the California Coastal Act requirements to maintain commercial fishing harbor space and facilities in harbors (Public Resources Code Section 30703)
- Small communities have a difficult time advocating for their access needs
- Moratorium on commercial abalone fishing continues to have impacts
- Commission rejection of possible commercial abalone fishery at San Miguel Island
- Climate change impacts
 - Loss of habitat (e.g., decline in kelp forest ecosystems)
- Coastal erosion
- Increased fishing fees reduces fishing opportunities
- Difficulty in establishing an aquaculture farm
- Increased harbor business costs
- Lack of money to dredge harbor mouth due to decline in fisheries landings volume
- Difficult for new fisherman to access permits
- Conflicting regulations between federal and state laws for shark fins
- Difficulty in making permit transfers
- Data gaps in fishery management (e.g., lack of lingcod data)
- Difficulty in determining legal recreational sheephead size when lengths shrink after being filleted
- Lack of storage for boats and equipment due to coastal gentrification and repurposing of storage warehouses

(B) Fisheries and port conditions have changed over the past 20 years. What do you want your port to look like 20 years from now?

- The Commission to interact with the CCC to strengthen local ports
 - Zoning for self-marketing
 - Coastal-dependent storage use for boats and equipment
- Diversified local fishery sources and reliable port infrastructure
 - More commercial fisheries, such as a small commercial abalone fishery open at San Miguel Island or other islands where the stock has rebound
 - Possible shellfish aquaculture if in synergy with continued commercial fisheries; together these can support reliable port infrastructure

(C) What policies or new regulations would you like to see the Commission develop to help you meet future goals?

- Encourage access to direct marketing/alternative marketing and incorporate into fishery management plans (FMPs)
- Streamline licensing involved in direct marketing
- Address infrastructure needs and zoning within harbors
- Clarify FGC engagement and interagency permitting process for new aquaculture ventures in State waters
- Implement artificial reefs to increase fish habitat and mitigate erosion
- Make permit transfers easier for young fishermen
 - Non-transferrable permits should be returned to the entity and reissued to another fisherman when no longer utilized
- 12-month from date of purchase sport fishing license
- Increase species in hatcheries for release into ocean (e.g., California halibut brood stock)
- Increase stability and local control
 - Permits tied to ports
 - Spatial management for equity in access
- Owner-operated fishing
- Avoid consolidation of fishing access
- Community permit banks to purchase permits
- Limit time (sunrise to sunset) for sea cucumber and for ridgeback prawn trawl fishing to protect the resource
- Reconsider experimental commercial abalone fishery for San Miguel Island as a test case for new approaches

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that these meetings will be continued up and down the coast in order to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville
Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITIES DISCUSSION

November 8, 2017 Meeting Summary

Central Coast – Monterey

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff. Participant responses to questions posed in the agenda are captured in bulleted format below each question.

Meeting Goals

- Identify priorities for your fishing community
- Discuss challenges and opportunities facing fishing communities
- Discuss how the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) can contribute to more resilient fishing communities

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Susan Ashcraft convened the meeting at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Monterey at 6:00 p.m. Commission staff provided a welcome, reviewed meeting ground rules, and introduced Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff. Introductions were made around the room, where approximately 27 members of the public were in attendance. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussion was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) What are the biggest challenges to a successful fishing/ocean dependent industry in your area? (e.g., infrastructure, limited seasons/catch, complexity of regulations, etc.)

- Dramatic declines in number of fishing vessels, processors and fishery diversity in local ports resulting from Federal programs (trawl buy-back, loss of trawl individual quota shares) and limited entry programs; loss of Monterey commercial fishing heritage and culture

- Restricted fishing access
 - Federal trawl fishing closures in Monterey Bay waters
 - Most productive fishing grounds and areas of easy access were closed
 - Federal over-regulation of groundfish (e.g., rockfish conservation areas)
 - No restored access to areas where species have recovered
 - Limiting access minimizes the market and the economic value
 - Demand for buying local, yet fishermen have limited access to catch and land locally
 - Access to permits: either unavailable or economically infeasible to purchase
- Prohibition on leasing permits limits flexibility
- Limited career trajectory for young fisherman
- Post-harvest regulations are a barrier to entry for new fishermen
- Cultural knowledge lost with the retirement of older fishermen
- New definition of bycatch in Marine Life Management Act (MLMA) is threatening to fisheries
- Need discussion of food system management and natural resources management

(B) Fisheries and port conditions have changed over the past 20 years. What do you want your port to look like 20 years from now?

