



New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

Amendment 23 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan July 30, 2020, 4-6pm Webinar Hearing

The Council held public hearings to solicit comments on the alternatives under consideration in the Draft Amendment 23 to the Northeast Multispecies (Groundfish) Fishery Management Plan. The amendment will adjust the groundfish monitoring program to improve the accuracy and accountability of catch reporting in the commercial groundfish fishery.

Hearing chairman: Terry Stockwell (Groundfish Committee Chair)

Council staff: Jamie Cournane, Robin Frede, Melissa Errend, Chris Kellogg, Janice Plante, and Tom Nies

Attendance: 41 audience members (including nine Council members); 15 commenters

The hearing began at 4:03 pm.

Mr. Stockwell opened the hearing, introduced Council staff in attendance, and commented on the Amendment 23 process. This included updates to the Amendment 23 timeline resulting from recent Council decisions to reschedule final action and schedule additional public hearings due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Ms. Frede and Ms. Errend briefed the audience on the purpose of the amendment, alternatives under consideration, draft impacts analysis, and amendment timeline and next steps. This hearing was geographically focused on Massachusetts. Council staff presented example fishing vessel profiles as part of the economic impacts that are specific to this state. After an opportunity to ask questions for clarification, public comments were taken on the measures proposed in the amendment.

Questions:

Michael Walsh (commercial groundfish fisherman) asked how you measure improved data, and how do you get more data out of a lot less vessels, since sectors have gone from 299 vessels down to 179. He said we have a lot of missing data because of closed areas where there is no data. Staff answered that regarding more data that it may be more correct to say there would be improved data, and that even if potentially fishing effort is reduced, which is acknowledged, that is a possibility that you might see reduced effort or consolidation among remaining vessels, and the data that will remain will be of higher quality. Staff also offered to have an extended

conversation about this offline to chat more about the analyses, including with others on the PDT who are involved with these.

Hank Soule (sector manager) asked several questions. First, he asked if the National Fisheries Service informed the Council that it expects the audit and maximized retention programs to be approved for any vessel that wishes to use them for Fishing Year 2021. Staff answered that the Council received initial guidance provided by NMFS, including that NMFS plans to approve the audit model, and at this stage is not yet ready to approve the maximized retention model for use in sector operations, but sectors can still propose one and continue to be in the experimental phase. Staff also said they would follow up with GARFO staff to confirm. *[Follow-up: Staff confirmed that NMFS intends to approve an audit model EM option for FY2021 sector operations plan, but not the maximized retention model of EM, since this program is newer and needs more time to work through testing. Sectors can, however, propose a max retention model option for their plans.]*

Mr. Soule then asked about the footnote on pp. 29-30 of the public hearing document which says the operating costs include sector fees, asking how those were obtained. Staff answered this cost information was from SSB and would follow up with additional information. *[Follow-up: Staff confirmed that the estimates used in the analysis for sector fees was \$.035/pound for groundfish and \$0.0075 per pound for non-groundfish, acknowledging that this varies across operations.]* Mr. Soule then asked how landing fees and unloading fees were obtained. Staff explained this is a generalized estimate and would follow up with additional information. *[Follow-up: Staff confirmed that the estimate of landing fees used in the analysis was \$0.01/pound, acknowledging that this varies across operations.]* Mr. Soule next asked whether effort shift means a reduction in smaller vessels. Staff answered that the analysis does not suggest a dramatic reduction in the number of vessels, but rather changes in effort, and for small vessels this may mean a reduction in their effort but not necessarily in the number of small vessels. Mr. Soule also asked a question about the statement in the document that under higher monitoring coverage the fishery might see a reduction in other operating costs, asking which of the five – ice, food, fuel, value of sector, etc., that would be. Staff explained that estimates for each of the cost categories was not provided explicitly in the analysis [since several are modelled in another model], but that as effort shifts across operations, decreases in other operating costs may result as trips selected by the model use inputs more efficiently.

Mr. Soule asked if the monitoring cost estimated under the Preferred Alternative [blended, dynamic simulation with removal of the management uncertainty buffer] was \$3.2 million, and in the same alternative that operating profits was estimated to be higher than under No Action by \$1.7 million, and whether this means that the model is stating that there are benefits of around \$5 million. Staff confirmed this is correct *[Follow-up: Revenue is estimated to increase from \$70.8 million under No Action to \$75.6 million under the management uncertainty buffer removal (blended-dynamic specification), however other operating costs increase by approximately \$1 million, reducing net benefits to closer to \$4 million.]* Mr. Soule also asked whether the calculation used for the maximized retention electronic monitoring cost include the cost of the dockside monitoring component to this. Staff answered that it does, but that it's a different calculation than what is used for the larger dockside monitoring alternative. *[Follow-up: DSM*

costs were estimated to be slightly higher than in the standalone program, due to the extra catch handing procedures as required by the maximized retention program. The estimate was \$1.17 million for fleetwide, static adoption].

Jackie Odell (Northeast Seafood Coalition) asked where in the DEIS does it cover improved ACE lease market performance, which is noted in the presentation. Staff answered that this is discussed qualitatively at the start of the economic impacts section [This can be found at page 380 in the DEIS]. Ms. Odell asked about the list of questions posed to commenters in the presentation, and who put the list together. Staff explained that Council staff put these questions together and that they were designed to give some guidance to commenters, noting that these are simple questions built around the preferred alternatives, but that comments can address any alternatives under consideration.

Joe Orlando (commercial groundfish fisherman) said he is a Gloucester day boat groundfisherman who makes about \$1,200 a day, and asked where does 6% (monitoring costs as % of revenue) come from as he does not think it reflects his circumstances. Staff explained that for the example vessel profiles it is important to look at the range of estimates rather than focusing on one number. Mr. Orlando said he felt the analysis is misleading, as his monitoring costs would be more like 90% of his revenue. He also said he did not understand how the analysis could suggest 100% monitoring would result in better data, because under 100% monitoring the fleet will disappear and there will be no data.

John Haran (sector manager) asked whether the cost estimates for the EM options include the costs of storage, as they will have to pay for storage of the video for years. Staff clarified that estimate of storage costs are included in the model. Mr. Haran also asked how it is possible the lease market performance would improve with higher monitoring coverage. He said the Council should be looking at why fishing effort diminished, and felt this action is the last nail in the coffin along with wind farms. Mr. Haran asked what will happen if the observer providers cannot provide 100% observer coverage. Staff answered that this is something NMFS would work through for implementation and would work with providers to try to have enough observers. Staff also answered these are target coverage levels and the Council acknowledges there are many factors, including the availability of monitors, that could affect realized coverage levels. Additionally, staff noted that this action would not change the current practice in which a vessel can get a waiver from coverage if there is no observer unavailable.

