February 26, 2018

VIA E-MAIL

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
ATTN: John Hoey, Assistant Chancellor for Public Affairs
Foster Administration Building – Room 320
285 Old Westport Road
Dartmouth, MA 02747
E-mail: publicaffairs@umassd.edu

Re: Massachusetts Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Mr. Hoey:

I write on behalf of Cause of Action Institute ("CoA Institute"), a nonprofit strategic oversight group committed to ensuring that government decision-making is open, honest, and fair.[1] In carrying out its mission, CoA Institute uses investigative and legal tools to educate the public about the importance of government transparency and accountability.

On April 11, 2017, CoA Institute submitted a public comment to the New England Fishery Management Council ("NEFMC") concerning NEFMC's draft Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment.[2] The comment was specifically directed to Dr. John Quinn, who serves as NEFMC Chairman and also represents the interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in his capacity as a voting member.[3] In the comment, CoA Institute expressed concern over the lack of statutory authority for the NEFMC and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") to compel regulated parties (*i.e.*, commercial fishermen) to pay for supplemental at-sea monitoring.[4]

---

[1] *See* CAUSE OF ACTION INST., *About*, www.causeofaction.org/about (last visited Feb. 26, 2018).

[2] Letter from CoA Inst. to Dr. John Quinn, New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council (Apr. 11, 2017) (attached as Exhibit 1).

[3] *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1852(a)(1)(C), (b)(2). To the extent Dr. Quinn uses his state government e-mail address for NEFMC business, the records that he creates, receives, and maintains qualify as "public records" for the purposes of the Massachusetts Public Records Act. *See* MASS. GEN. LAWS, ch. 4, § 7(26); *see also* 950 MASS. CODE REGS. § 32.02 (defining "public record" to include "[a]ll . . . papers . . . or other documentary materials or data, regardless of physical form of characteristics, made or received by a governmental entity[.]"). The relevant definitions of "governmental entity" and "agency" incontrovertibly include the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and Dr. Quinn in his capacity as a university employee. The University is therefore the proper custodian to receive and process CoA Institute's records request. Indeed, at all times relevant, Dr. Quinn advertised his university e-mail account as the proper addresses by which to contact him for NEFMC business. *See, e.g.*, NEW. ENG. FISHERY MGMT. COUNCIL, COUNCIL MEMBER BIOGRAPHIES at 1 (Jan. 22, 2018), *available at* http://bit.ly/2ommQ7l; *see also Council Membership*, New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council (archived page date July 31, 2017) (attached as Exhibit 2); *see generally* E-mail from CoA Inst. to Dr. John Quinn, New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council (Apr. 11, 2017) (attached as Exhibit 3).

[4] *See* CoA Inst., Press Release: Withdraw Unlawful Plan Forcing Fishermen to Pay for At-Sea Monitors (Apr. 12, 2017), *available at* http://coainst.org/2AYOikc; *see also Fishermen in New England Face Another Costly Regulation*, COA INST. (Apr. 26, 2017), http://coainst.org/2owyD5H.

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Public Records Act § 66–10, *et seq.*, CoA Institute hereby requests access to the following records:

> All records concerning CoA Institute's April 2017 comment, including but not limited to all correspondence between or amongst Dr. John Quinn and (1) members of the NEFMC or Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; (2) officials, employees, or representatives of NOAA; (3) officials, employees, or representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; or (4) any non-governmental third party.

The time period for this request is April 11, 2017 to the present.[5] Search terms may include, but are not limited to, "Cause of Action," "CoA," "Julie Smith," "Eric Bolinder," and "Ryan Mulvey." In addition to e-mail correspondence, other responsive records may include notes on the comment (handwritten or otherwise), memoranda, letters, meeting agendas, phone call notes, voice messages, text and instant messages, and desk calendar entries.

Request for a Public Interest Fee Waiver and Treatment as a News Media Requester

CoA Institute requests a waiver of all applicable fees. Massachusetts law and applicable regulations provide that a records access officer may furnish records without or at reduced charge if "disclosure of the requested record[s] is in the public interest" and "is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester."[6] In this case, CoA Institute seeks the disclosure of information that will contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the Commonwealth vis-à-vis Dr. Quinn's representation on the NEFMC. This request is not primarily in the commercial interest of CoA Institute, a federal tax-exempt organization that is frequently treated as a representative of the news media in its Freedom of Information Act work.

