

STAFF SUMMARY FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2015

8. FISHING COMMUNITIES**Today's Item****Information** **Action**

Explore the developing concerns about the sustainability and vitality of California's fishing communities and ports and what, if any, role FGC has in this issue.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- MRC initial discussion Mar 4, 2015; Marina
- **Today's scoping** **Nov 4, 2015; Ventura**

Background

Eleven public ports and numerous harbors dot the coast and waterways of California. Adjacent coastal communities that are reliant on certain fisheries and the fish harvesting industry are often referred to as "fishing communities," at various scales. Fishing communities depend on a number of conditions and players to sustain their vitality.

Over the past 15-plus years, many fishing communities have been confronted by challenges associated with changes in fishing or economic opportunity. Examples of challenges include fisheries management changes (e.g., management responses to address overfishing, overcapitalization and excess capacity in fisheries; loss of fish habitat, and fishery/area closures for species listed under the Endangered Species Act or federal rebuilding plans); environmental fluctuations in diversity, abundance, and distribution in fish assemblages, including those associated with climate change; and economic challenges related to increased competition in the global marketplace, and the recent economic downturn in general. The destabilizing effect of these challenges, and fishing/coastal community vitality and resilience, is a topic of active conversation along the Pacific coast, and nationwide (see exhibits 1-4).

FGC referred this agenda topic to MRC in 2014 following a petition from three northern California fishermen for new permits to fish for a more southerly species that had shown up in unusually high numbers due to warm water conditions. The petitioners, as well as supporters from northern California fish businesses and city representatives, made their case in support of the petitions based on the economic needs of local coastal communities reliant on fishing. While the specific request could not be granted without a lengthy regulatory and stakeholder process, FGC asked MRC to explore the issue of coastal community needs and the highlighted concerns.

Originally scheduled for discussion at the March 2015 MRC meeting, time constraints only allowed for an initial and very limited discussion. Today, staff will initiate further conversation with an overview of "fishing communities," guiding principles from the MLMA, and a report on current initiatives underway in California at the federal and local levels. One of the goals today is to hear from community members themselves, who are vital to clarifying the scope of the issues relevant to California fishing communities (see exhibits 5 and 6 for some perspectives originally submitted for the March 2015 MRC meeting).

STAFF SUMMARY FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2015

Significant Public Comments

1. Assemblyman Jim Wood has expressed concerns about the needs of northern California coastal communities (Exhibit 5)
2. The California Wetfish Producers Association (CWPA) supports discussing the big big-picture issue of sustainable harbor communities (Exhibit 6)

Recommendation

Solicit public input on the scope of issues of concern regarding California's fishing community vitality and resilience, and evaluate if there are areas where FGC can play a role. What types of views, values, and concerns do different stakeholders, including coastal fishery participants, currently hold, and what can contribute to resilient fishing communities? What is the role that fishermen and local communities can play, that FGC and its policies can play, and how can stakeholders effectively engage and represent the concerns of their communities to help create more efficient and effective management?

Exhibits

1. [California Sea Grant Extension Program webpage on fishing communities](https://caseagrant.ucsd.edu/project/discover-california-commercial-fisheries/fishing-communities) (<https://caseagrant.ucsd.edu/project/discover-california-commercial-fisheries/fishing-communities>), accessed Feb 26, 2015
2. [Ocean Protection Council webpage on preserving California's fisheries](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/preserving-californias-fisheries/) (<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/preserving-californias-fisheries/>), accessed Oct 28, 2015
3. [Maine Sea Grant, Best Practices for Working Waterfront Preservation: Lessons Learned from the Field, Mar 2013](#)
4. [National Working Waterfront Network webpage for Trinidad Harbor case study](http://www.wateraccessus.com/case_print.cfm?ID=31) (http://www.wateraccessus.com/case_print.cfm?ID=31), accessed Oct 28, 2015
5. [Letter from Assembly Member Jim Wood](#), received Jan 26, 2015
6. [Email from Diane Pleschner-Steele, CWPA](#), received Feb 12, 2015 (minus attachments)

Committee Direction

Provide guidance on next steps to consider fishing community needs.



Extension Program

[Focus Areas](#) [About Us](#) [Biographies](#) [Projects](#)

[Healthy Coastal & Marine Ecosystems](#) [Resilient Coastal Communities](#) [Safe & Sustainable Seafood Supply](#) [Climate Change](#) [Education](#)



Discover California Commercial Fisheries

- [Fishing Communities](#)
- [Fisheries Seasonality](#)
- [Statewide Commercial Fishery Activity](#)
- [Measuring Commercial Fishery Activity](#)
- [The Ocean Environment](#)
- [Management Context](#)
- [Regions](#)
- [Regional Seafood Posters](#)

Safe & Sustainable Seafood Supply

- [Aquaculture Resources](#)
- [California Seafood Council](#)
- [Collaborative Trap Fishing Research](#)
- [Discover California Commercial Fisheries](#)
- [Healthy Ocean, Healthy City](#)
- [Improving Yields of Farmed Pacific Oysters](#)
- [Managing Data-Poor Fisheries](#)
- [Safe Oysters](#)
- [Safe Seafood](#)
- [Seafood NIC](#)
- [Seafood Training](#)

[Home](#) » [Focus Areas](#) » [Safe & Sustainable Seafood Supply](#) » [Discover California Commercial Fisheries](#) » [Fishing Communities](#)

Fishing Communities

Fishing communities are an important part of California's maritime heritage and economy and its coastal and ocean ecosystems. Viable commercial fisheries require not only healthy marine resources and habitat, but also people and businesses to support fishing activities. Those activities, in turn, support local economies and provide seafood to consumers.



According to the Federal Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, a fishing community is defined as

... substantially dependent on or substantially engaged in the harvest or processing of fishery resources to meet social and economic needs, and includes fishing vessel owners, operators, and crew and United States fish processors that are based in such community.

However, a fishing community depends on these players and more to thrive and to get the catch to consumers. For example, harbors provide hoists, docks, boat slips and other amenities that are critical for offloading the catch, and provide "safe harbor," protecting boats and people from potentially severe weather and ocean conditions. Likewise, marine supply, electronics, boat maintenance, and other businesses are essential for keeping fishing boats operating safely and effectively. Together, fishing operations, these support businesses, and the people who run them, are dependent on one another for their livelihood and well-being. As communities, they are connected to each other socially and economically, both locally and across regions.