Maggie Raymond (Associated Fisheries of Maine) asked what the Council's rationale is for no action on dockside monitoring. Staff answered that the Council selected no action for dockside monitoring as its preliminary preferred alternative due to concerns about not having enough resources to review to verify landings, concerns about costs being passed to crew [regardless of whether the vessel or dealer pays for dockside monitoring], possible effort shifts or vessels landing in different ports, and that mostly there are many concerns from the previous program. Ms. Raymond also asked in the projection of increased operating profit can you tell what proportion comes from removing the management uncertainty buffers. Staff answered that for the 100% coverage option it is \$49.8 million versus \$52 million, but would follow up with more specific details. [*Follow-up: Table 218 in the DEIS shows the dynamic impacts of monitoring*

under the blended ASM and EM model with 100% as well as removing the management uncertainty buffers, with or without a subsidy for EM (1, or 0, respectively). You can compare this to Table 169, which is an analogous table looking at the dynamic impacts for the same model (the blended model) and coverage rate (100%) but of course without the management uncertainty buffer. From comparing these tables you can see that in the absence of a subsidy for EM (0, first set of rows) gross revenue is \$75.6 million for the management uncertainty buffer alt and \$72.3 million for the just 100% coverage option, therefore the value of the buffer is an additional \$3.3 million in just revenue. However, the total impact on operating profit is smaller because effort increases under the management uncertainty buffer alternative (increasing operating costs) from \$19.4 million to \$20.5 million, and so does the estimated monitoring cost from \$3.1 million to \$3.3 million—so the net benefit in terms of operating profit is \$1.9 million. This is pretty close to what was estimated on the fly, a little bit different because of rounding. You could similarly compare just the straight human-ASM program estimates as well—instead you would need to compare Table 218 to Table 132 (pg 426).].

Vito Giacalone (Northeast Seafood Coalition) commented that with the EM option right now there are many unknown costs, and since the industry knows about ASM and those costs, they will likely stick with that when the subsidy runs out and costs go from 0 to 100%. He asked if the document includes information on the costs of storage of EM data, and said that for both the audit model and maximized retention model fish handling is a direct trip cost that is not included in the document. He asked if there will be more detailed cost information for the EM options included in the document, otherwise the EM options should be removed. Mr. Giacalone also commented that the industry needs to see estimates for net revenue rather than gross revenue. Staff answered that with respect to data storage costs, these are included in the model, with more detail in the draft Amendment 23 document on pp. 386, and that with respect to catch handling and cost, this is an opportunity cost with crew focusing on catch handling versus other duties, and that this would be hard to estimate as a direct cost. Staff also explained that creating estimates of net revenue without a mandatory economic data collection program is difficult, noting that all U.S. fisheries face this challenge.

Comments:

David Leveille (sector manager for NEFS 2 (Gloucester) and NEFS 6 (Boston)): I am the sector manager for Northeast Fisheries Sector 2 and Northeast Fisheries Sector 6, both of which are comprised of predominantly full-time groundfish vessels. NEFS 2 consists of 62 members that hold 133 permits. We have 33 active groundfish vessels, that consist primarily of trawl vessels, two gillnetters, and six part-time longliners. The sector made 1,560 groundfish trips in 2019 and harvested 14.9 million pounds of ACE in 2019. NEFS 6 consists of five members that hold 24 permits. We have seven active groundfish vessels, all of which are trawl vessels. They made 136 groundfish trips in 2019 and harvested 4.3 million pounds of ACE. Both of my sectors are community based, with NEFS 2 located in Gloucester and NEFS 6 located in Boston. Our sectors are entirely industry funded, mostly based on fees on groundfish landings. We do not have grants that offset our operational costs, and we are always mindful that our members' viability in the groundfish fishery is directly tied to our sector's viability. The impacts to the viability of the

groundfish members was seen firsthand in the port of Gloucester, when in 2019 NEFS 2 absorbed the members of NEFS 3 which was Three Northeast Fishery, Inc. NEFS 3 originally had in 2010, 31 active small inshore vessels that primarily used gillnets and longline gear. In 2018, it became evident to NEFS 3 and the members that due to government regulation and quota cuts primarily to Gulf of Maine cod, that the sector could no longer support itself and made the decision to disband and merge with NEFS 2.

Although Amendment 23 may be well intended, the reality is that if the amendment is implemented once federal funding runs out, it will be the end of the industry as we know it. It will bankrupt the independent, small business, family-oriented fishermen. Although NEFS 2 and NEFS 6 are both currently viable, the COVID pandemic has had a big impact on fish prices, which in turn has diminished the profitability of the vessels in both sectors that I manage. The thing about the COVID pandemic is that it will hopefully end, and the prices will return to their previous levels. That can't be said for Amendment 23. If it passes, it will not end, and the burden to pay for 100% monitoring is shifted to the active members that rely on groundfish landings to sustain their business. They will end. Our input includes the following comments on Amendment 23's overarching themes. Amendment 23 is a fleet killer. It will bankrupt my members. As a manager, based on my discussion with members, I anticipate that a majority of my members will stop groundfishing once federal funds expire and the cost of monitoring falls on industry and the sectors. GARFO is very quick to point to sectors and their working relationship with us but neither GARFO nor the Council have ever really have taken the time to understand what we do. The majority of the responsibility of managing this fishery's quota falls on our shoulders, and the implementation of this action will fall on our shoulders also.

It's my job to help my members understand if they can afford this. And it's blatantly clear that small vessels cannot afford to pay 100% monitoring. But the document assumes larger vessels could potentially afford 100% monitoring. But it's unclear how this assumption is drawn since there is no break even or analysis provided. Further, these vessels would be deploying humans for observers at this time, since there are no electronic monitoring options that are suitable for their platforms. My members don't look at their viability in terms of gross profits, and the bottom line is the net profits, and every analysis in this document should be based on net profits. Amendment 23 offers no real benefits to my members. The cost analysis in the EIS is bogus. Groundfish vessels have been functioning on a very fragile and narrow profit margin for years. The conclusion that 100% monitoring will increase profits is illogical, devoid of any real understanding of the fishery. Removing the uncertainty buffers will do nothing to mitigate the impacts of 100% monitoring. If managers understood the fishery, they would know that there are many reasons void of monitoring impacting the current utilization of certain stocks. And this alternative is nothing more than a smoke screen, trying to make it look good on paper. This action does nothing to improve the abundance estimates in the stock assessment, which is actually what the fishery desperately needs. There are a lot of other factors that impact groundfish rebuilding, including and not limited to, the catch from other fisheries; for example, almost 50% of Gulf of Maine cod ACL goes to recreational and state waters fisheries and they have no monitoring. The document is misleading, because if the goal is to improve stock assessments, that cannot happen when a large segment of the mortality occurs outside the commercial sector.