In this case, the requested records will unquestionably shed light on the operations or activities of the NEFMC—and the Commonwealth's representative, Dr. John Quinn—in overseeing the transition of the herring and mackerel fisheries to an industry-funded at-sea monitoring regime and, moreover, in laying a foundation for the introduction of industry funding across all regional fisheries. The public interest value of the requested records is demonstrated by the widespread concern over the economic feasibility of industry funding among vessel owners and operators. Indeed, the legality of industry-funded monitoring has been the subject of litigation.[7] The public has a right to view these records. Disclosure will likely aid public understanding because, to date, all records concerning CoA Institute's comment have not been made publicly available.

CoA Institute has the intent and ability to make the results of this request available to a reasonably broad public audience through various media. Its staff has significant experience and expertise in government oversight, investigative reporting, and public interest litigation. These professionals will analyze the information responsive to this request, use their editorial skills to turn raw materials

---

[5] For purposes of this request, the term "present" should be construed as the date on which a search for responsive records is begun. The term "record" means the entirety of a record any portion of which contains responsive information.

[6] 950 MASS. CODE REGS. § 32.07(2)(k)(1)–(2).

[7] *See Goethel v. Pritzker*, 854 F.3d 106 (1st Cir. 2017); *Goethel v. Pritzker*, No. 15-497, 2016 WL 4076831 (D.N.H. 2016); *see also* CoA Inst., Press Release: Supreme Court Denies Petition to Review Job-Killing Fishery Rule (Oct. 2, 2017), *available at* http://bit.ly/2B5Hxx2.

into a distinct work, and share the resulting analysis with the public through CoA Institute's regularly published online newsletter, memoranda, reports, or press releases. In addition, CoA Institute is a non-profit entity as defined under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

For fee purposes, CoA Institute also qualifies as a representative of the news media because it gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.[8] CoA Institute gathers the news it regularly publishes from a variety of sources, including federal and state Freedom of Information Act requests, whistleblowers/insiders, and scholarly works. It does not merely make raw information available to the public, but distributes distinct work product, including articles, blog posts, investigative reports, newsletters, and congressional testimony and statements for the record.[9] These distinct works are distributed to the public through various media, including CoA Institute's website, Twitter, and Facebook. CoA Institute also provides news updates to subscribers via e-mail.

In the event fees are not waived or reduced, please inform me if the applicable costs for searching and copying the requested records will exceed $100.

Record Production and Contact Information

The Massachusetts Public Records Act requires a response to this request within ten (10) business days.[10] In an effort to facilitate document review, please provide the responsive documents in electronic form in lieu of a paper production. If a certain portion of responsive records can be produced more readily, CoA Institute requests that they be produced first and the remaining records be produced on a rolling basis as circumstances permit. If you deny any or all of this request, please provide citations to the exemptions that justify such determination, along with notice of the appeal procedures available under the law.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact me by telephone at (202) 499-4232 or by e-mail at ryan.mulvey@causeofaction.org. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

---

[8] Under the federal Freedom of Information Act, agencies have regularly recognized CoA Institute's status as a representative of the news media. *See, e.g.*, FOIA Request 2016-11-008, Dep't of the Treasury (Nov. 7, 2016); FOIA Requests OS-2017-00057 & OS-2017-00060, Dep't of Interior (Oct. 31, 2016); FOIA Request 2017-00497, Office of Personnel Mgmt. (Oct. 21, 2016); FOIA Request 092320167031, Ctrs. for Medicare & Medicaid Servs. (Oct. 17, 2016); FOIA Request 17-00054-F, Dep't of Educ. (Oct. 6, 2016); FOIA Request DOC-OS-2016-001753, Dept. of Commerce (Sept. 27, 2016); FOIA Request 2016-09-101, Dep't of the Treasury (Sept. 21, 2016); FOIA Request DOC-OIG-2016-001732, , Office of Inspector Gen., Dep't of Commerce (Sept. 15, 2016); FOIA Request OS-2016-00435, Dep't of the Interior (Aug. 31, 2016); FOIA Request 2016-366-F, Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau (Aug. 11, 2016); FOIA Request F-2016-09406, Dep't of State (Aug. 11, 2016); FOIA Request 2016-08-070, Dep't of the Treasury (Aug. 10, 2016); FOIA Request 2016-00896, Bureau of Land Mgmt., Dep't of the Interior (Aug. 10, 2016); FOIA Request 1355038-000, Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Dep't of Justice (Aug. 2, 2016).

[9] *See generally* CAUSE OF ACTION INST., *Media*, www.causeofaction.org/media (last visited Feb. 26, 2018).