And although the definition above focuses on communities as geographic places, fishing



communities also may be defined by shared occupation or interest. Examples include the West Coast groundfish trawl fishing community and the southern California sea urchin and sea cucumber dive community.

Information Sources

Clay P.M., and J. Olson. 2008. Defining 'fishing communities': Vulnerability and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act. *Human Ecology Review* 15:143-60.

Norman, K., J. Sepez, H. Lazrus, N. Milne, C. Package, S. Russell, K. Grant, R.P. Lewis, J. Primo, E. Springer, M. Styles, B. Tilt, and I. Vaccaro. 2007. *Community Profiles for West Coast and North Pacific Fisheries: Washington, Oregon, California, and Other U.S. States*. Seattle, WA: NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 602 pp.

Pomeroy, C., and M. Dalton. 2003. *Socio-Economics of the Moss Landing Commercial Fishing Industry*. Report to the Monterey County Office of Economic Development and the Moss Landing Study Steering Committee. Salinas, CA: Monterey County Office of Economic Development, 134 pp.

Pomeroy, C., C. Thomson and M. Stevens. 2010. *California's North Coast Fishing Communities: Historical Perspective and Recent Trends*. California Sea Grant Technical Report T-072, La Jolla: California Sea Grant, August, 340 pp.

[Pacific Fishery Management Council \(PFMC\): Habitat and Communities: Fishing Communities](#)

[Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission \(PSMFC\)](#) [Pacific Fisheries Information Network \(PacFIN\)](#) and [Fisheries Economics Data Program \(EFIN\)](#)

California Sea Grant part of NOAA's [National Sea Grant](#) network of university-based programs.

Website produced by California Sea Grant Extension, UC San Diego ©2011. All rights reserved. Suggestions and questions [contact us](#).

UC San Diego
California Sea Grant Extension
9500 Gilman Dr., #0232
La Jolla, CA 92093-0232



Stay Connected:



State of California Ocean Protection Council

Preserving California's Fisheries



The waters off California's coastline boast some of the most productive fisheries in the world and as a result, the state is defined by its rich fishing heritage. The OPC is committed to preserving and restoring California's valuable fisheries and the communities and people that depend on them.

California's fisheries are faced with many threats including pollution, habitat destruction, overfishing, and climate change. Each of these challenges can contribute to declines in fish numbers and changes in distribution that in turn threaten fisheries and associated businesses. Pursuing innovative policies and projects to help restore and promote our fisheries is a top priority for the OPC. The OPC views its mandate as an opportunity to address the underlying problems facing California's fisheries, not just the

symptoms.

The OPC is working to improve fisheries management throughout California by pursuing innovative community-based or cooperative management and supporting further implementation of the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA). The [Marine Life Management Act Lessons Learned Project \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/mlma-lessons-learned-project/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/mlma-lessons-learned-project/) is now a complete report which was led by a six-member team to evaluate the successes and challenges of the implementation of the MLMA. The evaluation provides recommendations to assist future MLMA efforts by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and California Fish and Game Commission (Commission). The Collaborative Fisheries Research (CFR) Organization will be a venue for commercial and recreational fishermen, academic scientists, coastal managers, tribes, non-governmental organizations, and funders to discuss and prioritize existing and emerging fisheries management data needs. Once established, the CFR Organization will also provide grant funding to support collaborative research projects that address these needs.

A primary focus of the OPC is to provide grant funding that directly supports fishermen, communities, and businesses that are willing to investigate and pursue new management approaches. In 2009, the OPC released the California Fisheries Challenge, a competitive grant program that offers fishermen and communities in the state an opportunity to submit proposals that will improve and sustain long-term fishery health and sustainability. The [California Fisheries Fund \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/california-fisheries-fund/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/california-fisheries-fund/) is another innovative undertaking that offers loans to California fishing communities, groups, associations, and businesses to assist in transitioning to more environmentally and economically sustainable fishing practices and governance. This is particularly important when conventional investment capital or loans from traditional financial institutions may not be available. The first loans and lines of credit from the California Fisheries Fund were distributed to a fisherman, a dockside fish buyer, and a distribution company from the Central Coast in 2009.

Much of the OPC's fishery work is also aimed at partnering with DFG to more fully achieve its mandate. In 2006, the OPC and DFG developed the Joint Workplan, which included a wide variety of projects funded through an \$8 million appropriation. These projects focus on collecting and analyzing essential data to apply to the decision-making process and improving DFG vessels and equipment. The data collected pertains to

marine ecology, essential habitats, species interactions, natural processes that affect fish populations, survey techniques, and data report methods.

The OPC tackles important fisheries issues by working with a wide range of stakeholders including commercial and recreation fishermen, state and federal fisheries managers ([California Department of Fish and Game \(http://www.dfg.ca.gov/\)](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/)), the [California Fish and Game Commission \(http://www.fgc.ca.gov/\)](http://www.fgc.ca.gov/), and [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration \(http://www.noaa.gov/\)](http://www.noaa.gov/), NGOs, academia, tribes, and others.

Related Projects

- [California's North Coast Fishing Communities: Historical Perspective and Recent Trends \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/CA_NCoastFCP.pdf\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/CA_NCoastFCP.pdf)
- [San Francisco Fishermen's Wharf Sustainable Seafood Market \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/12/san-francisco-fishermens-wharf-seafood-market/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/12/san-francisco-fishermens-wharf-seafood-market/) – 2010 Pilot Season
- [Collaborative Fisheries Research Organization \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/08/collaborative-fisheries-research-organization/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/08/collaborative-fisheries-research-organization/)
- [California Sustainable Seafood Initiative \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/03/california-sustainable-seafood-initiative/)
- [Central Coast Groundfish Project \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/05/central-coast-groundfish-project/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/05/central-coast-groundfish-project/)
- [Dungeness Crab Task Force \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/)
- [California Fisheries Fund \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/california-fisheries-fund/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/01/california-fisheries-fund/)
- [San Luis Obispo Sustainable Fisheries Support \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/10/san-luis-obispo-sustainable-fisheries-support/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/10/san-luis-obispo-sustainable-fisheries-support/)
- [Moss Landing Sustainable Fishing Feasibility Study \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/12/moss-landing-fisheries-market-project/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/12/moss-landing-fisheries-market-project/)
- [San Diego Sea Urchin Fishery Project \(http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/08/san-diego-sea-urchin-fishery-project/\)](http://www.opc.ca.gov/2010/08/san-diego-sea-urchin-fishery-project/)