The electronic monitoring options and analysis in Amendment 23 are inadequate. The DEIS is misleading about the cost of EM. EM has an expense to our members and to ourselves that is not considered. EM changes the way catch will be handled on deck and includes human labor and logistics for fishermen catching multispecies. Currently, the data associated with the EM trips is provided separate from other datasets and requires substantial manipulation to incorporate into quota accounting systems. Also, the handholding that occurs with the implementation of EM system and data review with individual members is substantial. And for some sectors with high activity vessels, this may add too much to the daily work responsibility. None of this is acknowledged in the DEIS cost analysis. Not all the EM programs are suitable for all groundfish vessels nor do all sectors have the capability of handling the workload associated with electronic monitoring. Max retention EM programs are not ready. The current max retention EFP cannot even remove the ASM requirement for participants at this time. It's misleading and wrong that it was even included in cost estimates in this document. The Council's and GARFO's assumptions that high levels of monitoring will incentivize sectors and their members to adopt EM options is so far from reality it's comical. Anyone who spends time talking to those industry members who actually go groundfishing, know the majority will opt for humans, as long as federal money is available. When those funds expire, they plan on exiting the fishery.

In reading Amendment 23 we can't help but wonder when did the Council stop caring about fleet diversity? Amendment 16 was full of promises by the Council that never happened. But the fishing business and community devastation that the industry predicted occurred monumentally. The Council and GARFO seem to no longer care about fleet diversity, or the impacts of what this amendment will do and will have on the fraction of the fishery that's barely holding on. Why did we even bother with Amendment 18? As I previously stated, the sector previously known as NEFS 3 could not sustain net viability due to the regulations and quota cuts. Many have joined NEFS 2 or have sold their permits or are looking to sell them. The Gloucester gillnet fleet has been decimated by past regulatory actions and Amendment 23 appears ready to extend that devastation to the few who are remaining. If the Council continues down the current path with Amendment 23, the groundfish fishery is destined to become the haves and the once-upon-a-timers. As currently contemplated in Amendment 23, it is creating exactly the situation that Amendment 18 feared would happen: the opportunity for big corporations to move in and take over the small, independent businesses that remain. It is concerning that the Council appears to either have missed or is not concerned with this reality. If one reads Amendment 23 the analysis is very clear, in the Vessel Characteristics section that those fishing today are a fraction of where they were in 2010. This action will have disproportionate impacts on fishing communities like mine and my members' and my sector's landings. As documented in the DEIS, Gloucester and Boston comprise two of the top three grossing groundfish ports in the region. In both of my sectors, the groundfish activity is where 90% of the member's annual income comes from. Regardless of how some may wish to portray things, most members do not have the luxury of shifting into another profitable fishery if groundfish becomes too expensive to pursue. The Council and GARFO appear to be following the Amendment 16 rulebook, attempting to convince and assure folks that it's not all that bad, EM will solve all the negative impacts of this action, and we can use federal money to offset EM costs. We have not forgotten that Amendment 16 playbook and we will not fall for those false promises this time. 100% monitoring will

destroy almost everyone who continues to participate full-time or close to full-time in this fishery, consolidating down to a handful of big players, which is completely counter with what the Council and GARFO have repeatedly claimed is important, i.e. fleet diversity. This is a multispecies fishery, and not a Gulf of Maine cod fishery, nor are my members Carlos Rafael. The analysis in this document is inadequate because it fails to see the fishery in all of its complexity. Amendment 23 analysis is short sighted in its approach. Everything appears to be centralized on Gulf of Maine cod and the actions of Carlos Rafael. The groundfish fishery is a multispecies fishery and my members actively focus fishing behavior on multispecies like haddock, pollock, and redfish. We're not fixated on cod, and neither should the analysis be. Furthermore, the DEIS rationalizes that 100% monitoring is needed to account for the action of Carlos Rafael. This is wrong. The fishery is not representative of the actions of Carlos Rafael and should not be forced to bear the consequences of what happened with Carlos. My members are not Carlos. They continue to be outraged by his behavior. They now are equally angry that the Council wants to treat them as criminals because of Carlos. The issues highlighted in the Carlos Rafael case are exactly the type of egregious behavior that the agency should be ferreting out in every fishery they manage. Thank you.

Tim Vinegra (F/V HUSTLER, commercial groundfish fisherman, New Bedford, NEFS 8): I'm the owner and captain of the fishing vessel Hustler. I purchased the boat five months ago, three partners, forty years later. I set up my boat five months ago, and here we are. If this amendment goes through, I am out of business. I cannot afford to tack on another \$10,000 or so anymore to the vessel between the charges and mortgages. I don't think I'm going to be able to make it. So you're taking the American dream. It was my dream for forty years, working for everybody else, my dad. I had a couple boats. I think I earned it and put in my time to this industry, and now it's virtually gone. And now I'm going to tack on another \$10,000? I'm sorry, I can't. I'm just getting by right now with the pandemic going on now. I think we should be able to look at where this is going. I cannot add another \$10,000 or \$12,000. Plus the cameras and all, that's unheard of. I don't have the \$10,000 to invest in a boat anymore that I've been working on. So please reconsider what you're proposing. Behind your models are people like me who are in this industry who were able to go to college, my grandchildren are able to go to college by me helping them out. And then finally after forty years the American Dream, it's gone. It's all going to be gone. I cannot add another \$10,000 to the \$20,000 I already have in charges. So please reconsider. Thank you very much.