[10] MASS. GEN. LAWS ch., 4, § 10(a).

Sincerely,

RYAN P. MULVEY
COUNSEL

EXHIBIT
1

April 12, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

New England Fishery Management Council
ATTN: Dr. John Quinn, Chairman
50 Water Street, Mill 2
Newburyport, MA 01950
E-mail: comments@nefmc.org

Re: Industry-Funded Monitoring (IFM) Omnibus Amendment

Dear Chairman Quinn:

I write on behalf of Cause of Action Institute ("CoA Institute") with respect to the New England Fishery Management Council's ("NEFMC" or "Council") consideration of final action on the Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment ("Omnibus Amendment").[1] The Omnibus Amendment raises a number of serious legal questions concerning the Council's authority to compel regulated parties, *i.e.*, fishermen, to pay for supplemental monitoring services. As set forth in detail below, there is no authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Act ("MSA"), 16 U.S.C. § 1801 *et seq.*, for industry funding requirements in most of the Atlantic fisheries. As such, the Omnibus Amendment, and future attempts to implement industry-funded monitoring under the Omnibus Amendment's framework, will almost certainly face legal challenge. CoA Institute requests that the Council either abandon the Omnibus Amendment or develop alternative ways to achieve the Council's goals of increased data collection and expanded policing of annual catch totals.[2] The NEFMC could, for example, work with the National Marine Fisheries Service ("NMFS") to reallocate existing funds for monitoring or petition Congress to appropriate funding specific to expanded monitoring. Attempting to shift monitoring costs without legal authority onto an already economically-beleaguered industry would be ill-advised.

---

[1] New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council & Mid-Atl. Fishery Mgmt. Council, Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amend. (Sept. 2016) [hereinafter Omnibus Amend.], *available at* http://bit.ly/2mQxrtn.

[2] CoA Institute acknowledges that the Council has chosen its preferred alternatives, including Omnibus Alternatives 2.2 and 2.6 and Herring Alternatives 2.5 and 2.7. *See, e.g.*, New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council, Press Release: Council Selects Industry-Funded Monitoring Alternatives for Omnibus Amendment, Atlantic Herring Category A and B Boats (Jan. 25, 2017), *available at* http://bit.ly/2nKW463. Nevertheless, final approval by the NEFMC and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council are required before the Omnibus Amendment is submitted to NMFS for secretarial review and publication in the Federal Register. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1854(a), (f)(1).

CoA Institute is a nonpartisan 501(c)(3) nonprofit strategic oversight group committed to ensuring that government decision-making is open, honest, and fair.[3] In carrying out its mission, CoA Institute uses various investigative and legal tools to educate the public about the importance of government transparency and accountability, as well as agency adherence to the rule of law. CoA Institute advocates on behalf of clients facing federal overreach and overregulation, including members of the New England fishing industry. CoA Institute currently represents David Goethel—a former member of the NEFMC—and the members of Northeast Fishery Sector XIII in a challenge to the Northeast multispecies industry-funded sector at-sea monitoring program.[4] That case raises many of the same issues faced by the Council vis-à-vis the Omnibus Amendment.

I. <u>The Magnuson-Stevens Act Does Not Authorize the Industry-Funded Monitoring Programs Intended by the Omnibus Amendment</u>.

The stated purpose of the Omnibus Amendment is straightforward: the Council is "interested in increasing monitoring and/or other types of data collection to assess the amount and type of catch, to more precisely monitor annual catch limits, and/or provide other information for management,"[5] but its ability to fund that increased monitoring is limited.[6] The proposed solution is to design a standardized mechanism that would permit the government to order fishermen to cover a substantial portion of monitoring costs.[7] Yet the Council fails to point to *any provision* in the MSA that gives it the authority to implement such a plan.

---

[3] CAUSE OF ACTION INST., *About*, http://www.causeofaction.org/about (last visited Apr. 12, 2017).
[4] *See Goethel v. Pritzker*, No. 16-2103 (1st Cir. argued Mar. 7, 2017); *Goethel v. Pritzker*, No. 15-497, 2016 WL 4076831 (D.N.H. July 29, 2016).
[5] *See* Omnibus Amend. at 41.
[6] *See id.* at 43–44 ("NMFS has limited funding for monitoring, so both Councils have considered requiring industry to contribute to the cost of monitoring."); Greater Atl. Reg'l Fisheries Office, Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., Press Release: Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment, Public Hearings and Comment Period (Sept. 20, 2016) ("The amount of available Federal funding to support additional monitoring is limited[.]"), *available at* http://bit.ly/2nHNpl1.
[7] *See, e.g.*, Omnibus Amend. at 62 ("Under Omnibus Alternative 2, there would be an established, standardized structure for new industry-funded monitoring programs . . . [that addresses] (1) standard cost responsibilities associated with industry-funded monitoring for NMFS and the fishing industry, (2) a process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring to be implemented via [amendment and revised via] a . . . framework adjustment action, (3) standard administrative requirements [for industry-funded monitoring service providers] . . . (4) [a] process to prioritize new industry-funded monitoring programs in order to allocate available Federal resources for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs, including the type of weighing approach and the timing of revising the weighing approach, and [(5)] a process for FMP-specific monitoring set-aside programs to be