Quick Links

[Calendar \(/category/meetings/\)](#)

[Japanese Tsunami Marine Debris Information \(/2012/06/information-on-efforts-to-address-marine-debris-resulting-from-the-2011-japanese-tsunami/\)](#)

[Sea Level Rise Task Force Guidance Document \(/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/\)](#)

[California Permitting Guidance for Ocean Renewable Energy Test and Pilot Projects \(/2011/12/california-permitting-guidance-for-ocean-renewable-energy-test-and-pilot-projects/\)](#)

[OPC Strategic Plan \(/strategic-plan/\)](#)

[Approved Resolutions \(/category/resolutions/\)](#)

[Funding Opportunities \(/category/funding-opportunities/\)](#)

[Documents Open For Public Comment \(/category/publiccomment/\)](#)

[Contact the OPC \(/contact-us/\)](#)

[OPC/SCC Project Viewer \(/project-viewer/\)](#)

[Back to Top](#)

[Help](#)

[Conditions of Use](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Privacy](#)

[Contact Us](#)

California Ocean Protection Council • 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311 • Sacramento, CA 95814

Copyright © 2015 State of California

BEST PRACTICES FOR WORKING WATERFRONT PRESERVATION: LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FIELD

MAINE SEA GRANT

MARCH 2013

This report was prepared by Maine Sea Grant, as part of the Sustainable Working Waterfronts Toolkit project funded under Investment Number 99-07-13873 from the U.S. Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EDA or its members, NOAA, or the U.S. Department of Commerce.

I. Overview

The *Sustainable Working Waterfronts Toolkit* seeks to engage and educate working waterfront stakeholders by helping to draw connections between abstract tools and concrete on-the-ground examples of successful implementation. The Tools in Action Work Group compiled a collection of 19 case studies of communities and states from around the country that demonstrate the implementation of a variety of tools for sustaining working waterfronts. Providing models of how tools have been used previously can be extremely helpful, especially as successful initiatives often utilize multiple tools.

II. Toolkit Case Studies by Region

A. Northeast

1. Gloucester, Massachusetts (Gloucester, MA)
2. Outreach and Education as Tools to Address Working Waterfront Issues in Maine (Outreach and Education in Maine)
3. Portland, Maine: Balancing Maritime Uses and Waterfront Diversification Through Municipal Zoning (Portland, ME)

B. Mid-Atlantic

4. Enabling Legislation in Virginia Establishes The Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority (Public Access Authority)
5. York River/Gloucester County, VA: Balancing Conflicting Uses Through Stakeholder Engagement (York River, VA)

C. Southeast

6. Collaborative Efforts to Retain Port Salerno's Diverse Maritime Heritage (Port Salerno, FL)
7. High and Dry Boats & Residents in Ponce Inlet: A Waterfront Property Owner Goes to Court to Enforce Florida's Growth Management Act and Invalidate a Municipal Referendum Prohibiting a Dry Stack (Ponce Inlet, FL)
8. Mayport Village Case Study: Using Litigation to Protect a Historic Florida Fishing Village from a Proposed Cruise Ship Terminal (Mayport Village)
9. North Carolina Water Access Study Committee Yields Major Results in Water Access Protection (NC Water Access Study)

10. Port of the Miami River Water Dependent Land Use Litigation Case Study (Port of Miami River)

D. Gulf of Mexico

11. Alabama Waterfront Access Study Committee Launches Waterfront Protection Effort (AL Waterfront Access Study).
12. Stan Mayfield Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program (Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program)
13. Waterfronts Florida Program (Waterfronts Florida)

E. Great Lakes

14. A Community-Led Endeavor to Preserve Historic Fishtown (Fishtown)
15. Transforming Marquette, Michigan's Waterfront with Form-Based Code (Marquette, MI)

F. Pacific

16. Balancing Fishing, Tourism, and Research in Newport, Oregon (Newport, OR)
17. Evolution of a working waterfront: A case study of Tacoma, Washington's Thea Foss Waterway (Thea Foss Waterway)
18. Gig Harbor's Historic Working Waterfront (Gig Harbor, WA)
19. Planning for Both Environmental Protection and Economic Development in Trinidad Harbor, California (Trinidad Harbor, CA)

The following is a brief synthesis of common themes that emerged during development of the case studies. These themes were collected into a set of “best practices” that refer specifically to the 19 case studies. Practices have been sorted by tool category, which are represented by the bold, italicized headings. Additional information about these categories is available in Section V of the Final Report. Within each category, key themes are followed by a bulleted list of best practices identified by the Work Group and the title of the case study content that informed its selection as a best practice.

III. Community Engagement

A. *Build partnerships across sectors to strengthen the links between thriving working waterfronts and thriving communities.*

- The importance of building a coalition. (Gig Harbor, WA)
- Generate public support. (Gig Harbor, WA)
- Start the process by increasing the understanding of issues working waterfront communities face. (Outreach and Education in Maine)
- Build national partnerships. (Outreach and Education in Maine)
- Partner across sectors: build community consensus and link working waterfront issues to the environment, the economy, and equity. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)
- Develop partnerships among diverse interests. (Thea Foss Waterway)
- Sustain the vision: The persistence of a vision is contingent on the persistence of participation, mobilization, and resources. (Thea Foss Waterway)
- Develop a community vision plan for the waterfront. (Port Salerno, FL)
- Engage the community: Pier owners and the fishing community were involved in establishing baseline information on current pier and building uses and vacancies. This involvement made the information credible and helped build buy-in for the process. (Portland, ME)
- Engage stakeholders and help them understand others' perspectives and interests. (York River, VA)
- Build a broad base of support. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)
- Involve stakeholders from the beginning. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)
- Clarify priorities. (Public Access Authority)
- Engage the community and gather citizens and professionals together to create an effective visioning process. (Marquette, MI)
- Engage in preliminary planning exercises to remove some biases from the development process. This allows for a conversation focused on economic development tools, Brownfield abatement credits, etc., rather than focusing solely on the appropriateness of a proposed project. (Marquette, MI)

- Stakeholder engagement helps people understand their role in working waterfronts and how changes may impact them. (AL Water Access Study)
- A community-wide visioning process created community values used to guide the city's approach to harbor development. (Gloucester, MA)
- Build capacity of both professional and community-based practitioners to address working waterfront issues. (Outreach and Education in Maine)