Mike Walsh (F/Vs Atlantic Prince, Olympia, Guardian, American Heritage, Flight 1, Boomer Too; commercial groundfish fisherman, Boston, NEFS 6): I want to say one thing. First of all, I am in Sector 6. 35 years I've fished at sea, 46 years I've been in this business. I agree 100% on everything Dave Leveille said. He's the sector manager. I mean, one of the biggest things is Carlos Rafael. Carlos Rafael was our problem. Carlos Rafael was your problem. And National Marine Fisheries for not taking care of law enforcement. If you think you did a good on this I would have to differ. As far as this amendment going here, we were told going into sectors that everything is going to be improved. I went to all the meetings, I guess I drank the kool-aid, when I probably should have drank whiskey. I don't know. I just don't see it as the boats surviving through this. I looked into EM before sectors, and I could see the costs they were talking about back then, having third party people looking at stuff, if somebody points a finger at you you've

got to pay. The boats aren't gonna do that, they can't afford it. One of the things is this whole fleet is aging out. I think you're going to age them right out. I think there's a lot of guys who are borderline there right now, and what is going to happen is if you put 100% monitoring in, I think the fishery is going to disappear. And I'm gonna be honest with you, I'm fourth generation. My son, fifth, and my grandson, sixth generation fishing. If I hadn't been involved in the fisheries here, and I got a couple of brothers that are fourth generation, they wouldn't be involved either. I know the amendment is going to push them right out of this business. 100%, they can't stomach it now that they're working besides somebody who is making more money than them. They're working on pennies now. This COVID is killing us. Everybody is half share, quarter share, nobody is making their share. Like I said, I've been in this business a long time, and I think this is the end. I honestly do. I think you should reconsider your alternatives and start thinking of fishermen. I think fishermen are a dying species, not the fish. I'm one of the Boston boats. I'm one of the guys that go around and move around and do something different. I'm always looking for something different as far as the fish. Talking to the captains, go fishing for pollock, fishing for redfish. But you know what, when it comes to this amendment, it won't matter what they're fishing for. They're done. I'm just saying guys are gonna throw their hands up and leave the fishing industry. That's my comment there, I mean, a lifetime of work gone down the drain. Thank you.

William Blount (F/V RUTHIE B, commercial groundfish fisherman New Bedford, NEFS 8): I have groundfished for 58 years, and I've been a captain for 48 years. I been involved with the development of stern trawlers. I love groundfishing. But if this amendment goes through, I'm convinced that I can't make it. If I have a really good trip, maybe my crew member makes a third of what he's making right now during COVID. If I have a poor trip, he won't make anything. I won't even be able to get people to work for me. I'm 75, I can't do it alone. I don't know where you're coming from, but we'll be done. We're not going to make anything working for nothing. I'm sorry, but the truth is you're up in never-never land and we won't be able to survive through all of this. It's crazy. I'm sorry.

Antonio P. Rico (F/V LUSO AMERICAN I, captain, commercial groundfish fisherman, New Bedford, NEFS 8): I have captained the Luso American for 17 years now. I have been fishing in America since 1995, and I fished in Portugal for 10 years, so altogether 34, 35 years fishing. We cannot afford Amendment 23. Can you imagine my family, three more crew members and their families, the owner, can you imagine, we go fishing, we have to pay all the expenses, the crew make no money, and we have to pay for the observer? I think it's not right.

Carlos Alberto (F/V LUSO AMERICAN I, owner, commercial groundfish, New Bedford, NEFS 8): I own the Fishing Vessel Luso American I. I own four more permits, so altogether we have five permits on the boat. We still don't have enough fish to fish year-round. We have to lease more fish. So right now, with the rise of expenses, every trip is \$25,000. To make money for the crew, to pay for the boat, you see how much you can get from the trip. If you have to pay for 100% coverage, we don't make enough money, nobody makes enough money, to survive in this industry, because every time you go to the shipyard, because it might be how much we pay towards the shipyard. You work all year long to try to pay for the ship, and you don't have

enough money to pay for the boat, and instead have to pay for people to be on the boats for coverage of 100%. So this is my comment. Thank you very much.

Cassie Canastra (BASE Seafood Auction and groundfish offload facility in New Bedford): I represent the Seafood Auction New Bedford, BASE, also known as Whaling City Seafood Display Auction in the port of New Bedford. We are an offloading facility. We know what vessels gross, we know what the market is and is not, we know what the margins are for vessels participating in the groundfish fishery, and we know what the costs are to run, maintain and repair vessels. We are acutely aware of the difficulties for vessel owners to find and maintain their crew. Every day, we witness how these realities play out in fishing. We see the results, the limited utility on many stocks, with many groundfish ACLs being underutilized. Many of these stocks were once critical to the port of New Bedford. Under status quo revenue there is not enough profit margin in the fishery for business owners to attempt to recapitalize to absorb the additional expenses associated with monitoring. Our offloading facility has watched the vibrant and plentiful groundfishery wither away to a skeleton of its former self. It has been difficult to see these members of groundfish industry that we view as friends and family exit the fishery with no acknowledgement from fishery managers. It doesn't matter how they may view these options, the groundfish fishery today cannot afford any of these options currently proposed. The cost considered under the proposed alternative of monitoring at 100% is significant and allows us to acknowledge the true state of today's commercial fishery. We are gravely concerned that the DEIS cost analysis includes consideration of a max retention EM program, which is deemed to reduce costs for the fleet, but is not self-ready for the majority of the fleet. The max retention program is in a pilot program. Guidelines and logistics are still being developed, and requirements need to be fleshed out. It is wrong of the DEIS to consider this as an option that will offer cost reductions for the fleet when there is no option has been approved by the agency. Thank you for your time.

Linda McCann (Sector manager, Sector 8, New Bedford): I'm the sector manager for Sector 8 in New Bedford. We are a community-based sector with 40 permits enrolled and out of those 40 permits, five active vessels that are full-time single permit groundfish vessels. These vessels are current fishing on Georges Bank and occasionally in the Southern New England area. We do have two members who are gillnetters, who primarily fish for monkfish and skate in the Southern Management area. New Bedford is the Georges Bank flounder capital of the world. But since 2010, the dramatic shifts in ACLs, such as Georges Bank yellowtail flounder and Georges Bank winter founder, forced many of the boats to stop operating. Eventually we merged with Sector 7, which was also a New Bedford sector. I ran both Sectors 7 and 8. They were forced to consolidate the membership into one sector, to align the overhead costs with the potential revenue generated on groundfish sectors. Our sector is entirely industry-funded, mostly based on fees on groundfish landings. We do not have grants that offset our operational costs and so we're mindful that our members' viability in the groundfish fishery is directly tied to our sector's viability. Amendment. 23 is a fleet killer. It's going to destroy my members' business and my sector. I've been the manager nine of these years, and I've been with the sector system since it began in 2010. With this COVID right now, we are not making a lot of money. The prices are way down. We're lucky that they're even taking our fish, the dealers right now. And that's where these funds for monitoring are going to expire, and this happened back in 2018 when the funds