a. The Council Requires Explicit Statutory Authorization to Require Industry to Fund Supplemental Discretionary Monitoring Programs

Federal agencies do not enjoy unbridled power in choosing which programs to pursue; they cannot impose new fees or taxes, nor can they simply demand that citizens pay for programs that the government ought to be financing in the first place. In this sense, the most basic presumption in the Omnibus Amendment, namely, that the Council can order industry to fund a monitoring program, is gravely mistaken and runs afoul of a fundamental principle of administrative law: "[A]n agency literally has no power to act . . . unless and until Congress confers power upon it."[8] The Council appears to acknowledge as much, but does not give the principle due credit: "A Federal agency cannot spend money on a program beyond the maximum authorized program level without authorization from Congress. [It] also cannot get around the maximum authorized program level by adding to its appropriations from sources outside the government without permission from Congress."[9]

The MSA does not authorize the Council to redesign fishery management plans to introduce the sort of industry-funded monitoring envisioned by the Omnibus Amendment. At most, the MSA authorizes the *placement* of observers and monitors.[10] The Council, however, is not at liberty to design any particular *funding* mechanism for those monitors. The plain meaning of the MSA, here, is clear and unambiguous.[11] The statute only authorizes industry-funded monitoring in a few specific regions and circumstances: (1) foreign fishing,[12] (2) limited access privilege programs,[13] and (3) the North Pacific fisheries research plan.[14] Congress's decision to permit NMFS and the regional councils to require industry-funded monitoring and observing in those, and

---

implemented via a future framework adjustment action. Additionally, [it] would include a range of options for the process to prioritize industry-funded monitoring across all FMPs.") (alternations indicate changes in the April 2017 Omnibus Amendment draft, *available at* http://bit.ly/2omwA0Q).

[8] *La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Fed. Commc'ns Comm'n*, 476 U.S. 355, 374 (1986); *see Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. Envtl. Prot. Agency*, 134 S. Ct. 2427, 2466 (2014) ("An agency confronting resource constraints may change its own conduct, but it cannot change the law.").

[9] *See* Omnibus Amend. at 45.

[10] 16 U.S.C. § 1853(b)(8); 50 C.F.R. § 648.2.

[11] *See generally Palmieri v. Nynex Long Distance Co.*, 437 F.3d 111, 115 (1st Cir. 2006); *Bonilla v. Muebles J.J. Alvarez, Inc.*, 194 F.3d 275, 277 n.2 (1st Cir. 1999).

[12] 16 U.S.C. § 1821(h)(4).

[13] *Id.* § 1853a(e). The Greater Atlantic Region contains two fisheries that permit cost recovery through a fee system: the Atlantic sea scallop individual fishing quota and golden tilefish individual fishing quota limited access privilege programs. *See* Omnibus Amend. at 51.

[14] 16 U.S.C. § 1862(a).

only those, three situations shows its intent to disallow industry funding in other instances.[15] To read the statute otherwise violates Congress's clear intent and the well-established legislative history of the MSA.[16]

b. The Omnibus Amendment's Industry-Funded Monitoring Scheme Would Violate the National Standards and Other Important Legal Principles.