B. *Consider putting collaboration ahead of self-interest, toward meeting mutually beneficial goals.*

- Consider valuing collaboration over self-interest. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)

C. *Foster community leadership.*

- Encourage leadership by industry families and city leaders. (Gig Harbor, WA)
- Build the capacity of both professional and community-based practitioners to address working waterfront issues. (Outreach and Education in Maine)
- A community-driven approach and community engagement were very effective in preserving a historic commercial fishery. (Fishtown)
- A community-driven approach was an effective method to preserve historic Fishtown. Using a variety of tools to generate attention and support for waterfront protection helped the community raise adequate funds to purchase the property. (Fishtown)
- Create advisory committees: the Port Salerno Neighborhood Advisory Committee was formed. (Port Salerno, FL)
- The mayor established a nine-member Community Panel that held five listening posts around the city and distilled public comment into core community values. (Gloucester, MA)

D. *Identify the skills of your leaders and key supporters; there are "big picture" people, and there are "get it done" people.*

- Use a practical, problem-solving approach to makes the issue's relevance clear to stakeholders. (Public Access Authority)

E. *Promote networking and mentoring.*

- Opportunities for mentoring and networking exist and entities that can provide assistance in these processes should be identified. (Waterfronts Florida)
- Enlist the expertise of outside resources, such as state agencies. (Port Salerno, FL)
- Constant coordination and communication between government agencies has been critical to Newport’s success as a working waterfront community. “Cross-pollination” between groups helped ensure continued coordination and communication. For example, City representatives attend Port meetings to open dialogue between various groups. These “strategic partnerships” initiate progress and have proven to be efficient. (Newport, OR)

F. *Use a variety of approaches to engagement; not everyone can make a 7 p.m. meeting.*

- Communicate accomplishments to stakeholders. (Public Access Authority)
- Convey information by establishing a web presence as well as using photography. These tools are effective in increasing awareness and building support around the preservation of working waterfronts. (Fishtown)

G. *Manage the process, balancing the both big picture and small details.*

- “The main method utilized by the Port Salerno community was simply getting organized.” Teresa Lamar-Sarno, (Port Salerno, FL)
- The publication of best management practices and community case studies generates interest among a wider community.
- Communities that want to apply for designation as a Waterfronts Florida Partnership Community are encouraged to take part in a two-day training event. (Waterfronts Florida)
- Host a designation ceremony: The Waterfronts Florida Partnership Coordinator and other program staff visit the community following designation to promote the local Waterfronts Florida Partnership. (Waterfronts Florida)
- The location of The Waterfronts Florida Program meetings for managers rotates among designated communities. (Waterfronts Florida)

H. Take action to meet specific needs that have been identified.

I. Celebrate working waterfronts.

- Local commercial fishermen initiated an annual seafood festival to benefit the community. (Port Salerno, FL)

J. Mapping, Inventory, Study

- A legislative study can lead to concrete recommendations and public engagement. (AL Water Access Study)
- Inventories of economic and working waterfront uses are important to inform decisions. (AL Water Access Study)
- Economic and working waterfront use inventories establish a baseline allowing communities to track changes to their working waterfronts over time. (NC Water Access Study)

IV. Policy and Regulation

A. Emphasize policies that protect and encourage small-scale industrial interests within working waterfronts.

- Emphasize policies that encourage and facilitate marine-industrial-related development within recreational working waterfronts. (Ponce Inlet, FL)

B. Take advantage of regulations that are aimed at other outcomes (such as habitat protection), but have ancillary benefits for working waterfronts.

- Leveraging existing state policies and regulations. (Gig Harbor, WA)
- Habitat protection has regulatory benefits: habitat mandates facilitated the need to rebuild the pier. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)
- Settlement benefits: A comprehensive settlement proposal from responsible parties for the Superfund cleanup resulted in a timelier cleanup of the waterway and reduced litigation costs. (Tacoma, WA)
- A Community Redevelopment Area was formed and served as a financing mechanism. (Port Salerno, FL)

C. *Establish management authorities to tackle specific waterfront issues.*

- Prioritize the effort to form various types of management authorities: For example, in Tacoma, a development authority was established under the guidance of the City but was given the ability to operate independently to develop the waterway. (Tacoma, WA)

D. *Work with the state legislature to establish a state-level working waterfront revitalization technical assistance program available to coastal communities.*

- Establish a state program: A program created via state legislation provided technical assistance to coastal communities that revitalized their waterfront. (Waterfronts Florida)

E. *Consider historic preservation and charitable organization policies to promote WWF preservation.*

- Historic registry designations can effectively preserve working waterfronts. (Gig Harbor, WA)
- Local commercial fishermen organized themselves into a non-profit organization to work to protect their working waterfront. (Port Salerno, FL)

F. *Plan for policies to facilitate transition from private ownership to public property.*

- The management needs of a recognized historic property are significantly different from a shanty. The transition from a standard, open public, family-owned dock to a non-profit-owned facility required changes in policies, insurance, and additional safety precautions. To continue to allow open public access but avoid hiring security and gating off the Fishtown docks, new policies to ensure the protection of the site in perpetuity were needed. (Fishtown)

G. *Legal experts can help and may be needed.*

- Retaining an experienced land use lawyer may be beneficial. (Port of Miami River)

V. Land Conservation, Transfer, Acquisition

- A. *Secure community ownership and investment in waterfront can facilitate management of its use and development. (Gig Harbor, WA)*
- B. *Establish non-profit organizations in support of working waterfronts to ensure continuity of property management for public benefit.*
- Selling Fishtown’s historic docks, structures and property to a non-profit organization and establishing a historic landmark increases the long-term viability of the commercial fishery and ensures the continuity of active management of the historic docks and public access. (Fishtown)
- C. *Look to existing state level land protection and acquisition programs for possible links to creating a targeted working waterfront land acquisition program.*
- Establish working waterfront protection by creating a working waterfronts land acquisition program within the context of an existing and broader land acquisition program. (Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program)
- D. *Create policies to make it possible for working waterfront land to be acquired at favorable interest rates.*
- Acquisition of working waterfront land in fee simple or less-than-fee simple interest. (Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program)