just automatically expired and the next day they just said, the industry will pay for that. And this happened in March, when two of my vessels were charged almost \$6,000. When I finally was allowed to get reimbursement in July, they refused to go back to March, and those two vessels had to incur and pay the \$6,000 in charges that had incurred from at-sea monitoring. We just don't have the money to do this. They are already tapped out, the prices and fees. The DEIS fails to analyze the economic impacts of these alternatives being proposed of sectors. You just haven't looked at the viability of the sector. You haven't looked at the viability of the member. I don't know what you're looking at. And honestly, the benefits, the costs, there is no benefit. The conclusion that 100% monitoring will increase crews' profits. How do you figure out that you're going to increase profits when you're going to put a big amount of money on this fishery? I don't get it. Your action doesn't improve anything with stock assessments, the action doesn't improve any abundance estimates in stock assessments. There is no benefit from the DEIS, and it's misleading the costs of electronic modeling. EM has an expense to our members and to ourselves that has not been considered. EM changes the way fish will be handled on deck and includes human labor and logistics for fishermen fishing for multispecies. Currently, the data associated with the EM trips is provided separate from other datasets and requires substantial manipulation to incorporate into sector accounting systems.

I'm just disappointed that another problem was Carlos Rafael. Carlos Rafael is also here in New Bedford and had his own sector because the gentlemen, the members, would not work with him, so they had four different sectors. They had Sector 7, Sector 8, Sector, 13. Sector 9 was all by himself. And a broad brush is just being flung all over us because of what he did. My members have never displayed any activity as such. And I'm sad to say that the Council and GARFO appear to be following their Amendment 16 playbook. And they forgot that we are going to take all this from one big owner. Carlos Rafael was the big guy in New Bedford and what do they do? They let it happen again. Now Blue Harvest is the big guy in New Bedford. Only Blue Harvest is in a Maine sector, not in a New Bedford sector. That's very disappointing because some of my members might have been able to get financing to be able to buy some of these boats and permits, but they weren't allowed to do so because one big conglomerate got it. And that makes me very sad. And as far as the agency working with the sectors and the Council, I'm really waiting to see that. It's been ten years. I'm not sure when they're going to start. I don't even know if you read my narratives, every year I put out a beautiful annual report from all of what we've landed in the sector, what we've done in the sector. I never hear anything back. I never get any feedback. So it's disappointing, and I really hate to keep beating a dead horse, but I really wish we would stop saying that the Council and GARFO are working with the sectors, because they are not. Thank you.

Frank Mirarchi (retired groundfish fisherman): I'm a retired groundfish fisherman. I spent 55 years primarily fishing in the Western Gulf of Maine. I'm here this evening to speak for Sector 12. Sector 12 is a very small sector. It has 18 permits and five active vessels at present all of which are docked in the Port of Scituate, Massachusetts. They're smaller vessels, the largest being about 55 feet in length, and they're almost exclusively day boats. Their daily earnings are in the range of \$2,000 to \$2,500 on an average day trip. So that the cost of at-sea monitoring as proposed of \$700 basically would take away 33% of the gross and 100%, of course, of the net, because the net is a very small percentage of the gross. I'm going to abbreviate my comments

because it's getting late and I don't want to delay other people. So the majority of my comments are going to be submitted in writing. My one comment that I'm going to make tonight is this, that the Council should defer its final vote in September for this reason: that the cost analysis presented in the DEIS is totally out of date. It was done before a lot of events that began in 2019 and accelerated with the COVID-19 pandemic have occurred. Number one, earnings are down. Earnings are down because fish prices are down, not because there's a lack of fish, but because the value of those fish had dropped. The cost analysis doesn't take into consideration the new safety costs that certainly will occur once we begin fishing again under the COVID safety protocols - things like PPE, social distancing, transportation costs, overhead costs that the service providers might have to incur will all be added to that estimated \$700 driving it upward beyond the range that was estimated in the analysis. In addition, disruptions in the supply chain have occurred. It's more expensive to move fish now. The large volume of fish being moved before has been fragmented because of fragmentation in the processing side, and it costs more to move a few pounds of fish in a truck partially loaded than it does to move a lot of pounds of fish in a truck fully loaded. In addition, changes in insurance haven't been incorporated. I fully expect that there's going to be increases in P&I insurance premiums, because of the possibility of infection from other crew members or from observers.

Finally, the cost benefit analysis is very, very irrational. It says a couple of things. Number one, that removal of the uncertainty buffers because of 100% monitoring will improve landings. Well they will; they will improve ACLs. Landings are what people can afford to catch of the fish and our share of the ACL has been steadily declining, and I expect that rate of decline will increase when we begin to look at the 2020 landings to the point where basically we're just leaving more fish in the ocean. It would be wonderful if we could catch those fish, but it's not likely that that's going to happen before the advent of whatever Amendment 23 imposes on us. Finally, the expectation that simply catching more fish is gonna make us more money I think is fallacious because of the disruption in the marketplace. Right now, the loss of the restaurant and food service trades, as well as the reduction in processing capacity because of the difficulty in obtaining labor, is making it more and more difficult to process larger volumes of fish. When that's going to change, I don't know. Neither does the analysis and Amendment 23. So, my expectation is that before any of these benefits occur we'll all be gone. The small boats maybe will lead the parade, but the larger boats will follow until only a vertically integrated business that is able to catch, process, and market fish is going to survive in that environment. I don't want to see that happen. My life has been devoted to fishing in Scituate and most of my friends who still fish feel very strongly about the sanctity and integrity of that port and other small ports like it. So, Sector 12 stands fully in opposition to this amendment as it's presented and objects to the fact that the Council is going to be asked to take a vote before a proper analysis has been done. I'll submit the rest of my comments in writing later on. Thank you very much.