Notwithstanding the Council's lack of explicit legal authority, the introduction of industry-funded monitoring across the Greater Atlantic fisheries would also impose a tremendous economic burden on the fishing industry and could lead to the elimination of small-scale fishing. This result would violate National Standards 7 and 8.[17] Congress never intended to grant the Council the authority to regulate a substantial portion of the Atlantic fleet out of existence.[18] Indeed, as the Supreme Court has held, "Congress . . . does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme [such as the one intended by the MSA] in vague terms or ancillary provisions,"[19] nor does it "delegate a decision of such economic and political significance [as the introduction of

---

[15] Any other reading of the MSA would render provisions discussing industry funding surplusage, *Nat'l Credit Union Admin v. First Nat'l Bank & Tr. Co.*, 522 U.S. 479, 501 (1998), and offend important canons of construction. *Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 173 (2001); *see also EchoStar Satellite L.L.C. v. Fed. Commc'ns Comm'n*, 704 F.3d 992, 999 (D.C. Cir. 2013); *Ry. Labor Execs.' Ass'n v. Natl' Mediation Bd.*, 29 F.3d 655 (D.C. Cir. 1994); *cf. Anglers Conservation Network v. Pritzker*, 139 F. Supp. 3d 102, 116 n.9 (D.D.C. 2015) ("'[C]ost sharing' programs with industry participants in other fisheries in order to provide higher observer coverage levels . . . were expressly authorized by statute *for particular fisheries only*.") (emphasis added) (citing 16 U.S.C. § 1862).

[16] There is no evidence of Congressional recognition for some pre-existing, implied authority to impose monitoring costs on industry. Congress has repeatedly declined the opportunity to permit industry funding nationwide. Each time the MSA has been reauthorized, Congress considered (and rejected) bills that would have created blanket authority for mandatory industry funding. H.R. 1554, 101st Cong. § 2(a)(3) (1989); H.R. 39, 104th Cong. § 9(b)(4) (1995); H.R. 5018, 109th Cong. § 9(b) (2006).

[17] *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1851(a)(7)–(8). It should not lightly be concluded that Congress intend to grant authority for the Council and NMFS to take actions that would put fishermen out of business. *See Arctic Sole Seafoods v. Gutierrez*, 622 F. Supp. 2d 1050, 1061 (W.D. Wash. 2008) (rejecting agency interpretation because it "leads to absurd results—the inevitable elimination of the fishery); *W. Sea Fishing Co. v. Locke*, 722 F. Supp. 2d 126, 140 (D. Mass. 2010) ("[The MSA] creates a duty to allow for harvesting at optimum yield in the present, while at the same time protecting fishery output for the future[.]").

[18] The Council could certainly repeal or revoke any of its fishery management plans, but it must do so explicitly and by three-quarters majority approval of its voting members. 16 U.S.C. § 1854(h).

[19] *Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc.*, 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001).

industry-funded monitoring] in so cryptic a fashion."[20] Industry-funded monitoring as a normal course of fishery regulation is not only novel, but represents a shift of economic and political significance.

In the absence of authorization for the sort of industry-funded monitoring programs contemplated by the Omnibus Amendment, the Council can only be described as preparing to impose a "tax" to extract money from regulated parties in order to fund desired regulatory programs. This cannot stand as "only Congress has the power to levy taxes."[21] The Omnibus Amendment, as applied in future fishery management plan amendments, would also violate numerous statutes governing agency finance, such as the Anti-Deficiency Act[22] and the Miscellaneous Receipts Statutes.[23] Finally, industry funding requirements would impermissibly compel fishermen into commercial transactions in violation of the Commerce Clause[24] and violate other parts of the Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment.

II. <u>The Expected Economic Impact of the Omnibus Amendment, including Provisions for the Herring and Mackerel Fisheries, and Stakeholder Feedback Expose Other Important Deficiencies</u>.

In line with the National Standards, the Omnibus Amendment and future industry-funded monitoring programs must "minimize costs,"[25] "provide for the sustained participation of [fishing] communities,"[26] and "minimize adverse economic impacts."[27] The Omnibus Amendment fails to meet these standards, both generally

---

[20] *Food & Drug Admin. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 160 (2000); *see Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 267 (2006) (rejecting the argument that Congress would delegate "broad and unusual authority through an implicit delegation").
[21] *Thomas v. Network Solutions*, 2 F. Supp. 2d 22, 29 (D.D.C. 1998); *see* U.S. Const., art. I., § 8, cl. 1; *Nat'l Cable Television Ass'n, Inc. v. United States*, 415 U.S. 336, 340 (1974) ("Taxation is a legislative function, and Congress . . . is the sole organ for levying taxes[.]").
[22] *See* 31 U.S.C. § 1341(a)(1)(A)–(B); *see also Envtl. Def. Ctr. v. Babbitt*, 73 F.3d 867, 872 (9th Cir. 1995).
[23] *See* 31 U.S.C. § 3302(b); *see also Scheduled Airlines Traffic Offices, Inc. v. Dep't of Def.*, 87 F.3d 1356, 1361 (D.C. Cir. 1996). The Government Accountability Office has rejected the proposition that an agency can avoid the Miscellaneous Receipts Statute "by authorizing a contractor to charge fees to outside parties and keep the payments in order to offset costs that would otherwise be borne by agency appropriations." Gov't Accountability Office, 2 Principles of Fed. Appropriations L. at 6-177 (3d ed. 2006).
[24] *See, e.g.*, *Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 132 S. Ct. 2566, 2587 (2012) (The government cannot "compel[] individuals to become active in commerce by purchasing a product.").
[25] 16 U.S.C. § 1851(a)(7).
[26] *Id.* § 1851(a)(8).
[27] *Id.*