- Elements of infrastructure (e.g., buyers, ice, dock, areas to fish) that lead to more interest in fisheries
- Flexibility in management

(C) What policies or new regulations would you like to see the Commission develop to help you meet future goals?

- Reopen closures
 - Reopen trawl fishing areas
 - Reopen closures closer to the harbors
 - Part-time openings in state parks
- Implement adaptive management in the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA)
- Consider Alaska's limited entry commission as a model for new restricted access programs
- Make permit leasing more accessible
- Adopt FGC principle of not supporting imported seafood
- Implement experimental fisheries to expand long-term fishing opportunities
- Streamline post-harvest regulations

- Apprenticeship program for new entrants
 - Opportunity for experience for young fishermen
 - Regulatory power for fishermen with more certifications/experience

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that these meetings will be continued up and down the coast in order to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President

Saint Helena

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville

Anthony C. Williams, Member
Huntington Beach

Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa

Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director

1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320

Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 653-4899

www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITIES DISCUSSION

December 5, 2017 Meeting Summary

South Coast – San Diego

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff. Participant responses to questions posed in the agenda are captured in bulleted format below each question.

Meeting Goals

- Identify priorities for your fishing community
- Discuss challenges and opportunities facing fishing communities
- Discuss how the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) can contribute to more resilient fishing communities

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Valerie Termini convened the meeting at Handlery Hotel in San Diego at 6:00 p.m. Commission staff provided a welcome, reviewed meeting ground rules, and introduced Commissioner Holster-Carmesin, Commissioner Burns, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff. Introductions were made around the room, and approximately 25 members of the public attended. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussion was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) What are the biggest challenges to a successful fishing/ocean dependent industry in your area? (e.g. infrastructure, limited seasons/catch, complexity of regulations, etc.)

- Deteriorating infrastructure
 - Need increased investment in ports
- Barriers to access
 - Permit availability is limited

- Difficult to move between fisheries
 - Lost fishing access due to Shelter Island ramp construction
- Difficult for younger fishermen to start a fishing career
- Limited catch data available
- Food system viability
- Tijuana River sewage spills polluting fishery
- Transboundary issue
 - Difficulty in importation process of fish caught recreationally in Mexico due to recreational fishing possession regulation in California
- Difficulty in understanding/deciphering commercial fishing regulations due to existing management structure complexity
- Concern about marine spatial planning with respect to aquaculture
- Need transparency for money that has been contributed from fishing
- Population increase of predators (e.g., sea lions)
- Increased fees and landing taxes

(B) Fisheries and port conditions have changed over the past 20 years. What do you want your port to look like 20 years from now?

- Developed infrastructure that accommodates fishermen's needs
 - Adequate pier size
 - Offloading resources
 - Local markets

(C) What policies or new regulations would you like to see the commission develop to help you meet future goals?

- Establish an apprenticeship program for new entrants
- More direct marketing to involve the community
- Co-management practices that allow flexibility for local fishermen to make decisions
- Increase connectivity between local fishing and food systems
- Implement artificial reefs to increase habitat for fish populations
- Support the hatchery program and its expansion
 - White seabass program is effective
 - Consider a California halibut and yellowtail hatchery program
- Develop new fisheries
 - Experimental box crab fishery development is underway
- Educational support for underutilized local species in the market place
 - E.g., "San Diego-caught" marketing
- Implement a 12-month from date of purchase sport fishing license instead of calendar year
- Promote pier fishing to bring young fishermen into the industry

- Implement a fee for non-consumptive users utilizing the resource
- Intermediary between commercial fishing and DFW
- Extend the electronic tickets deadline from 24 hours to 1 week
- Eliminate fish fraud in the market place
- Streamline permit transfers between family members
- End permit fee increases
- Need to collect more data to fish more diverse fisheries

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that these meetings will be continued up and down the coast in order to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President

Saint Helena

Anthony C. Williams, Vice President
Huntington Beach

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin Member
McKinleyville

Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa

Peter S. Silva, Member
Chula Vista

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Valerie Termini, Executive Director

1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320

Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 653-4899

www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

COASTAL FISHING COMMUNITIES DISCUSSION

June 1, 2018 Meeting Summary

Central Coast – Half Moon Bay/Granada

The following is a summary of the meeting as prepared by staff. Input from participants is captured in bulleted format below each question posed in the agenda.