Vito Giacalone (Northeast Seafood Coalition): When the scoping for this amendment started, I can't even remember, has it been three years? We went to the very first one at the Maine Fishermen's Forum. The very first thing that we said was, if there's an observer bias, and no one disagrees that there's going to be an observer bias, that's just human nature. The issue is to determine and quantify the magnitude of it. We never did that, used Gulf of Maine cod to do it. But didn't really acknowledge that Gulf of Maine cod had a 95% reduction in its ACL, which

causes all kinds of biases and issues and concerns especially if the stock assessment was off by an order of magnitude, which we're certain it was. But what happened was, the system in place was already so accountable, that, as Dave said and others have testified and your own numbers validate, we've had a loss of not only members in the industry, we've had a dayboat fishery that was focused on cod. One whole sector, actually three sectors have gone out, and have either merged or gone out of the business completely. And Dave talks about 30 active boats, and we run the cost efficiency for the community preservation fund and the demand for leased fish over the last two years has dropped dramatically. Major changes have happened, major players that were normally purchasing fish are not purchasing fish anymore or they're out of the business or they've sold and consolidated. So, that game has changed completely. And, you know, this lease market that is talked about with a 5% management uncertainty being released, and actually applying the monetary revenue values to that, is amazing because I get a spreadsheet from 2010 forward, and if folks were to look at that, you'd be shocked to see the underutilization. And we've mentioned this at every single meeting, and have even talked about that myth of releasing 5% and attempting to apply a nickel of positive revenue to that was amazing to me, but we looked at it. Most stocks are under harvested by 20% or more. Almost the entire complex is, you got a couple of cod stocks that have had serious reductions in effort, as Dave pointed out, and will continue to beat this drum. This amendment has hung its hat on Gulf of Maine cod. Gulf of Maine cod has had an ACL reduction from 5,000 metric tons in a very short period of time to at one point, it was at 200 metric tons for the commercial sector ACL. Of course you're going to have issues that occur there if the stock biomass isn't reflective of the assessment. So back then we said yes, we want better data, but we're not going to go down the Amendment 16 route again because that was the problem with Amendment 16, was we went from 4% monitoring and 3% NEFOP monitoring to 38%. We eliminated the trip limits. The problems with discards were eliminated. They were eliminated in the fishery. And what have we gained from that data? I'll say nothing. This program is only just going to do more of that. That's why everybody's skeptical of it.

The other big problem with this is the glaring obvious fact that you've got a re-engineering of the fleet that will happen the moment people actually have to pay for this. Remember we'll be going from zero to 100% because they're not paying for it now at all. If they were paying even the 13%, 20%, 31%, or now the sheer 40%, if they were paying for that now, most of them will be out of business already. The same people we're expecting to accept, oh you're gonna do better under 100%. And if that money runs out, and the way it looks, we're not allocating the money to the grants as we had hoped and expected, it's being spent on electronic monitoring, who knows what else it will be spent on, if that money runs out in two years, there is no way any of these benefits that folks have listed in bullets here throughout the public documents and elsewhere of all the benefits that are coming to these guys. The reason there are no new boats in this fleet is because we've mismanaged that. There's no new boats being built, there's nothing coming, who is going to invest in that, so you're re-engineering it because \$700 on any dayboat, even the most profitable one, is an enormous proportion of the gross. So they're done. Right now, you're talking about an amendment at 100% monitoring, the cost of it makes every boat with three crew or less counting the captain, insolvent. If they think they're not, they're kidding themselves, just like a lot of the poor guys who are still fishing today because they don't know what else to do, but they really don't have profitable businesses. And that's why the effort keeps going down. The trip

boats, these guys are having a hard time getting through now. As soon as you start taking 6%, 13% when we actually get the real numbers of what it's going to cost us in travel costs. And a lot of that stuff is it's escalating as soon as that happens, and you start losing a few crew there, those guys are going to consolidate.

So, I'm complaining about the analysis. I think it's extremely inadequate. I think the face value re-engineering of the fleet by putting a \$700 plus cost on a group of people that have fishing one, two, or even three men, where the gross revenues could never support that on a daily basis. You're putting them out of business, and the benefits that we look for, because we knew you're going to try to go down this road. We said, let's do something test two hypotheses: the missing catch theory that people seem to be wedded to and the entire analysis group went down that one road, missing catch. We've got to find every bit of that. We said what about missing biomass? What if you're missing half the biomass, ten times the biomass? Can we test both? Let's agree we want better data only this time, let's actually use it to work both sides of the equation. This DEIS does not even acknowledge, not once is there a statement in there that says that could be confounding problems with a monitoring program if any of these stocks that cannot be avoided are underestimated by an order of magnitude. It doesn't even mention it. Now I just told you, it's not happening at any scale that's making any difference right now, it's not because guys just went out of business, is the problem. I've never been more upset with an amendment then this one. And I'm just shocked that the analysis doesn't at least say it that way. So I think it fails on a lot of fronts. Just to testify, I can let you know that the lease market is going to continue to collapse. Throwing 5% in the bucket is going to do absolutely nothing. There will be less and less utility going to happen on these. Thank God for the haddock that showed up inshore. Otherwise the dayboat fleet would be gone already. Thank God there was so many haddock that this system missed, we were at 100 metric tons, don't forget, 100 metric tons of Gulf of Maine haddock is what the science and scientists said, that we were having collapse on Gulf of Maine haddock that almost destroyed the fishery. But the recreational fleet, thank God, were catching a ton of it, and it took two or three years for the science to catch up, and now we have more haddock, or at least a reasonable haddock quota. If it weren't for that haddock being catchable in the inshore, which I've never seen in my career, those codfish would be all over the place. But they're not, they're in certain areas. People know how to avoid them because the regime shift happened. Saint Peter took care of that. Not us, as managers, we didn't. This is a travesty with what's going on right now, because it's cavalier in that we're re-engineering the fleet with an enormous cost, and we did not do a cost benefit that the industry expected to pay for can recognize. I don't recognize any benefit. Everything that you've listed here and the public hearing documents and then the DEIS fall on deaf ears to us. I'm looking at them, I'm saying what fantasy land are they in? These are not benefits to anybody that's in this business right now is going to realize unless they're ready to totally consolidate and go in a whole different direction. So, just say that should be the purpose and need of this amendment, not trying to get better data. That's my comment on this amendment.

Al Cattone (Gloucester commercial groundfish fisherman): Good evening everyone. I am a commercial fisherman out of Gloucester and I'm 100% groundfish so this is going to have a great impact on me. And not many groundfish boats will be able to afford the cost of monitoring once funding runs out. And because of cod being off the table and the depressed prices of all the

other groundfish stocks, primarily haddock, it has a very low price right now. It won't even be profitable to leave the dock. I guess everyone else has commented that the cost of monitoring added to the gross income of a dayboat or primarily a dayboat, is just the numbers don't add up. It's true some will fish more, very minimal will fish more. Most people will not fish at all under 100% monitoring. All operations right now that are groundfishing are efficient. We're all doing it. Whoever's left is efficient in making money. But at least 80 to 90% of the current people engaged in the groundfishery will be automatically out of business once funding runs out at 100% monitoring. It's just not going to be profitable to leave the dock. And under the analysis, when you say that increased profits are going to happen with the releasing of the buffer and all that, that's just a fantasy. I don't know. I mean I'm not trying to beat a dead horse here, but with all the other comments, I just can't not say that. The analysis is just so far from reality, it's almost comical. It's unbelievable. And the last thing that I wanted to say and this is what kills me more than anything is that you are opening the door for large corporations to come in and steal this fishery because the sharks are circling. And you're making it so much easier for this to happen that it's sad. I've been doing this for 35 years. I got guys standing alongside of me doing it for over 50 years. And my heart and soul is in this industry and to see it just be given away by something like this is just heartbreaking. The first thing you have to do is go back to the drawing board and redo this analysis with some reality, and some input from the people who are actually doing the work. Because this is a travesty what's happening right now. Thank you.

