

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 Summary 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:

- Diversified approach to development of ports and target species

Thank you for participating!

- 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!