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LOBSTERMEN/DEVELOPERS COMPETE FOR BOSTON WATERFRONT LOCATIONS:

THE SEARCH FOR SOLUTION

by Jean H. Christensen

Langley C. Keyes, Jr., Professor of Urban Studies and Planning

ABSTRACT

Proposed waterfront developments are threatening to create a shortage of mooring sites for the lobster fishermen of Boston Harbor. Members of the 50-boat fleet which has historically been dispersed throughout the inner harbor are worried that unless they manage to buy or obtain long-term control over their docking spaces, they will no longer be able to afford to remain in the harbor which is the most productive lobstering ground in the entire state.

Several of the lobstermen who had already received notices of eviction discussed the situation and decided that the best way to insure their continued presence in the port was to organize the fleet and acquire a facility that could be shared by all the local commercial lobstermen. The men then formed an association, The Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association (BHLA). The new association agreed to pursue the idea of establishing a common facility and they began the process of locating an available and acceptable site.

This paper looks at the lobster industry and in particular focuses on the efforts of the Boston lobstermen to solve their domicile problem. It attempts to present the dynamics of the current problem by first outlining the history of the industry and then discussing the current position of the Boston fleet within that industry. It goes on to relate the history of the men's search for a solution to the impending crises. Next the reasons for the current impasse are analyzed, and finally resource alternatives are presented and strategies for resolving the issue are suggested.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I particularly wish to extend my thanks and appreciation to Roy Tate of the Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association for the valuable information he made available to me on the lobster industry in Massachusetts. Without the benefit of his knowledge and insights this report would not have been possible. I also want to thank the many Massachusetts lobstermen who gave willingly of their time to share their experiences and concerns with me. Because of the contacts I have made in the course of researching this paper, I shall always retain a special place in my affections for these men who "go down to the sea" to harvest our New England lobsters.

My special thanks goes also to my advisor Langley Keyes whose continuing encouragement and excellent advice forced me to organize my thoughts so they could be expressed in a more coherent fashion.
CHAPTER ONE: THE INTRODUCTION

A Problem in the Industry

Several individuals of the 50-member Boston Harbor lobstermen's fishing fleet are being evicted from their mooring sites by large and well-financed development interests. In an effort to preserve their place in the harbor, and those of other men who may eventually share the same fate, the men formed the Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association (BHLA) to try and find, for purchase or long-term lease, a waterfront parcel where they could establish a common facility to serve all the fleet. Because of the very high price of waterfront property, the group focused most of its attention on land owned by various public and semi-public agencies. When they realized that they did not possess the sophistication to work with the bureaucracies of the agencies to learn what was available and then to present their case if they did find something, they hired, on a short-term basis, the lobbyist of the Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association (MLA) to head their effort for them. He followed their instructions and made a concerted effort to find a site and generate support for the lobstermen's cause among public officials. Although the lobstermen have always operated as independent businessmen, they did realize that by getting together in one location they might be taking the first step on the road to changing the whole organization of their businesses. They understood there were significant profits to be made by vertically integrating their operations. Fishing cooperatives are not a new phenomenon and the men discussed the possibility of establishing one. However they were reluctant to look closely at what the implications of such a
change would be for them, deciding that every decision must wait until a site was acquired. This reluctance also included addressing vital financing issues which they likewise put aside until the site was found.

After more than a year and a half of effort, the men are no nearer to a solution than they were at the start. The reasons for this failure are at least partly rooted in the individualistic nature of the job which has changed little over the past three hundred years. An examination of the origins and historical development of the industry should help to shed some light on the current situation.

The Industry: A Mythical Perspective

The lobster is an American seafood speciality long associated in the public's mind with the New England seacoast. And, indeed, this luxury product so sought after and enjoyed by the average consumer and gourmet diner alike, is almost exclusively harvested off the shores of northeastern North America in much the same manner as it was 100 years ago.

In the early morning the independent, entrepreneurial fishermen still go down to the sea alone in their wooden boats to haul lobster traps in the daily effort to make a living. After the day's work, the men return to their harbors and docks with their live catch which they immediately sell to "their" dealers. Completing that all important transaction, they then prepare their boats for the next day's sail before returning home to their families for the evening.