Joe Orlando (Gloucester commercial groundfish fisherman, president of Sector 2, board member of NSC): I'm a commercial fisherman here out of Gloucester. I've been a groundfish fishermen for 46 years. I depend on this groundfish fishery. I'm the president of Sector 2. I'm a board member of the NSC. I've gone through multiple boats, because of the reductions that we've had in these fisheries. Now I have a boat that is 44 feet which I fish, me and one other crew member. I'm 66, he's 68. Now we get up between one o'clock in the morning to three o'clock in the morning. We get in from fishing that same day between 4 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon. We work hard. We work like dogs. And it's just a hard thing. You work for 12 hours a day. You start going between \$1,000 to \$1,500. Sometimes you have a bad day or breakdown or whatever, and you don't make any money. I fished basically 160 days last year. So, if you take that I'm going to start maybe \$180,000 to \$200,000. If I take an observer with me every single day, and it's going to be a \$1,000 a day, it's not going to be any less. That's \$160,000, out of that \$180,000 that I'm starting with. How does that work? They did that analysis, and that 6%, like I was talking about earlier. I can't believe it. I laugh at it.

I'm going to stop at that but now I'm going to tell you a little story. Now the people that are going to vote for this, I want them to put themselves in my shoes or our shoes, okay? So let's just say it's a Council member that's going to vote on this. Let's say he makes \$300 a day. He's going to work, and on the way to work he's got to pick up an observer. He's going to pick up a guy that, he's got to \$280 a day out of that \$300. And he's driving down the highway. Guess what? The car blows a gasket. So now he's got to pull over and call the tow truck. The tow truck is going to cost him \$200, \$300, \$400, whatever it is to get the car fixed. So they go down to the gas station and the guy goes, well, you blew a head gasket and it's going to cost you \$2,000 to fix it. At the same time, he's saying, wait a minute, I still have to pay \$1,000 for the guy that's in the backseat with me. This is what this is about. That's how this thing works, and this is the way I see it. This is

crazy. It's just a crazy, crazy situation. I don't know what to say, to be honest with you. Like I said I've fished 46 years now. And now I look at this guy who's going to come fishing with me, who's going to do maybe 10% of the work that I'm going to do and my crew member, and he's going to make more money than I am. How does this work? How am I gonna pay? Insurance is going up all the time. I pay \$8,000 a year for insurance now, that's cheap. Ice, fuel, water expenses, you got the mechanics now we have to hire for \$160 an hour. How do you make this work? And then I see the analysis. I'm going to make more money. Well how do I make more money if I take a guy fishing with me? How am I going to make more money by taking that guy to fish to me, which I'm going to pay \$1,000 a day? How does that happen? I wish somebody would tell me because I would love to do it right now, if I can make more money. But I don't see it. I don't know what's happening in New England, but it will completely destroy this fishery. Now we know the system hasn't worked for years, take a look at what's happened. When we started this thing, sector stuff in 2010, we were promised the world. Just look at where we're at now. We lost 80% of our participants. Now we're talking about paying people to go fishing with us \$1,000 a day to oversee us what we do. This was terrible. We should all take a break, it is just moving too fast. And the worst part about this is, I've lost two sons to this fishery, I've lost two other boats. And I don't see any young generation benefiting from this. Our sons and daughters benefited from this. We're going to lose it all. And that's terrible. That's on your shoulders, not ours. Thank you very much.

Angela Sanfilippo (president of Gloucester Fishermen's Wives Association): Good afternoon everyone. I wear many hats. I'm the president of the Gloucester Fishermen's Wives Association, the assistant director of the Massachusetts Fishing Partnership, board member of the Fishing Partnership Support Service. And I just cannot believe that next month marks my 43rd year that I make speeches like this. It was in 1977 when I attended my first Council meeting, and I realized there's something seriously wrong with this process. And I just cannot believe all that I've heard today and from people who were just before me. Thank God for the Northeast Seafood Coalition. They deal more with this than I do. But I deal with this every day, because my work is with the socioeconomic benefits, a loss of the fishing industry. And what kills me is that I've been in that position for 43 years, and not once, not ever has one Council member or NOAA member come to me and said, Angela, what's going on? How are the fishermen doing? How are the fishing families? We have all this stuff documented. But nobody cares. It's so sad. And definitely for myself, personally, and the organization that I represent, we are not going to support the Council's preferred alternative. This is real an insult to the industry. Because they would be made to pay a price for the damage that someone else did [Carlos Rafael], and that person did because the people who were supposed to monitor these things did not do their jobs. He could have been caught way earlier than that. The information was there. But people were afraid or didn't care and now we punish our whole industry because of the action of one person. In addition, the person who did what he did today is a millionaire walking around the streets, no concern if we get 100% monitoring or not. And this is, as I said, is so unfair. In addition, the time that we're in with this COVID-19 situation, and it's not getting any better. I really will say that I would like to see the whole amendment frozen in time and not to move forward until we all come back to normal life, if there would ever be one. In addition to all of this, this month the governor of Massachusetts, Governor Baker, Lieutenant Governor, have put out \$36 million because they want to see food security in the state of Massachusetts. And they have come to us

and say, we want the fishing people to take advantages of these infrastructure grants because we want food security in Massachusetts. Well if this goes on, that is not going to happen. They could make all the money available that they can, but there would not be security of seafood for the people of Massachusetts. There is so much more, all through the years, always been said for every amendment, and I can count them all, we've been through all of them, and always been said that it's good, is going to be good for the stock and is going to be good for the fishermen. I don't remember any of those amendments that were good for the stock and good for the fishermen. So at some point, unfortunately, the people who've been involved in causing these problems, they should take responsibility. And do not blame the fishermen. The management has been terrible for 43 years. And now when they don't want to accept that, they're blaming the fishermen. Shame on all of you. Thank you.

