Groundfish Amendment 18 Part 2 of 2 – Public comments PRELIMINARY SUMMARY

Rachel Feeney
Council Staff

NEFMC
Groundfish AP & Cte. Mtgs.
September 2-3, 2015



Outline

- Participation/demographics
- Comment content
 - Alternatives
 - Council process



Amendment 18 Public Comment Period

- July 7 August 31, 2015
- 13 oral comments
- 18 written comments



Oral comments

Location	Attendees*	Speakers
Portland, ME	8	5
Portsmouth, NH	2	0
New Bedford, MA	7	5
Mystic, CT	0	0
Gloucester, MA	6	3
webinar	1	0
Total	24**	13

^{**22} total attendees if duplicates removed.



^{*}Not including Council members or staff.

Oral comments

Stakeholder Type

Commercial groundfish fisherman = 6 (46%)

Handgear = I(8%)

Other = 5 (38%)

Home state

ME = 5 (38%)

MA = 5 (62%)

Non-governmental organization = 6 (45%)

Environmental = 2(15%)

Commercial = 2(15%)

Other = 2(15%)

Interested public = I (8%)



Written comments

Letter types (n=18)

Individual = 6
Group = I (40 signatures)
NGO = 9
Agency = 2

Stakeholder type of letters (n=16)

Commercial groundfish fisherman = 5 (no handgear)

Non-governmental organization = 8

Environmental = 2

Commercial = 3

Other = 3

Interested public = I

Recreational = 2

Home state*

ME = 6

NH = 2

MA = 4

RI = I

VA = I

Unknown = I

* Not including letter from 40 fisherman of multiple states



NGOs represented (oral and written)

- Commercial fishery
 - Associated Fisheries of Maine
 - Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership
 - New Bedford Seafood Consulting
 - Northeast Coastal Communities Sector
 - Northeast Hook Fisherman's Association
 - Northeast Seafood Coalition
- Environmental
 - Environmental Defense Fund
 - The Nature Conservancy
- Other
 - Health Care Without Harm
 - Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance
 - Penobscot East Resource Center



Content – accumulation limits

- General comments re having caps
 - Support keep as many people fishing as possible
 - Opposition sufficient protections in place; caps prevent achieving OY.
- The preferred alternatives (15.5% average PSC, 5% permit)
 - Support least disruptive; doesn't penalize PSC acquired through A16.
 - Opposition can accumulate too much of a stock, caps need to be stock-specific; community impacts of consolidation should be considered and prevented; don't just focus on preventing market power.



Content - HA measures

- Support for Council preferences (Alt. 2 throughout)
 - Promotes fleet diversity
 - Supports a future for handgear
 - Increases flexibility for handgear fishermen

- Opposition to Council preferences
 - Cited NOAA's repeated comments on the inability to accurately monitor such small sub-ACLs.



Content – data confidentiality

- Support for Council preferences (No Action.
 ACE lease price remains confidential)
 - The data are not necessary for the administration of the sector program.

- Opposition to Council preferences
 - The data would improve fishermen's ability to participate in the lease market; increase ACE use that would benefit individuals and communities.



Content – inshore/offshore GOM

- Support for Council preferences (No action. No line or associated measures.)
 - Council's objective unclear.
 - Other alternatives wouldn't help the inshore fishermen.

- Opposition to Council preferences
 - A line would improve data collection to aid development of future actions.
 - Disappointment that the alternatives miss the mark, not protecting inshore fish or fishermen.



Content – Redfish Exemption Area

- Support for Council preferences (Establish in FMP)
 - The gear, rules, and area are well studied and laudable.

- Opposition to Council preferences
 - Sector exemptions should remain within the current approval process.



Themes – Council process

- The Council is failing
 - A18 has taken too long, wasting precious time/resources.
 - A I 8 has not adequately addressed the concerns that prompted it.
 - Very difficult for newcomers to understand/engage in the Council process.
 - Stakeholder views not taken seriously.
 - Groundfish management is failing to sustain communities.