For seacoast dwellers and for the lovers of maritime tales the routine is a familiar one, varying according to the weather and the
seasons. To the casual observer it may appear as though nothing significant has changed over the past several generations: that here one finds a job where the individual continues to be his own boss and succeeds directly because of his own efforts and skills--with a bit of cooperation from Mother Nature; that here the bureaucratic complications of modern post industrial America have left untouched a unique corner of the work world; and that here life is direct and simple--men perform useful and understandable labor and are rewarded for their contributions to the market place accordingly. It is a romantic assessment cherished by many, including some of those who participate directly in the industry.

Of course, the situation is actually much more complex than this. Strong new economic and social forces that are certain to have major impacts on the lobstering industry seem to be gaining momentum. Some change appears inevitable. A look at the past may help one understand the dynamics of the present and the possibilities for the future.

The Industry: A Historical Perspective

Individuals have been catching lobsters (Homarus Americanus) off the coast of New England for centuries. When the pilgrims first arrived on these shores lobsters were so plentiful that anyone could catch all he/she wanted merely by wading into the water at low tide and hooking the abundant protein rich crustaceans with a long stick or "gaff" as it was, and is still, commonly called.

The growth and urbanization of the colonial population encouraged the emergence of an American lobster fishing industry as early as the end of the 18th century. Not surprisingly, the industry had its
beginning in Massachusetts, primarily on Cape Cod in Provincetown. By the mid 19th century local harvests were no longer able to keep up with the demand, which in Boston alone exceeded 700,000 pounds a year, so the Massachusetts fishermen sailed into the waters off the coast of Maine to supplement their catch. From that time the fame of the Maine lobster grew. Even today its reputation far overshadows that of the lobsters caught elsewhere. (Actually much of what we term Maine lobsters are, in truth, imported Canadian lobsters.) (Dueland, 1973: 23).

Methods of catching and distributing lobsters changed fairly slowly at first. Basically the fishermen used gaffs off the ends of their boats or they used a baited hoop net which they had to raise and lower into the water every fifteen minutes or so. With an abundant stock these methods of operation were quite adequate.

About the same time the Massachusetts lobstermen were expanding their fishing grounds to the north, a new method of canning developed by the French was introduced in this country. Local Maine residents saw the economic value of their coastal resource and took to the sea themselves. Meanwhile others, recognizing a new potential, built the first lobster canning factory which was opened in Eastport. Within the next 35 years over 23 such facilities had been constructed and were operational on the Maine coast from Eastport to Portland. (Prudden, 1973: 8). With a product that could now travel a much greater distance because its life had been greatly extended, demand jumped and the fisherman intensified their efforts. The fishing grounds were pushed farther north into the waters of Nova Scotia and beyond.
This increase in the fishing activity lead to what many claimed was an over fishing of the stock. Warnings were raised about what would happen if controls were not enacted. There was no limit on the size of lobsters that could be caught and many of the species were being taken before they had the opportunity to spawn. The lobster is a creature that continues to grow throughout its entire life cycle--rapidly at first, but more slowly as it ages. The female lobster does not become sexually mature until it is six or seven years old and is about a pound in weight and reaches somewhere between seven and twelve inches in length. (Dueland, 1973: 36).

In 1895, after the passage of the 10 1/2 inch minimum size law, the canning industry died quickly for the industry relied heavily on the availability of short lobsters. (Prudden, 1973: 8). From that time on the industry was a fresh product one and the market was therefore limited by the transportation network of the time.

Also by the last quarter of the 19th century lobstersmen had adopted the trap or "pot" method of harvesting their catch which Europeans had been using since the early 1700's. This method greatly increased the efficiency of the individual fisherman by providing him with self tending traps which he could leave out overnight. Since lobsters are basically nocturnal creatures this aided the catch. (Dueland, 1973: 52). In spite of their hard shell, lobsters are fragile creatures and special care must be taken in catching and handling them for they die easily or lose valuable appendages which contain much of the meat for which they are so prized. Although over the years other methods of fishing for the lobster have been tried, so
far nothing has proved as successful as the old-fashioned technique. Therefore, little has changed in the actual fishing method of operation.

The industry continued to grow over the years. In 1888 the state began to keep records of the yearly catch. (Attachment No. 1.) Although the number of pounds caught per year has generally increased it has taken much more effort to accomplish this for the average catch per trap is today significantly below what it was in the late 1800's.