VI. Financing

- A. *Work at the local level to establish a marine investment fund in which non-marine users pay to help offset working waterfront infrastructure improvements.*
- Establish or maintain a marine investment fund: non-marine users pay to help offset pier infrastructure enhancements. (Portland, ME)
- B. *Seek out public/private partnerships to facilitate access to a wide range of funding sources.*
- Public/private partnership: Trinidad Rancheria and City partnered to access funding sources. (Trinidad Harbor, CA)

C. *Establish non-profit organizations in support of working waterfronts to improve access to funding sources and reap tax benefits.*

- Form a non-profit organization: community-led fundraising helped the community acquire and manage a historic commercial fishery (Fishtown)

D. *Use innovative approaches for cost savings (Public Access Authority)*

E. *Create new and utilize existing trade associations in support of working waterfront initiatives.*

- Creation of an informal port: the Port of Miami River created the trade association, Miami River Marine Group. (Port of Miami River)

VII. Planning

A. *Understand how working waterfront issues are intrinsically connected to other community issues (social, economic, and environmental) and plan approaches that create synergies to meet multiple goals.*

- Employ synergistic planning, for example:
 - Watershed, harbor, and economic development planning (Trinidad Harbor, CA);
 - Environmental preservation/remediation and economic development planning (Tacoma, WA);
 - Waterfront and historic preservation planning (Fishtown); and
 - Environmental protection and economic development planning (Trinidad, CA)

B. *Invest time and resources in planning to build support, clarify goals, and look to the future.*

- Invest in planning (Trinidad Harbor, CA)
- Take time to understand regional needs. (Outreach and Education in Maine)
- Preparation of planning documents such as interpretive plans, historic structures inventory and analysis, and master plan aid in ensuring long term sustainability in a historic fishery (Fishtown)

- The master planning process that the Fishtown Preservation Society implemented was helpful to generating additional community support and for showing the community how Fishtown had physically changed over the years. (Fishtown)
- Plan early. (Marquette, MI)

C. *There is likely no silver bullet, so consider a range of planning tools.*

- Create an informal port, for example, the Port of Miami River. (Port of Miami River)
- Utilizing an array of planning tools can facilitate revitalization of former industrial land into a mixed use, public-private, working waterfront. (Marquette, MI)
- Identify the tools needed to take action. If new tools are needed, create them. (Outreach and Education in Maine)

D. *Don't reinvent the wheel – profit from the lessons learned by others.*

- Models are available - adapt them to meet your needs. In addition, share your resources to benefit others. (Outreach and Education in Maine)
- Reference existing guidance documents:
 - A 67-page guidebook was developed that contains best management practices drawn from ideas and “on-the-ground know-how” of practitioners. (Waterfronts Florida)
 - A 98-page document was created that contains a set of 21 case studies highlighting the communities that received Waterfronts Florida designations. (Waterfronts Florida)
- Require applicants to provide a management plan to ensure that they have the financial resources, qualifications, and competence to manage their proposed project site in perpetuity. (Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program)

E. *It may be wise to formalize partnerships – consider developing MOUs, contracts.*

- Require a transmittal letter that binds the applicant to fulfill commitments made in their application. (Working Waterfronts Florida Forever Grant Program)

VIII. Zoning

A. *Take time to define – formalize definitions of water-dependent, water-related, and water-enhanced uses.*

- Develop common terminology. (York River, VA)
- Through the Oregon Statewide goals, the importance of water-related and water-dependent uses is clear. Newport has done everything possible to preserve the water-dependent and water-related uses along its Bayfront, aligning with the communities desire to preserve historic uses. There are many communities that have water-dependent industrial areas that became vacant over the years. It is in the city's best interest to value this real estate and ensure that the area remains a water-dependent zone. Once these areas are lost, that action can rarely, if ever can be rescinded. (Newport, OR)

B. *Know who's in charge – pay attention to jurisdictional authority.*

- Analyze jurisdictional authority (York River, VA)

C. *When developing waterfront zones, start by considering the desired outcome of single or mixed-use zoning.*

- Designate waterfront districts with maritime use guidelines. (Gig Harbor, WA)

D. *In mixed use waterfront zones, focus on creating compatibility between marine and non-marine uses.*

- The City of Newport evaluates proposals for new businesses based on a broader vision of the community's culture, rather than focusing exclusively on the financial return on an investment. Permitted uses must align with the overall vision and character of the community, and this is reflected in the well-balanced mix of uses along the Bayfront. (Newport, OR)
- Employ municipal mixed use zoning: focus on compatibility between marine and non-marine uses. Performance standards can address compatibility between marine and non-marine uses. (Portland, ME)
- Overlay Zoning District (AL Water Access Study)
- Recognize that compatibility is important when devising mix use zoning. This requires understanding the potential for compatibility between marine and non-

marine uses. Portland is addressing this issue through performance standards (Portland, ME)

IX. Taxation

A. *Offer tax incentives to reward the type of development you seek.*

- Offer tax incentives: The City of Tacoma offered a substantial tax deduction and exception program for new residential construction along the waterway, encouraging development and investment that helped to recover costs. (Thea Foss Waterway)

Case Study

Planning for Both Environmental Protection and Economic Development in Trinidad Harbor, California

Location

California, Humboldt County, Northern Coast, City of Trinidad

Timeframe

2006 - present

Summary

Trinidad is a small city of roughly 300 people on the northern coast of California, renowned for its spectacular scenery and natural resources. Commercial and recreational fishing have evolved as the cornerstone of the local economy. Trinidad Pier, built in 1946, has provided critical infrastructure for a once-thriving salmon fishery and private boat recreational fishing. Groundfish and salmon fishery management regulations imposed since the 1980's have resulted in substantial reductions in (nontribal) commercial and recreational fishing in the region, and contributed to social and economic impacts that have altered the fisheries landscape at Trinidad. Additionally, the bay's kelp beds have been designated an Area of Special Biological Significance and a Critical Coastal Area. These designations mandate stringent water quality standards and as such, run off from the pier meant that the pier itself was designated as a hazardous discharge. This designation essentially mandated the pier's reconstruction at a cost much higher than the industry standard. The goal of the project was to reconstruct the pier to improve both the water quality, and the social and economic vitality of the Trinidad Bay region. A combination of planning to address both environmental and economic issues jointly, broad community support, and diverse **partnerships** facilitated fundraising success by the owner of the pier, Trinidad Rancheria, and the City of Trinidad, that resulted in the opening of a new, low-to-no discharge pier in spring 2012.