and with respect to the herring and mackerel alternatives, because it will have a severe and adverse impact on the fishing industry.

The expected economic impact on fishery-related business and communities is uniformly negative.[28] Monitoring costs in the herring fishery, for example, will likely exceed $710 per sea day for an at-sea monitor and $818 per sea day for a NEFOP-level observer.[29] Such costs are probably higher than the daily landings revenue of the typical small-scale vessel. This is certainly the case in the Northeast multispecies fishery. Under the groundfish sector at-sea monitoring program, up to 60% of the fleet is expected to "see negative returns to owner when full" monitoring costs "are factored in."[30] The Council cannot ignore the devastating economic effects of industry funding in the herring and mackerel fisheries, just as it cannot ignore the costs associated with the Omnibus Alternatives, which it has deemed too "speculative" to consider.[31]

It is worth noting the overwhelmingly negative feedback that the Council and NMFS have received in pursing the Omnibus Amendment. Of the eighty-three (83) submissions posted to the electronic docket during the last round of public comment, only six (6) voiced various levels of support for industry-funded monitoring; the vast majority — 93% — opposed it.[32] The reasons for this opposition are straightforward enough. Many small-scale fishermen cannot remain profitable if they must assume

---

[28] *See, e.g.*, Omnibus Amend. at xiii–xxiv; *id.* at 244 ("Overall, there will be *negative direct economic impacts to fishing vessels* as a result of selecting Omnibus Alternative 2[.]") (emphasis added).

[29] *Id.* at 291 (Table 89). For fishermen active in both the herring and the mackerel fisheries, these costs could rise even further. *See id.* at 301 ("Many of the vessels that would be impacted by industry-funded monitoring costs in the herring fishery would also be impacted by industry-funded monitoring costs in the mackerel fishery."). Total estimated costs for vessels active in the mackerel fishery will depend, of course, on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council's preferred mackerel coverage target alternatives, which have not yet been chosen.

[30] New Eng. Fishery Mgmt. Council, Draft Report: Preliminary Evaluation of the Impact of Groundfish-Sector Funded At Sea Monitoring on Groundfish Fishery Profits at 10 (June 19, 2015), *available at* http://bit.ly/28QUXwT. These costs are predicted to be heaviest for small vessels. *Id.* at 13 (Table 12). NMFS recognized these prospects, describing them as a "restructuring of the fleet." *Id.* at 10.

[31] Omnibus Amend. at 237 ("[P]otential downstream effects (e.g., subsequent management measures to address bycatch issues) of this action are considered too remote and speculative to be appropriate for consideration[.]").

[32] Dep't of Commerce, Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., 81 Fed. Reg. 64,426 (Sept. 20, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0001, *available at* http://bit.ly/2p5NO1s.

monitoring costs.[33] The Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, for example, expects that the Omnibus Amendment's approximately $800 per sea day cost would force more than half of the entire New York-based fleet out of business.[34] Stakeholders are also skeptical that increased monitoring has any connection to conservation or maintaining the sustainability of the fisheries, and they question the quality of the data collected. Most importantly, however, the public recognizes that the MSA does *not*, in fact, authorize industry-funded monitoring simply because the Council or NMFS wishes it to do so,[35] and they acknowledge the potential constitutional problems.[36]

Apart from the lack of authority under the MSA for the Council and NMFS to impose monitoring costs on vessels, the Council has also failed to provide an adequate explanation for why increased monitoring is necessary, let alone justify that monitoring in light of the extreme financial burden it will put on fishermen. Industry-funded monitoring, as proposed, would destroy multi-generational, small-business fishermen up-and-down the East Coast while benefitting industrial fishing firms. That result is unacceptable.

---

[33] *See* Comment of Meghan Lapp, Seafreeze Ltd., on Omnibus Amend. (Nov. 7, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0009, *available at* http://bit.ly/2nUf8Ph (discussing impact of herring and mackerel alternatives).