For over 80 years Maine has lead the United States in the size of its lobster landings, with Massachusetts continuing to remain in second position. The two states account for over 80% of the United States lobster catch. (Fisheries of the United States, 1981, NOAA: IX). However the total catch is not enough for the United States is such a major consumer of this delicious crustacean that it must import millions of pounds from Canada each year.

Certainly competition for legal lobsters (3 3/16" carapace length) has become intense and marine biologists estimate that each year over 95% of the lobster eligible for taking are captured. Harvesting lobsters is a serious business.

The Industry: Massachusetts Today

To catch lobsters in Massachusetts it is necessary to have a state license. In 1981 the state granted approximately 16,000 licenses but of these only 1,500 were coastal commercial fishermen. The Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association (MLA) estimates that there are approximately 700 full-time lobstermen in the state. They, along with
the 800 part-time professionals and the 600 off-shore men account for over 95% of the lobsters taken each year.

In an effort to protect the fishery and the commercial fishermen the state has presently placed a moratorium on the issuing of commercial licenses--only one hundred new ones are added each year. Of these, twenty are issued on the grounds of hardship. Because of these limitations the state fleet enjoys a degree of protection that has contributed to the stability of the industry. Commercial licenses are a desirable asset and families are allowed to keep a license upon the death of the original holder. In some cases there may be a transfer between partners for this purpose. Holders of the 13,500 non-commercial licenses are allowed to fish up to ten traps, but they may not sell any of their catch. (There is an exception for students.)

Everyone is required to report their annual catch to the state authorities.

State statisticians estimate that the value of the state commercial fleet for 1981 was approximately $58 million. This figure includes traps valued at $10 million; boats, at $24 million; along with the sale price of the year's lobster catch which was approximately $24 million. These numbers, which show that lobstering is the single most valuable species fishery in the state, do not tell any where near the full impact of the industry of the state economy however. The purchase of fuel and bait are major costs of doing business for the lobstermen. Their purchases pump millions of dollars into the local markets each year. Although their contribution to the creation of jobs is not high,
in the summer the larger operators do add sternmen and so provide some additional work opportunities especially for students.

Recently the MLA did a survey to determine the average value of the lobster boats in the state fleet. They focused their attention on six of the forty-two state ports. This provided information on 13% of the total fleet. The results they found varied considerably by fishing port—ranging from a low average of $10,135 in Fair Haven to a high of $32,089 in Marshfield—with an overall average of $20,000 per boat. The business practices of the individual lobstermen differ greatly. Some men purchase new boats every six to seven years (they may do this for any number of reasons not the least of which is the tax break they get when paying interest on loans); others keep the same boat for over 25 years. Most of the professional fishermen do have modern electronic equipment. The cost of such equipment has gone down considerably in the past few years.

Based on the assessment of the average vessel value along with the knowledge of the number of traps fished, the MLA has estimated that the average full-time commercial lobster business is capitalized at about $50,000. However, the cost of entry is actually quite low—a small outboard boat, a few traps, some rope and bait can get one started—provided that a state license is obtainable.

An average working year for lobstermen consists of 150-180 days at sea from April to the beginning of December. This "average" fisherman fishes between 300-500 traps off his 32' boat. The mean average income for 1980 (again, according to MLA estimates) was $14,766. A more successful full-time lobsterman may gross over $90,000 a year. However
he rarely nets over $30,000. One reason for this is that a fisherman hauling the number of traps needed to gross that amount usually has to hire help to do it. Operating costs have been pegged by a number of members of the industry, MLA spokesmen, lobstermen and dealers alike, at up to 60% of gross income. The purchase of bait and fuel are the two major components of this operating cost figure. (Attachment No. 2). In the past the charge for boat docking was usually quite minimal. In Boston Harbor rents have gone up and according to one of the leaders of the Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association, the average cost last year ran about $250 per month. The expectation, based on owners statements, is that this year that figure may rise to $350. Fleets in smaller outlying towns often have use of town piers and pay only nominal sums for the privilege of tying up. In Marshfield, for example, the rent is $1 per boat foot length per year--this averages out to be about $40 annually. Even so, throughout Massachusetts lobstermen have higher operating costs than do their counterparts in Maine and Canada.