Transferability

The environmental, fisheries, and economic challenges faced in Trinidad are similar to those encountered on small community waterfronts across the country, and many of the approaches used here can be applied elsewhere.

Limited resources can be overcome by forming mutually beneficial public/private **partnerships**. These partnerships are based on common objectives in order to collectively seek funding, and cooperatively implement actions.

Region

- Pacific

Geographic Scope

- City
- Small (< 20,000)
- Rural (<500 people per square mile)

Governance Structure

- Dillon Rule

Issues

- Economic development
- Environmental impacts: resource protection, habitat loss, water quality degradation
- Regulatory factors

Tools

- **Partnerships**
- Stakeholder Analysis
- Visioning Exercise
- **Grant**
- **Acquisition**
- **Land Trust**
- **Economic Analysis/Assessment**
- Natural Resource Inventory
- Needs Assessment
- **Comprehensive Plan**
- **Harbor Management Plans**
- **Land Use Planning**

Waterfront Uses

- **Pier/dock/wharf/lift**
- **Commerical fishing**
- **Recreational fishing**
- **Charter fishing**
- **Coastal tourism**
- Public access (docks/wharfs /beach/park)
- Pier/dock/wharf/lift
- Commerical fishing
- Fish/bait shops, fish cleaning station
- Recreational fishing
- Charter fishing
- Recreational boating, kayaking, other recreational watercraft
- Coastal tourism
- Retail/commercial
- Restaurant accessible by water
- Hotel/motel/lodging providing water access

The state policy and regulatory frameworks that apply to Trinidad are likely more restrictive than those of many other states.

Some of the funding mechanisms accessed by the City are California state **grants** - resources will vary state-to-state. Trinidad Rancheria was also able to access funding specific to its tribal status.

Best Practices

A central theme in Trinidad's success has been the consistent process of engaging stakeholders to promote understanding, build support, form **partnerships**, improve planning, raise funds, and take action. Project leaders recommend these as best practices.

Build a Broad Base of Support

A key to success is the persistence of the Trinidad Rancheria Chief Executive Officer and her ability to recognize that pier redevelopment is linked to a diversity of community issues and to call on this vision to build **partnerships** and networks that are beneficial to all. A partnership between Green Diamond Resource Company and Trinidad Bay Watershed Council is also powerful. Green Diamond owns more than half of all the land in the watershed and has pledged staff and financial support for the Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan.

Involve Stakeholders from the Beginning

Before planning efforts began, the City and the Rancheria identified those individuals, groups, and agencies most invested in protection and redevelopment of harbor resources. Those stakeholders were engaged since the initial stages of planning so as to identify and address their needs and concerns. Their input was integrated as plans evolved and their involvement facilitated community consensus.

Invest in Planning

Planning is a key tool in waterfront development. The City of Trinidad is a small community with limited resources, making it necessary to tackle issues one-by-one and integrate results into a whole as progress is made. The City hires consultants for key functions such as planning and engineering, thus providing access to a wide range of expertise and resources, including **grant** writing to obtain financing for a variety of projects. Additionally, the development of the Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan provided the foundation needed to justify fund seeking proposals, which ultimately resulted in the awarding of \$15 million in harbor-related **grants**.

Plan for Environmental Protection and Economic Development Together

Habitat and water quality protection standards for the area resulted the designation of the pier itself as a hazardous discharge due to contaminated run off from the pier, which essentially mandated the pier's reconstruction. As a means of eliminating discharges, the City and the Rancheria were able to access funds for harbor redevelopment and pier reconstruction. Also, during the Integrated Coastal Watershed Management planning process, stakeholders considered and incorporated both water quality goals and socioeconomic goals in developing the watershed plan. The plan was completed in 2008 and has since acted as launch pad for new **initiatives**.

Consider Putting Collaboration Before Self-Interest

Because Trinidad Rancheria was not an eligible applicant for State Water Resources Control Board funding, the City of Trinidad (which was eligible) chose to partner with the Rancheria in its own application in order to enable the Rancheria to access pier reconstruction funding. The application was successful in funding the identified pier work, but did not fund all other proposed activities.

Full Case Study Description

History

Located 300 miles north of San Francisco, Trinidad is known for its spectacular scenery, unique cultural history, and abundant natural resources. The incorporated city has a resident population of just over 300, and the Trinidad-Westhaven region has a population of roughly 2,000. Once home to the Yurok village of Tsurai, Trinidad became a hub for the gold mining, whaling and timber industries in the mid- to late-1800s. Currently the upper half of the watershed is owned by a private timber company. But, as those industries declined, residents increasingly turned to fishing for their livelihoods.

Following the construction of the Trinidad Pier in 1946 and a mooring basin soon after, Trinidad became an active fishing village, with smokehouses and a seasonal "mosquito fleet" of up to 400 salmon trollers by the late 1970s. Charter fishing operations, first established in 1952, provided recreational fishing opportunities for visitors and residents.

Over the years, the pier fell into disrepair and required replacement. When the state designated the bay as an Area of Special Biological Significance http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/asbs_map.shtml in 1974, the pier became subject to particularly stringent water quality standards. In 2000, the pier and adjacent restaurant were purchased as a business investment by the Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria <http://trinidad-rancheria.org/>, a local, federally-recognized tribe. The Rancheria initiated the effort to reconstruct the pier, which would involve a complex permitting process due to the Area of Special Biological Significance. To navigate the process, the Rancheria partnered from the beginning with the City of Trinidad <http://www.trinidad.ca.gov/>. Then before planning began, the partners identified those stakeholders most invested in protection and redevelopment of harbor resources and engaged them in the planning process throughout. Stakeholder input was integrated as harbor redevelopment and coastal watershed management plans evolved and their involvement facilitated community consensus.

Goal

The goal of the project was to reconstruct the pier to improve both the water quality, and the social and economic vitality of the Trinidad Bay region.

Challenges & Issues

Maintaining Environmental Quality

Trinidad's location, geography, oceanography, and storm and fog hazards, together with the bay's designation by the state as an Area of Special Biological Significance and a Critical Coastal Area http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/Web/cca_humco1.htm, make it impractical to develop as a larger scale fishing port. The designation also created a zero-discharge zone to maintain high water quality in the area. Runoff from the pier, which included fish cleaning waste and boat cleaning chemicals, then constituted non-point sources of pollution that were considered 'prohibited discharges' in this zero-discharge zone. These factors made the pier itself a hazardous discharge, essentially mandating its reconstruction. In this way, the reconstruction of the pier addressed both environmental and economic goals for the community by simultaneously providing for improved water and habitat quality, and improved infrastructure for local businesses.

