

Croteau, Amy

From: connor rogan <connorrogan69@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2026 4:26 PM
To: Croteau, Amy; Douglas Crook; Lawson, Derek; Coleman, Nina
Subject: Public comment for proposed fee changes

Hello,

I hope this email finds you all well. I will not be able to attend the meeting tonight so I wanted to leave my public comments via email.

Firstly, I understand there's a directive to work towards net zero in these programs. I'm opposed to net zero for these programs. I feel I pay more than my fair share in taxes and still have to pay hefty fees to go to the dump, park, own a car, ride the school bus, the list goes on and on. I'm happy that some of my taxes actually go to the programs that support me...

I agree with the proposed fee changes to the recreational program, as that is completely optional for participants and even at \$70 it's still a pretty good deal if you get a few peck of oysters every fall.

As far as the commercial (both wild harvest and aquaculture) fee increases, I feel they are steep and of no benefit to the folks that don't have a choice but to pay them just to go to work and keep our business running. (Please correct me if these fees make some beneficial change to our businesses)

One thing that was not made clear in the last meeting (maybe I missed it) was how many different endorsements there would be for doc species. Quahogs, steamers, razors, and scallops would be the obvious ones bringing the permit to \$950 for a full time shellfisherman. What about stubby razors, blood arcs, mussels, and manilla clams? \$1350 to land every thing in town? Almost \$1500 if you include dredging.

I realize the commercial fishery has had it pretty good the last 2 years with the razor clams but that's not the status quo. A permit fee of almost a thousand dollars would be a real good 6 day week of quahogging just to cover the fee to go fishing, never mind the cost of operating, which as you know has gone up on our end too. That kind of bill hurts in the middle of the winter when days to fish are limited. Keep in mind we had a 5 week stretch where we couldn't work due to ice this winter.

I think in addition to raising recreational cost, the town should really dig into the propagation program. I have a funny feeling that the deficit incurred by both the commercial fisherman and aquaculturists can be saved in inefficiencies in the propagation program.

I've had the opportunity to work on a few farms in town and see the growing process first hand. I'm by no means an aquaculture specialist but I can see stark contrast in the way the town grows shellfish vs the folks who depend growing shellfish to reach ends meet. It's hard to ignore when the towns looking for was to save money.

Hopefully this public comment finds its way to the right people and is taken into consideration.

Best,

Connor Rogan