[34] *See* Comment of Long Island Commercial Fishing Ass'n on Omnibus Amend. (Nov. 8, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0084, *available at* http://bit.ly/2odOrsX ("The onus for NMFS required observer coverage should be on NMFS, not industry. It is cost prohibitive.").

[35] *See, e.g.*, Comment of David Goethel on Omnibus Amend. (Nov. 7, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0010, *available at* http://bit.ly/2o04Mye ("Monitoring is a function of government and should be funded at levels Congress deems appropriate through NOAA line items in the budget. . . . [The MSA] allows for the placement of observers on fishing boats but is silent on cost recovery except in specific fisheries in the North Pacific Region."); *see also* Comment of Gregg Morris on Omnibus Amend. (Nov. 8, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0080, *available at* http://bit.ly/2o09hJp (same).

[36] *E.g.*, Comment of N.C. Fisheries Ass'n on Omnibus Amend. (Nov. 7, 2016), Docket No. NOAA-NMFS-2016-0139-0082, *available at* http://bit.ly/2oXBtAa (raising due process concerns) ("There was no reasonable opportunity for [public hearings] down in the affected states of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. Their involvement in the public hearings process was substantially truncate. [Those] whose stand to be severely impacted . . . have not been given a single public hearing reasonably close enough for them to be expected to attend."); *cf.* Brooke Constance White, *Stonington fishermen, first selectman: Camera proposal violates Fourth Amendment rights*, THE WESTERLY SUN (Apr. 7, 2017), http://bit.ly/2o00maB.

III. Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of the foregoing comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at julie.smith@causeofaction.org or (202) 499-4232.

Sincerely,

JULIE A. SMITH
VICE PRESIDENT
CAUSE OF ACTION INSTITUTE

cc: Mr. Michael Luisi, Chairman
Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
800 North State Street, Ste. 201
Dover, DE 19901
E-mail: michael.luisi@maryland.gov

Mr. John Bullard, Administrator
Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
National Marine Fisheries Service
55 Great Republic Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930
E-mail: john.bullard@noaa.gov

Mr. Benjamin Friedman
Acting Administrator
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Rm. 5128
Washington, D.C. 20230

Hon. Wilbur L. Ross
Secretary of Commerce
U.S. Department of Commerce
1401 Constitutional Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

EXHIBIT
2

https://www.nefmc.org/about/council-members Go JUN JUL AUG
24 captures
8 Oct 2014 - 31 Jul 2017
31
2016 2017 2018
About this capture

Council Members

Council Membership

The 18 voting members of the Council include the Regional Administrator of NOAA Fisheries in the Greater Atlantic Region (GARFO) and the five principal state officials with marine fishery management responsibility (or their designee) from CT, ME, MA, NH, and RI.

Twelve other NEFMC members are nominated by the governors of the New England coastal states and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce for three-year terms. Additionally, four non-voting members represent the United States Coast Guard, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of State, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

New England Fishery Management Council 2016-2017 voting members. Front row (left to right): Mark Godfroy (NH), Dr. Michael Sissenwine (MA), Eric Reid (RI), Council Chairman Dr. John Quinn (MA), Council Vice Chairman Terry Stockwell (ME), Terry Alexander (ME), Peter Kendall (NH), Doug Grout (NH), and Elizabeth "Libby" Etrie (MA). Back row (left to right): Rick Bellavance (RI), Dr. David Pierce (MA), Dr. Matt McKenzie (CT), U.S. Coast Guard representative Capt. Brian Fiedler (non-voting member), John Pappalardo (MA), Mark Gibson (RI), Mark Alexander (CT), Vincent Balzano (ME), and Mary Beth Nickell-Tooley (ME). Missing is Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Regional Administrator John Bullard, a voting member.

Download Full Bios

Financial Interest of Members

Council members may have an interest in any fishery-related harvesting, processing, lobbying, advocacy, or marketing activity as long as they disclose the extent of this interest to the public. This ensures that knowledgeable fishing industry members can serve on the Council. Council members are not allowed to vote on matters that would benefit only them or a minority of other people within the same sector or gear group.