The Industry: A Profile of the Lobstermen

Just who are these people who make up the Massachusetts lobster fishing fleet? First, they are all male and they are all white. The ethnic background of the fleet does vary according to what harbor is being discussed however. In Boston Harbor the ancestry of the men is predominately Italian or Irish with a number of French (formerly Canadians) also included. Most of the men (except for the older contingent) are high school graduates. Some of the younger ones hold college degrees. Many of the fishermen have relatives in the
industry--there is often one family name that dominates in each port. Brothers and father-son combinations are relatively common. However, each man has his own boat and his own business.

Most of the current commercial men started on a part-time basis--some while still in school and others while working at such trades as carpentry, policing or fire fighting. Many still work at other jobs particularly in the winter; a number do not, using the time to repair their boats and rebuild their traps. The restricted entry (license limits) has cut down on the number of young men in the fleet. Since, this occupation is attractive to young people, new recruits do seek to join the ranks when they are able. Therefore, the age range of the group is broad.

Most fishermen sell their lobsters exclusively to one dealer for the dealers demand that type of monopoly before they will guarantee to purchase the entire catch of any one individual. Since most of the lobstermen do not want to have the trouble of looking for a market for their catch at the end of each day's fishing, they are willing to enter into an exclusive sales arrangement. In the off season selling commitments are less rigid and those few lobstermen who do go fishing may establish temporary arrangements with other businesses for short periods.

By nature the lobstermen are considered to be rugged individualists--both by themselves and by those who deal with them. They are reputed to be very tight with their money. The lobster business is a cash business--the fishermen get paid once a week for their catch from the dealers. Although they must report their yearly
catch (records of which their dealers also provide the government), the
average fisherman is usually quite secretive about his actual income.
Many seem fond of complaining about their problems and hardships.
Moreover, many feel that they do not receive what they consider to be a
fair share of the profits made in the industry.

The Industry: Its Dealers

Actually the role of the lobstermen is pretty much limited to
harvesting the lobsters. Dealers take over after the catch is brought
to shore. They claim responsibility for establishing and maintaining
the intricate marketing network that exists. They store, ship,
promote, wholesale--and in some cases even retail the product. And,
they set the per pound price that the lobstermen are paid.

Approximately six Boston lobster dealers control the national (and
the international) market for lobsters and they set the basic lobster
prices that all the smaller dealers take into account before making
their own purchases. Fishermen claim that the price does not relate
directly to supply and demand as the dealers say it does. They charge
that the dealers ability to store lobsters for months at a time in
large pounds in Maine gives them the flexibility (within limits) to
manipulate the ex-vessel price to greatly favor themselves.

Dealers counter this accusation by saying that they are paying
fairly for the lobsters and only adding a reasonable amount to the
price as they pass them on. They point out that they bear a great deal
of risk because the product is a delicate one. (Lobsters are cannibals
and will eat each other if not properly restrained when confined; also
lobsters are subject to several types of contagious diseases which can wipe out a whole pound population in a short time.)

The Industry: The Organizations

Although they typically do operate as independent business men, the lobstermen have organized over the years to take advantage of their combined strength for a few specific purposes. The Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association (MLA), the most powerful voice for the state lobster industry, was founded in 1963 through the efforts of the South Shore Lobstermen's Association. The MLA has provided health and boat insurance to its members. It also has become a serious lobbying group on the state and federal levels. This is a most important consideration for although the image of independent activity on the open seas persists, the truth is that the fishing and lobstering industries are quite tightly regulated by the state and federal governments. All fishermen must attend to a number of bureaucratic procedures in order to conduct their businesses. Actions of the government are not always restrictive in a negative sense for the industry. Increases in the size of the fishing fleet and new technologies have both put intense pressure on the fishery and, in order for the fishery not to be depleted, protective regulations need to be in place.

The MLA has experienced a reasonable amount of success in pushing for the interests of its members. Nonetheless it has not infrequently been prevented from taking action because it could not get majority approval from its membership. However, when there has been agreement and the organization has been able to present a united front to the
world, it has often met with positive results. The men, independent as they may wish to be, have realized the benefits of concerted action.

Besides the state-wide organizations, there are two major regional groups as well as several harbor associations. Both the north and the south shore areas have associations. The south shore group, which dates from the 1920's, is by far the more active of the two. These groups are primarily social outlets for the men to meet, drink and discuss whatever is of interest to them. Leadership in the various associations is often overlapping. The president of the local harbor association may be the treasurer of the regional group and a delegate to the MLA. To a significant extent these local associations provide a leadership training ground for the individual fishermen. Physical proximity can help build a sense of community and encourage participation in joint efforts. The situation is different in Boston.