Regulating for Fisheries Management

Over the past 30 years, growing concerns about the status of West Coast salmon and groundfish stocks prompted the Pacific Fishery Management Council <http://www.pcouncil.org/> and the State of California to implement increasingly stringent management measures for commercial and recreational fisheries. These measures included the establishment of fishery management zones, restricted areas, season limits, commercial and recreational fishery closures, and most recently the complete closure of the salmon fishery in 2008.

Cumulatively, these measures have resulted in substantial reductions in (nontribal) commercial and recreational fishing in the region, and contributing to social and economic impacts that have altered the fisheries landscape at Trinidad.

Economic Challenges

The fishing industry cites increasing fuel and gear costs, dockage, offloading, and crab catch fees as significant issues, in addition to the loss of local fishing support services such as the fuel dock and fish cleaning station, and lack of local vessel repair, refrigeration, gear suppliers, etc.. Changing and uncertain revenues due to natural variability in crab stocks and regulatory constraints on rockfish and salmon also pose challenges.

The Rancheria's greatest challenge has been replacement of the aging pier itself. The need for its replacement has been seen as critical by recreational and commercial fishers, support businesses, and the community alike. In addition to the pier's function as a tribal investment, it directly or indirectly supports 60 local tribal and nontribal families, and generates activity that supports 25 local businesses. In addition to dockage and offloading fees, the Rancheria depends on fees for mooring rentals, boat launches, and boat washing. However, these sources of revenue have become less reliable following recent declines in recreational use that are linked to regional fishery closures.

Securing the estimated \$10 million needed to complete the pier reconstruction project (an amount significantly more than the industry standard) posed a challenge, especially given resource variability and regulatory uncertainty. Raising the funds required an ongoing effort involving public/private **partnerships** among private organizations, and businesses, and local, state, and federal government to share costs and secure **grant** funding. For example, in order to access funding through the State Water Resources Control Board (<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/>), the partnership between the Rancheria and the City of Trinidad proved critical, as the Rancheria was otherwise not eligible to apply on its own. To complete the project, the Rancheria accessed funding from numerous sources, including the California State Coastal Conservancy (<http://scc.ca.gov/>), the Headwaters Fund (<http://www.theheadwatersfund.org/>), the EPA Brownfields Program (<http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/>), the Federal Highway Administration (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/index.cfm>), and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (<http://www.bia.gov/>) to support various aspects of the pier reconstruction project. A partnership between the watershed's major land owner, Green Diamond Resource Company, and Trinidad Bay Watershed Council was also valuable as the company pledged staff and financial support for the Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan. Additionally, leadership from the Trinidad Rancheria Chief Executive Officer helped clarify the vision of pier redevelopment as linked to a wide range of community issues. These diverse partnerships were a key to success.

Next Steps

The new pier opened in June 2012.

Key Partners

Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, <http://trinidad-rancheria.org/> City of Trinidad, CA, <http://www.trinidad.ca.gov/>

Contacts

Case study compiled by:

Kristen Grant

Marine Extension Associate

Maine Sea Grant and University of Maine Cooperative Extension kngrant@maine.edu

<http://www.seagrants.umaine.edu>

Jonas Savage
Environmental Director
Trinidad Rancheria
JSavage@trinidadrancheria.com
<http://trinidad-rancheria.org>

Rebecca Price-Hall
Grant Administrator and Watershed Coordinator
City of Trinidad
rpricehall@trinidad.ca.gov
<http://www.trinidad.ca.gov>

Additional Information For More Information

Waterfront Revitalization for Small Cities (1990)
<http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/24463/EMNO8414.pdf?sequence=1>

Quotes

"Fishing is the main reason Trinidad is an incorporated City." Mr. Savage suggests that all Trinidad stakeholders have links to fishing (mostly crab), whether it be commercial, recreational, or fishing/waterfront related tourism. Therefore the community is tied to the pier, which has likely made community consensus easier. - Jonas Savage, Environmental Director, Trinidad Rancheria (personal communication, February 10, 2012)

"It is critical to create relationships that are mutually beneficial – these relationships are a key strategy for making progress in small communities where mutual support can provide human resources, if not financial resources, to get a job done." – Jonas Savage (personal communication, February 10, 2012)

"To succeed in development work in small communities, you need to be responsive to opportunities and work in partnership, favoring collaboration at times versus protecting your own interests. It's important to recognize the value of community leaders and the enthusiasm they generate in others. Encourage them to lead and be willing to follow their lead. Working collaboratively is infectious – those involved here have gone on to apply the approach elsewhere in the community." – Rebecca Price-Hall, Grant Administrator and Watershed Coordinator, City of Trinidad (personal communication, February 2, 2012)

"Public engagement is one of the hardest, most frustrating parts of community planning – but it's the most important. If you don't bring stakeholders in at the beginning, to address their needs, interests, concerns – you will need to do it later when it is harder to accommodate. So in a way, you have to go slow to go fast." – Jonas Savage (personal communication, February 10, 2012)

"The planning process is a 5 - 10 year endeavor, and before it ends, it begins again. This is the most discouraging part to many involved with community development, but change takes time." – Jonas Savage (personal communication, February 10, 2012)

"Since the (Integrated Coastal Watershed Management) Plan was developed, \$15 million in grants have been awarded - \$8 million to pier redevelopment alone." – Rebecca Price-Hall (personal communication, February 2, 2012)

References

California's North Coast Fishing Communities Historical Perspective and Recent Trends: Trinidad Harbor

Fishing Community Profile. Pomeroy, Caroline; Thomson, Cynthia J.; Stevens, Melissa M. California Sea Grant College Program, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla CA, 2010

http://ca-sgep.ucsd.edu/system/files/files/4TRNprofile_29Nov2011.pdf

Informational Public Meeting for the Trinidad Pier Reconstruction Project. Trinidad Rancheria, http://trinidad-rancheria.org/sites/trinidadrancheria.com/files/Pier%20Meeting%20Press%20Release_final_0_0.pdf

Reconstruction Project Description. Trinidad Rancheria, <http://trinidad-rancheria.org/sites/trinidadrancheria.com/files/Brief%20Project%20Description.pdf>

Last updated 19-Mar-13

Assembly
California Legislature



JIM WOOD
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, SECOND DISTRICT

RECEIVED
CALIFORNIA
FISH AND GAME
COMMISSION

2015 JAN 26 PM 1:42

MLS

January 22, 2015

California Fish and Game Commission
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in support of the issuance of three experimental market squid permits for use in the 2nd Assembly District.