Council member financial disclosure forms must be available for public inspection on the internet and at the Council office. Details of this requirement are provided in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management

Voting Members 2016-2017

Dr. John F. Quinn

Chairman

219 Smith Neck Road
Dartmouth, MA 02748
(508) 910-6602 fax (508) 999-8153
2nd term expires 8/10/18
jquinn3@umassd.edu
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

E.F. "Terry" Stockwell III

Vice Chairman

Director of External Affairs
Maine Department of Marine Resources
21 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0021
(207) 624-6553 fax (207) 624-6024
terry.stockwell@maine.gov

John K. Bullard

Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries

Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
55 Great Republic Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930
(978) 281-9250 fax (978) 281-9207
john.bullard@noaa.gov

Mark Alexander

Connecticut, Assistant Director, Fisheries Division

CT Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection
PO Box 719
333 Ferry Road
Old Lyme, CT 06371
(860) 434-6043 fax (860) 434-6150
mark.alexander@ct.gov

Dr. Matthew McKenzie

Connecticut - Appointed Obligatory Member

158 Pequot Avenue
Mystic, CT 06355
(860) 405-9270
2nd term expires 8/10/18
matthew.mckenzie@uconn.edu
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Terry Alexander

Maine - Appointed Obligatory Member

67 Grover Lane
Harpswell, ME 04079
(207) 729-2538 fax (207) 725-7009
2nd term expires: 8/10/18
Jlinc1000@aol.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Vincent Balzano

Maine - Appointed At-Large Member

31 Vines Road
Saco, ME 04072
(207) 332-6492
2nd term expires 8/10/18
vbalzano@maine.rr.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Mary Beth Nickell-Tooley

Maine - Appointed At-Large Member

43 Norton Pond Road
Lincolnville, ME 04849
(207) 837-3537
3rd term expires 8/10/17
mbtooley@live.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Mark Gibson

Rhode Island, Deputy Chief for Marine Fisheries

RI Division of Fish and Wildlife
Marine Fisheries Office
3 Fort Wetherill Rd.
Jamestown, RI 02835
(401) 423-1935 fax (401) 423-1925

Eric Reid

Rhode Island - Appointed Obligatory Member

315 Hamilton-Allenton Road
North Kingstown, RI 02852
(401) 440-1885
1st term expires 8/10/18
ericreidri@gmail.com

Rick Bellavance

Rhode Island - Appointed At-Large Member

140 Jerry Lane
North Kingstown, RI 02852
(401) 741-5648
1st term expires 08/10/19
rickbellavance@gmail.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Dr. David E. Pierce

Massachusetts, Director for Marine Fisheries

Division of Marine Fisheries
251 Causeway Street
Boston, MA 02114
(617) 626-1532 fax (617) 626-1509
david.pierce@state.ma.us

Dr. Michael Sissenwine

Massachusetts - Appointed At-Large Member

39 Mill Pond Way
East Falmouth, MA 02536
(508) 566-3144
2nd term expires 8/10/19
m.sissenwine@gmail.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Elizabeth Etrie

Massachusetts - Appointed At-Large Member

Northeast Sector Service Network
1 Blackburn Center, 2nd Floor
Gloucester, MA 01930
(978) 491-1848
1st term expires 8/10/17
Libby.MP.Etrie@gmail.com
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

John Pappalardo

Massachusetts - Appointed At-Large Member

Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance
1566 Main Street
Chatham, MA 02663
(508) 945.2432
1st term expires 8/10/17
john@capecodfishermen.org
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Douglas Grout

New Hampshire, Chief for Marine Division

NH Fish and Game Department
225 Main Street
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 868-1096 fax (603) 868-3305
douglas.grout@wildlife.nh.gov

Peter T. Kendall

New Hampshire - Appointed At-Large Member

159 West Road
Rye, NH 03870
(603) 964-7824
2nd term expires 8/10/17
peter.kendall@comcast.net
2017 Financial Disclosure Form

Mark Godfroy

New Hampshire - Appointed Obligatory Member

80 Alison Drive
Seabrook, NH 03874
603-234-8445
1st term expires 8/10/19
mark@eastmansdocks.com
2017 Financial Disclosure

Copyright © 2017 New England Fishery Management Council

50 Water Street, Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950
Phone: (978) 465-0492 Fax: (978) 465-3116 Email: info@nefmc.org

EXHIBIT
3

From: Julie Smith
To: comments@nefmc.org
Cc: jquinn3@umassd.edu
Subject: Omnibus Amendment Comment Letter
Date: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 4:45:17 PM
Attachments: Omnibus Comment Letter.pdf
image003.png

Dear Dr. Quinn,

Please find attached a letter with Cause of Action Institute's comments on the draft Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment. We hope that you and the other Council members will take these comments under consideration at your upcoming monthly meeting. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Julie Smith | Vice President
Cause of Action Institute
1875 Eye Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(o) 202.400.2722 / (c) 202.603.8010
julie.smith@causeofaction.org