



## Workshop Goals and Materials

### **Workshop Goals**

- Understand Commission direction on policy development
- Orient participants to materials that served as the starting point for drafting a potential coastal fishing communities policy
- Provide input on staff's initial draft language and structure
- Collaboratively contribute to the next iteration of a potential coastal fishing communities policy
- Develop shared understanding of next steps and additional opportunities for engagement

### **Materials**

#### I. [Background documents packet:](#)

1. Project Background for Public Workshop, dated February 7, 2022, and exhibits:
  - 1.1. *Staff Synthesis Report on California Coastal Fishing Communities Meetings, 2016 – 2018*
  - 1.2. Table of Public Comments related to staff recommendation #1
  - 1.3. Staff summary and exhibits from Nov 9, 2021 MRC meeting, agenda Item 6

#### II. [Meeting materials packet:](#)

1. *Policies Adopted by the California Fish and Game Commission: Questions and Staff Answers*, dated February 18, 2022
2. *Initial Draft Coastal Potential Fishing Communities Policy Language Drafted by Staff*, dated February 18, 2022
3. *Table Connecting Specific Stakeholder Input to Staff-Drafted Policy Language and Goals*, dated February 18, 2022
4. *Examples and Excerpts of Existing Ocean and Fisheries Policies*, dated February 18, 2022

## Participant Feedback on Initial Draft Policy Language

### **General Feedback**

- Policy is conservative and builds on things that are already being done. Some concern that the policy is only reflective of actions already being taken. It is important for the policy to lead to real change.
- Expressed appreciation for effort and affirmed which concepts are on-point.
- Reconsider word choices, especially the word “consider,” could try “develop,” “evaluate and adopt,” “identify,” “use,” or “will adopt.”
- Deciding and planning for how to implement the policy if adopted is critical.

### ***Policy Section I***

- Some agreed that aquaculture is an appropriate addition, whereas others suggested that the policy should only focus on fishermen.

### ***Policy Section II***

- Highlight the social science and human-dimensions research more. Think about how understanding what is happening in the community can help identify appropriate management actions.
- Include references to the impacts of climate change and fisheries emergencies that have impacted coastal fishing communities from an economic and social perspective.
- Include the cultural heritage specific to tribes as long-time stewards of coastal waters.
- Include acknowledgement of the partnerships between the fishing industry and the Department, including participation in credible research and data collection efforts that support management, and being proactive in recommending management changes.

### ***Policy Section III***

- No input was provided.

### ***Policy Section IV, Goal A***

- Mention timeliness and urgency of filling data needs and describe what the data looks like (high quality, robust, timely).
- Consider a scoping and review of potential management actions to evaluate how action will affect all parties involved.
- Need port representation or a liaison between fishing community and Commission and Department.
- Successful implementation of this goal will require the involvement and engagement of the fishing industry.
- The focus on analyzing proposed management measures is insufficient; it should also explore industry-imitated management needs if fishery conditions change and spur the need for new or reevaluated management action (e.g., if market dynamic shifts or ecology or climate change shifts).

### ***Policy Section IV, Goal B***

- Add sub-bullet about reaching out to communities; suggest bringing pieces of Commission's JEDI plan into this policy.
- Support illuminating concerns of fishermen and risks to fishing communities from outside stressors and initiatives in the policy.
- Add phrase "championing fishermen/fishing communities" into the policy.
- Request recognition for fishermen assisting with information-collection. Add language that encourages finding new ways to utilize information collected by fishermen to fill data gaps. Using their data will build trust and provide cost-savings benefits.

- Highlight that fishermen’s engagement in data collected is port-specific. Engaging a greater diversity of fishermen in data-collection can add to collective understanding.
- Recognize existing data collection efforts and mention the need to expand on them.
- Need to think about implementing this in a way that will build trust between Commission, Department, and fishermen.
- State that fishermen also have expertise on seeing what makes a fishing community work.

***Policy Section IV, Goal C***

- Suggest incorporating the idea of resilience in economic goals.
- State that management options should not destabilize existing fishery management policies (e.g., restricted access policy).
- Put what makes economic sense to the fishermen at the forefront when considering management options.
- Address permit holders that do not actively use their permit.
- Implementation of this needs careful planning.
- Prioritize what is best for the broader fishing community or fishery, not necessarily the individual fisherman.

***Policy Section IV, Goal D***

- Appreciates the inclusion of the Experimental Fishing Permit (EFP) Program as a pathway.
- Include ways the Commission and Department can take the EFP Program experiment and put it into practice.
- Recognize that there are barriers to entry and that there should be greater opportunities for fishermen to adapt.
- Supports including language about maintaining existing fishery management policies (e.g., restricted access policy). Policy could strengthen the language around it. Established fisheries need assurances that they are not going to be disadvantaged.

***General comments and questions raised by participants that may require additional exploration for potential development in the draft policy or may be relevant to the implementation stage of an adopted policy:***

- What in the policy simply memorializes what is already being done and what in the policy would be a “pain point” that would be a radical change for Department operations? The policy should implement new actions though they may at first be a challenge.
- The policy seems vague and abstract, especially in the goals section, prompting questions:
  - What are new data streams (Goal A) and how would the policy provide direction on their use by Department and Commission (e.g., citizen science and non-governmental data streams)?

- What information will we need and how will it be used to make hard decisions?
- What are the real-world applications of the policy concepts? How will this policy be taken up by the Department?
- How will these goals be achieved?
- How will this policy be implemented? How will the Commission and Department incorporate new data and engagement into management?
- How will the Commission enable new entrants into fisheries in a manner that does not threaten the balance of the resource and economic livelihood for existing fisheries? Those who have invested into developing today's fisheries did so because they were confident of long-term stability; how will this be implemented without threatening them? Engage diverse participants to figure out creative solutions.
- New processes require funding to implement: how will actions be prioritized?
- How do the Commission and Department support fishermen?
- Consider how to better leverage fishermen's on-the-water expertise as well as expertise on what make a fishing community work. Co-production of science is crucial, not just to fill data gaps, but also to build a productive dynamic and establish trust between fishermen and the Department.
- Agree with the concept of establishing port-by-port representation (i.e., liaisons) or small working groups to structure informational exchanges directly with Department and Commission related to different needs within individual ports. Many approaches were discussed and need to be developed.
- Ask the fishing industry to identify on which issues they would appreciate the Commission to engage. In exchange, fishermen need guidance on what information is needed by the Department and Commission.
- Is the Commission advocating for new open access fisheries in this policy? Expressed concern that this will override the limited entry structure, which is intended to manage the fishery, not exclude fishermen.
- Can the Commission help fishermen more with some of the issues that are occurring outside of the Commission venue, but dramatically impact fishing communities, such as federal fisheries data and models?
- The Commission does not have any members that understand commercial fisheries. Would like to see this change given the significant impact of Commission decisions on the commercial fishing industry.

### **Next steps**

- Summarize the discussed topics that need further development and prepare a summary of workshop outcomes to distribute to participants and post online.
- Integrate suggested revisions to existing initial draft policy language where possible and present workshop outcomes, the revised initial draft policy, and key issues for further exploration to the MRC at its March 24, 2022 meeting.
- MRC discussion and direction on next steps in developing the draft policy, including a preferred venue for receiving feedback on the next iteration of the coastal fishing communities policy.