Jackie Odell (Executive Director of Northeast Seafood Coalition): The Northeast Seafood Coalition is a non-profit membership organization that represents commercial fishermen, shoreside businesses, and fishing communities that are economically dependent upon the northeast multispecies groundfish fishery. NSC fishing members fish from small and large ports along the northeast coast. They fish small, medium, and large vessels, and they deploy among them all the groundfish gear types. NSC represents over 170 commercial fishing entities, which hold over 300 limited access groundfish permits. Recognizing that Amendment 23 is an industry-funded regulatory action that is proposing sweeping changes to the operations of the New England groundfish fishery, NSC worked with others to contract non-federal experts to conduct extensive economic, scientific, and legal analyses of the DEIS. The work of these experts has brought NSC to the conclusion that the DEIS as has been discussed throughout this public hearing tonight is fundamentally flawed. It does not comply as it must with the National Environmental Policy Act, core Magnuson Act mandates, or even the amendment stated purpose and need. It fails to provide evidence that it will significantly improve stock assessments or management performance, nor is it based on the best scientific information available. Lastly, it fails to document that unreported catches are widespread or a substantial problem for which increased monitoring might be needed or increased costs justified. Much of the Amendment 23 analysis has relied heavily upon qualitative, subjective analyses, has failed to provide any meaningful, quantifiable information that's based on the real activities and fishery facts. This has been a failure of the process and raises a red flag, even in other items that we haven't discussed tonight, which is the Review Process for Sector Monitoring Coverage in Section 6.1.4 in this document. You really have to question how can a future review be based on metrics and indicators as identified and addressed under that section that are not available for the DEIS analysis today. Amendment 23 needs to be re-examined. It cannot move forward with such inadequacies and flaws that do not meet the purpose and need, goals and objectives, or legal mandates. Furthermore, it is not acceptable or legal for the Council to backfill the DEIS with subsequent analyses that are not part of this initial DEIS review now. And I stress that because that is a great concern of those within the NSC, that folks who have supported this action since day one will support that analyses be brought in after the comment period and be used to justify this action. We strongly oppose that, and we will make note of that in our written comments as well. Thank you.

Pamela Lafreniere (Deputy Director of the Port of New Bedford): The Port of New Bedford is going to reserve the opportunity to submit written comments, based not only on the stakeholder input given this evening but on stakeholder input derived from now to the time that there is an opportunity to give written comments. But the couple of items that the Port of New Bedford would like to note is that the preferred alternatives, one of which being the 100% observer coverage. The cost for that is simply too expensive for the fleet as it currently exists. In addition, it appears that there has not been an adequate and fully vetted evaluation of the 100% observer coverage that is the preferred alternative. In addition, even if either one of the preferred alternatives, being the electronic monitoring and/or the 100% at-sea observers were to be implemented, neither one could be fully implemented as there are not enough at-sea observers for implementation, nor is the electronic monitoring fully operational and able to be implemented. The Port of New Bedford will limit its comments to those items, but as I said we reserve the opportunity to make written comments, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this evening.

Additionally, **Maggie Raymond** (Associated Fisheries of Maine), thanked Ms. Etrie and Ms. Odell for providing the opportunity for fishermen to participate in the session tonight. The Chair echoed these sentiments.

The public hearing closed at approximately 6:43 pm.

**Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring
Public Hearing
Webinar**

Audience List

Date	July 30, 2020
Start time	4:03 PM
End time	6:43 PM
Number of participants	41

Groundfish Committee Chair: Terry Stockwell

Council Staff (6): Jamie Cournane, Robin Frede, Melissa Errend, Janice Plante, Tom Nies, Chris Kellogg, and Jonathon Peros

Participants (taken from webinar list during presentation)

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation (based on email address)</u>
1	Albert Cottone*	F/V SABRINA MARIA, Gloucester commercial groundfish fisherman
	Allison Lorenc	Conservation Law Foundation
	Angela Sanfilippo*	President of Gloucester Fishermen's Wives Association
	Bill Blount**	F/V RUTHIE B, commercial groundfish fisherman, New Bedford, NEFS 8
	Carlos Alberto**	F/V LUSO AMERICAN I, owner, commercial groundfish, New Bedford, NEFS 8
	Cassie Canastra**	BASE groundfish offload facility, New Bedford
	Cheri Patterson	NEFMC/NH F&G
	Claire Teylouni	Office of Senator Markey
	Daniel Salerno	Sector Manager
10	David Leveille	Sector Manager for NEFS 2 and NEFS 6
	Elizabeth Etrie	NEFMC
	Eric Reid	NEFMC
	Frank Mirarchi	Retired groundfish fisherman
	George Lapointe	Blue Harvest Fisheries
	Glenn Delaney	
	Hank Soule	Sector Manager – Sustainable Harvest Sector
	Heather Cronin	Gulf of Maine Research Institute
	Jackie Odell	Executive Director of Northeast Seafood Coalition
	Joseph Orlando*	F/V SANTO PIO, Gloucester commercial fisherman, President - NEFS 2 and Board Member of the Northeast Seafood Coalition
20	John Haran	Sector Manager – Sector 13
	John Quinn	NEFMC

	Linda McCann	Sector Manager - NEFS 8, New Bedford
	Liz Moore	Gulf of Maine Research Institute
	Maggie Raymond	Associated Fisheries of Maine
	Mark E. DeCristoforo	MA Senate
	Mark Grant	NOAA Fisheries
	Melanie Griffin	NEFMC/MA DMF
	Michael Walsh**	F/Vs Atlantic Prince, Olympia, Guardian, American Heritage, Flight 1, Boomer Too; commercial groundfish fisherman Boston, NEFS 6
	Pamela Lafreniere	Deputy Director Port of New Bedford
30	Pat Kavanagh	
	Pete Aarrestad	NEFMC/CT
	Antonio Peter Rico**	F/V LUSO AMERICAN I, captain, commercial groundfish fisherman, New Bedford, NEFS 8
	Scott Olszewski	NEFMC/RI DEM
	Sefatia Romeo Theken	City of Gloucester
	Stephanie Sykes	Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance
	Terry Alexander	NEFMC
	Tom Vinegra**	F/V HUSTLER, commercial groundfish fisherman, New Bedford, NEFS 8
	Tory Bramante	Atlantic Coast Seafood
	Vincent Balzano	NEFMC
40	Vito Giacalone	Northeast Seafood Coalition
	William McCann**	F/V Pilgrim and Shamrock (New Bedford, NEFS 8)

* Attended an in-person session organized and hosted by Jackie Odell for Northeast Seafood Coalition (NSC) member fishermen in Gloucester.

** Attended an in-person session organized and hosted by Elizabeth Etrie for NSC member fishermen in New Bedford.