The Boston Story

In the smaller ports, commercial boats are usually clustered together for there just are not a lot of piers and wharfs to be found. In Boston that is not the case, and the fleet is dispersed throughout the harbor. (Map 1). Some men dock in East Boston, others near Charlestown, some in South Boston and still others can be found right downtown in the Fort Point Channel area, along Lewis Wharf and near the Coast Guard station in the North End. Most of the lobstermen are tenants-at-will renting from private land and waterfront owners. Although each fisherman makes his own arrangements for supplies, most of them purchase bait on the southside of the city for that is where the major number of fish processing plants are. In addition to that,
the southside of the city is nearer the actual fishing grounds, and so is the preferred location of most of the men.

In spite of the fact that the Boston harbor lobstermen work in the city that is the largest trading center for lobsters in the country, they are not very important to that network. Only one of the big six dealers, Hines and Smart Co., buys local lobsters on a regular basis. His trade with the Massachusetts lobstermen makes up only 25% of his business even though he has 79 men from both Boston Harbor and the north shore who sell their catch to him.

The Boston men estimated their combined 1979 catch at over 1.8 million pounds. (Attachment No. 3). However, since the sale and distribution of that catch is very diverse, the financial impact of the Boston fleet is not concentrated on any one sector of the market. There is, therefore, no obvious powerful entity that depends on the existence of the harbor lobstermen. This lack of interdependence with significant others has been, and continues to be, a real problem for the members of the fleet.

The lobstermen did not even have an association of their own in the harbor until two years ago when changing conditions within the harbor caused the men to feel concerned enough to band together in a formal group. The impetus for their action was the informal notices that several of them had received from their landlords on the piers telling them that they would face eviction in the near future due to new waterfront development. Since several of the most successful fishermen in the fleet happened to be among this group that received a warning, the news spread fairly quickly as the future began to look
less certain for everyone. By this time development activity had become increasingly visible on the waterfront with conversions, renovations and some new construction taking place. Word of new proposals received media attention periodically so that it was not really possible to deny the arrival of change.

Boston Harbor: A History

For many years the extensive waterfront of Boston (87.7 miles of coastline) was neglected and under-utilized. The harbor which has had its ups and downs over the centuries really fell into disuse after World War II. Commercial piers and military docks alike were abandoned or sold as the once great world port lost out in the competition for dominance with other eastern seaports for the world market. The city was at one time a leading exporter of grains from the midwest. The loss of that trade dealt a severe blow to the harbor. Furthermore technological changes played a major role in the harbor's demise.

Railroads which at one time converged in large numbers on the busy Boston piers were taken out of service as the nation turned to the highways to move many of its products. Labor problems among the local longshoremen, which held off the establishment of container ports, hastened the decline of maritime activity in the capital city. And the once large Boston fishing fleet, completely outperformed by its Canadian competition after the war, was reduced to a mere shadow of its former grand self.

Besides the commercial activity in the harbor, the United States government operated both Army and Navy installations on the city's waterfront. Gradually these facilities were phased out after the war.
As these places closed, public agencies such as the Massachusetts Port Authority and the Boston Redevelopment Authority acquired ownership or long-term control of many waterfront sites. Much of this under-used property is in the East Boston section of the city.

The Harbor Today

Of course, scattered throughout the harbor, maritime businesses still carry on their trade. Many of the harbor-front locations are owned by businesses who use the docks and wharfs primarily for warehousing purposes. Other owners do not utilize their property to even that extent, but are content to sit with idle land in hopes that the future will see a continued rise in real estate values. Individuals who own piers that are still serviceable gain some income by renting to lobstermen and other boat users. Arrangements for these locations are made on an individual basis and both tenants and landlords are content to operate under tenant-at-will status. The lobstermen have preferred to move to wherever they could find the cheapest rent rather than establish long-term arrangements.