As you know, as part of the Market Squid Fisheries Management Plan, three experimental non-transferable market squid vessel permits were established in order to develop a squid fishery in areas previously not utilized for squid production. In recent years, the squid population has increased in the waters of the north coast and there is an interest in determining whether a squid market exists in this area.

I'm sure you are aware that at one time the communities of the north coast flourished due to a healthy fishing industry. Unfortunately, for many years their economies have been in serious decline along with the decline of our fisheries. Almost 24% of the residents of Fort Bragg and Eureka live below the poverty level. Unemployment exceeds the national average and these areas are currently experiencing the loss of more jobs. The opportunity to create local jobs in the fishing industry and additionally providing a product that can be used locally would be a boon to their economy.

I appreciate your serious consideration of these permit applications. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jim Wood", written over the typed name.

JIM WOOD
Assemblymember, 2nd District



From: [Ashcraft, Susan@FGC](mailto:Ashcraft.Susan@FGC)
To: FGC
Cc: [Mastrup, Sonke@FGC](mailto:Mastrup.Sonke@FGC)
Subject: FW: Congratulations!! from CA Wetfish Association
Date: Thursday, February 12, 2015 10:33:05 AM
Attachments: [CA Squid Marketing Summary.pdf](#)
[SavingSeaFood - D.B. PLE...ifornia Squid Marketing".pdf](#)

For March MRC folder

From: Diane Pleschner-Steele [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 6:54 PM
To: Jack Baylis
Subject: Congratulations!!

Hi President Baylis (Jack),

Congratulations on your appointment as new Commission president!! Thank you also for your ongoing special interest in the squid fishery.

I watched the meeting online today and paid close attention to Commissioners' comments on your desire to support sustainable harbor communities. I also watched the testimony and read the written comments from the fishermen who are seeking the three experimental squid permits. Their pleas are compelling.

When I was writing features for Pacific Fishing and other magazines many years ago (in my earlier life), I spent a lot of time in northern CA. I trolled for salmon with my husband out of Noyo Harbor, and we wintered over up there one year in the 19980s when he was diving sea urchins, so I'm well aware of the harbor culture. That harbor sustained itself on a seasonal mix of salmon, Dungeness crab, pink shrimp and groundfish, especially blackcod and rockfish, and sea urchins also became an important fishery. The cuts in groundfish quotas and buyback of many of the draggers in N.CA. really impacted not only Ft. Bragg/Noyo, but also Eureka and Crescent City. In those days groundfish was the year-round volume fishery complex that really supported the infrastructure, along with salmon in summer, Dungeness in winter, and sea urchins.

I think it's safe to say that we all are interested in sustaining vibrant harbor communities in California — and that includes Half Moon Bay, Monterey, Moss Landing, Ventura, Port Hueneme, San Pedro — all of which rely on market squid to maintain infrastructure and economic vitality over time. It's important to view the "big picture" in ongoing discussions, in my opinion. As you're aware, and as we discussed over lunch in the family dining room at State Fish Company in San Pedro in December 2013 — more than a year ago (good grief! time flies!!), market squid is the economic driver of California's historic wetfish industry, and protecting this fishery is essential too, as it represents the lion's share of California's fishing economy.

I heard two issues emerge from today's discussion: first was the urgency of the fishermen who want experimental squid permits ASAP, soon enough to fish this season. The overarching issue, however, is the big picture look at sustaining fishing communities as a whole.

In that regard, the wetfish fisheries have always relied on a complex of fisheries, with squid the most important when it's available. Wetfish fishermen understand the dynamics of all the

coastal pelagic (CPS) stocks — we've had an amazing period of high squid productivity over the past few years, but as our research is now showing, that cycle is changing. We're again facing El Niño conditions in S.CA. this year, which we believe contributed to the superabundance of squid in Monterey and northern CA last season. But when the "real" El Niño hits, still predicted for later this year and into next spring, squid typically take a hike altogether.

Long story short, a sustainable harbor, whether it's Noyo, Monterey or San Pedro, needs more than one highly dynamic stock to keep the ice plants and fuel docks open.

I will look forward to further discussion on the big picture issue of sustainable harbor communities. I'll be bringing these issues to the CWPA Board prior to the MRC meeting in March, and I hope we can offer some ideas on how to help achieve long-term goals.

Meantime, I would appreciate the opportunity to talk to you further about a couple of things that I heard you say with regard to marketing local "fresh" squid. You quoted an estimate from some source that more than 90 percent of CA squid is exported. Perhaps you'll recall the presentation that I made when this topic came up at a Commission meeting some time ago — based on a quick poll of processors at that time, I estimated that close to 30 percent of our squid harvest is consumed here in the domestic market, whether processed here (at double the cost) or exported for cleaning and reimported.

The two key points that I learned in my survey: except for a very small volume that goes to ethnic markets primarily in LA and SF, the overwhelming preference in the local market is for cleaned squid — and because squid's shelf life in fresh state is only a couple of days with impeccable handling, freshness is preserved by flash freezing the squid as quickly as possible.

I'm attaching FYI my earlier presentation, along with a piece that we published in response to an op ed in the LA Times by Paul Greenberg, who got a few things wrong...

I also wanted to let you know that our squid research is providing some fascinating insights into squid behavior. We received a small contract from the SW Fisheries Science Center last summer to extend our surveys into Monterey, as far north as Half Moon Bay. We ran two surveys last summer and just completed a third survey in Monterey in January. We will be able to repeat the Monterey cruises again this year, in addition to our core surveys in the S.CA. Bight. We would love to present an update to the Commission at an appropriate time later this year (after our summer survey would be best timing for us). Please point me in the proper direction to learn the process for securing time on the agenda.

Thanks again for your dedication to marine resources (all resources) and your interest in the squid fishery. And again, Congratulations!! I'll look forward to working with you and the other Commissioners on emerging fishery issues.

All the best,
d.



Diane Pleschner-Steele
Executive Director
California Wetfish
Producers Association
805.693.5430
Fax: 805.686.9312
PO Box 1951
Buellton, CA 93427