Meeting Goals

- Identify priorities for your fishing community
- Discuss challenges and opportunities facing fishing communities
- Discuss how the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) can contribute to more resilient fishing communities

1. Welcome, Background, and Goals

Valerie Termini convened the meeting at the San Mateo County Harbor District at 4:00 p.m. Commission staff provided a welcome, reviewed meeting ground rules, and introduced Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff, and introductions were made around the room, where approximately 13 members of the public were in attendance. A brief background on the coastal fishing communities discussion was presented, and the meeting goals and structure were identified.

2. In-depth Discussion and Dialogue

(A) Challenges: What are the biggest challenges to a successful fishing/ocean dependent industry in your area? (e.g. infrastructure, limited seasons/catch, complexity of regulations, etc.)

- Data-poor fisheries management constrains recreational fishing opportunities
 - Federal stock assessment process needs revision
- Difficulty in deciphering recreational fishing regulations due to existing

management structure complexity

- Different regulations for nearshore versus offshore
- Lack of simple information clearing houses
- Difficult to interpret legal boundaries of rockfish conservation areas (RCAs) that meander
- No warnings for laws
- Lack of information available for recreational angler boundaries
- Restricted fishing access and spatial management
 - Large marine protected area (MPA) fines keep fishermen away from geographical boundaries – they keep a buffer to avoid unintended violations
 - Access to Deep Reef, one of the most productive spots in port area
 - Fishing is concentrated in nearshore areas due to RCAs
 - Layout of Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCA) are arbitrary and cause Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel operators to avoid previously productive areas for risk of unintended violations (this is especially unique to this port)
 - Limited seasons/catch and underutilized species (i.e., limited access to chilipepper rockfish due to RCA-imposed depth constraints)
- Deteriorating infrastructure
 - Need improved fuel facility
 - Limited hours to receive fuel
 - Lacking storage
 - Broken ice machine

(B) *Adapting:* How do you adapt when key fisheries you engage in are not viable, or close?

- Ripple effect: moving into different fisheries (i.e., fisherman turned to squid and sablefish after salmon crash)
 - More emphasis on bottom fish with loss of salmon
- Economic ripple effect: less expenditures with decreased opportunities

(C) *Future:* Fisheries and port conditions have changed over the past 20 years. What do you want your port to look like 20 years from now?

- Allow for bubble (pop-up) fisheries
- Regulation for tier allocation (crab and salmon)
- New generations of fishermen entrants
- Increased education of commercial fishing
- Genetic testing to clarify ranges
- Bycatch tracking

- Electronic representation of current fishing regulations at each port
- Modernization of infrastructure (e.g., credit card machine for fuel house)
- Continued support for recreational and commercial fisheries

(D) *Commission response: What policies or new regulations would you like to see the commission develop to help adapt to uncertain conditions and meet future goals for your port?*

- Revise Federal stock assessment process
- Lower commercial and sport fishing license costs
- Permit 12-month sport fishing licenses from date of purchase
- Support apprenticeship program for new entrants
- Establish free fishing day to increase opportunities and interest for young fishermen entrants
- Implement requirements for a net and descending device on board to reduce bycatch mortality

3. Next Steps and Wrap-up

Commission staff provided a brief recap of what was learned from the meeting and explained that there will be one last meeting held in Fort Bragg to learn more about the regional challenges faced by fishing communities. Staff thanked meeting attendees for participating and explained that a meeting summary will be posted to the Commission website (www.fgc.ca.gov).

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville

Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa

Peter S. Silva, Member
Jamul

Samantha Murray, Member
Del Mar

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov
www.fgc.ca.gov

Placeholder for summary for meeting 7.