The details of the fishing business remain largely unknown to the general public. Impressions are often at variance with reality. Many are aware that Boston has a Fish Pier which is in the process of being renovated at considerable public expense by Massport. It is frequently assumed by those unfamiliar with the structure of the industry that this facility accommodates all sectors of the fishing business. This is not the case. The Fish Pier is the location of many of the fish processing plants in the city and it serves as an unloading dock for large offshore fishing vessels. Small wooden and fiberglass boats such
as the lobstermen use are not rugged enough to tie up among the steel-hulled vessels that call at the Pier to sell their catch. Potential damage from direct contact with these large ships is enough to keep the small operators sufficiently hesitant to use the facility, which was not designed for their needs in any case.

Unlike the offshore fishermen who are at sea much of the time and are subject only to limited contact with each other, the lobstermen come into home port every night and thus need more space on a daily basis than the other types of fishing fleets. There are approximately 50 boats in the lobster fleet with an average size of 38 feet. Besides the water area the men need a fair amount of land space to store traps, repair equipment and house bait. Parking of the lobstermen's trucks (usually pickups) is another consideration that adds to the land requirement. Putting the fleet together in one location is likely to create stresses on the urban environment nearby, primarily because of traffic generation.

Even if one is aware of these limitations and grants that the Fish Pier does not have adequate resources to meet the lobstermen's needs, it is natural to assume that somewhere on the harbor there must be an under-utilized public marina with space enough to accommodate the lobster boats. Unfortunately this is not true. The City of Boston, although it owns a significant amount of waterfront land, does not have a public marina. Construction of such a facility is very expensive. Plans do exist that call for such an addition to the City's assets--particularly in the Charlestown redevelopment area. There are no
reliable time tables for such an improvement however. And if it should come, it is likely to be geared primarily for pleasure craft.

Private marinas do exist today and offer facilities to pleasure boat owners. These facilities are not suitable to the lobstermen's needs because working vessels are not felt to be compatible with sporting craft. Also private marinas usually have very limited land areas.

These then were the overall conditions that existed in the harbor when the BHLA was formed in 1981. The threat of displacement was still somewhat vague. That threat is very much a reality today for ten lobstermen (approximately 20% of the fleet) have been given eviction notices for December of 1983 by their landlord Anthony Athanas, owner of Piers 1 through 4 on Northern Avenue in South Boston. A large commercial development--hotel, shops and condominiums is being planned for the site where the men now moor their boats. Although nothing is firm about the project, (no permits have been issued, etc.), meetings have been held to inform relevant agencies about the prospects of what is to come. The state has instructed the developers to address the displacement of the lobstermen when they do their EIR (Environmental Impact Report). Unofficial reports have also suggested that the owner of Pier 7 has plans to renovate his property which will result in the displacement of several other lobstermen. The winds of change are definitely in the air, and the lobstermen are seriously concerned about survival on the waterfront.
CHAPTER TWO: THE SEARCH FOR SOLUTIONS

After analyzing the situation before them, the lobstermen decided that they were not faced with a single isolated event—but rather that new forces were very much at work on the waterfront—forces that they could not evade and could not individually conquer. Although they felt that some of them might be able to make temporary arrangements to remain in the harbor that would be satisfactory, the long-range potential was not encouraging. They decided that the only way to really guarantee their moorings was to somehow own or control a waterfront parcel themselves. This became their goal. Under the auspices of their new association they began to move in the direction of identifying what was available and who might be able to help them. They formed a five-member search committee to work on locating a site.

The Search Begins

The first agency they approached for help in the fall of 1981 was Massachusetts Port Authority. The BHLA's appeal for help was acknowledged and evaluated. The Authority decided that they needed more information on the actual requirements and interests of the group's general membership. The Massport staff subsequently developed a survey which was sent to all the members of the Harbor Association in December of 1981 (Attachment No. 4). Responsibility for this questionnaire was shared jointly by the Senior Port Planner from the Planning Department and the Assistant to the Director of the Maritime Division. However, actual work was handled on a much more junior level by a graduate student intern in the Planning Department. This was not considered a priority item within the Authority. There was some
feeling that the lobstermen were hard to deal with, that they were not as organized as they had indicated, and that their expectations were unrealistic.

Returns from the questionnaire were disappointing for only eight members responded. Those who did, did not display the same enthusiasm for developing a common facility with other lobstermen that their leadership had claimed existed. The respondees listed such a number of requirements for any prospective site that Massport staff felt they did not have the resources to be of any real help to the group. However, communication between the lobstermen and the Authority continued throughout the spring of 1982 on a spasmodic basis. The Authority had indicated to the Association that they were willing to rent docking space to them at the East Boston Piers on a tenant-at-will basis, but they would not be willing to talk about long-term leases. The Authority claimed that it was unwilling to tie up its properties for any period of time because it was in the process of developing long-range master plans for many of its sites and in no way wanted to be prevented from taking action if recommendations called for them to do so. Besides the East Boston piers, the Authority also owned the Navy Fuel Piers in Jeffries Point section of East Boston. However access to that parcel was through a residential neighborhood and the local citizens had voiced very strong opposition to any increase in traffic on their crowded and narrow streets. The upland part of that site was only one acre and the Authority did not want it developed. The lobstermen themselves did not show any enthusiasm for this site and so the idea was dropped by both parties.
While these contacts were going on, the lobstermen were also talking with the MBTA about a parcel of waterfront land they owned in South Boston. The President of the Association sent a letter to the head of the Real Estate Division of the MBTA introducing his organization and outlining their needs and interests in obtaining long-term control of a waterfront location. Response from the agency was vague—although friendly. The men were told that the decision on divestiture would be "political." Discouraged by this information, action moved very slowly and by May, when the lobstering season was under way, things came to a standstill.

In June a new intern at Massport was given the task of working with the lobstermen on their domicile issue. When the intern contacted the Association President to see what progress had been made on the Association's part, it pushed the men into action again. By the time it had become obvious to the directors of the lobstermen's group that they needed someone with more time and more skills than they possessed to help them with this project. They turned to the man employed as a lobbyist for the MLA because he understood their business and because he had the experience and the sophistication to work with the various agency bureaucracies and political structures that were among the important actors on the Boston waterfront. Roy Tate took over the part-time job in the middle of July. His retainer with the group was for a limited period for everyone underestimated the extent and demands of the task. Tate's first move was to inventory what actually existed on the Harbor that might be available and to meet with representatives
from the various public bodies that controlled parcels on the waterfront.

**Tate Takes Over**

One of his first meetings was with several people from the Massport staff. In an effort to stimulate wider interest in the issue, the Authority invited the Executive Director of the Boston Harbor Associates, a citizens' public interest group organized to promote waterfront revitalization, to attend. At this meeting Tate laid out the needs of the lobstermen and answered questions about their intent and capabilities. He said that the men were interested in either ownership, long-term lease or sublease of a property. Although he did not specifically say so, it seemed clear to those present that his group was focusing their attention primarily on parcels owned by public agencies because the fishermen were hoping that they would be able to get a public body to subsidize their acquisition of a site or use their influence to pressure another public agency to subsidize them. The men were quite aware that public monies, such as UDAG grants, had been spent to rebuild pier facilities in Gloucester, New Bedford and at the Boston Fish Pier. A feeling seemed to exist among the lobstermen that they were really entitled to some type of public help, but that they would probably not get it. In the beginning discussion centered on unused waterfront parcels and the likelihood of their being available. Financial resources and potential costs were not really examined. Tate did make it clear that the lobstermen wanted to keep costs down by doing as much site improvement and construction work as they could.
Although it was never so stated, it seemed that "sweat equity" was the major contribution that the men intended to make.

Tate had the lobstermen review their list of site specifications. It contained the requirements for minimum standards and also the specs for an optimum situation. (Attachment No. 5). This outline was given to several of the agencies to see if they had, or knew, of any parcels that would meet the stated criteria.

By early August Tate had made a number of contacts with public agencies and with some political leaders in his search to find a solution to the domicile dilemma. He discussed with the BRA the possibility of a site they owned and "managed" in Charlestown on the Little Mystic Channel; he continued conversations with the MBTA about the South Boston property on the Reserved Channel (by far the favored location of the lobstermen); and he kept in touch with Massport. He also touched base with: the Boston City Government Properties Department and discussed unused property on several of the harbor islands, including Moon Island (which is connected to the mainland); the Economic Development Industrial Commission (EDIC) about the possibility of location in the Boston Marine Industrial Park in South Boston; and with the GSA Division of the federal government about the Army Base property which had been leased to Massport. The only major waterfront-owning government agency that Tate did not contact was the MDC. Although he did not get any actual encouragement to pursue these possibilities, he did get other suggestions. One suggestion which he explored was a privately-owned parcel on the Reserved Channel known as
the King Terminal. This property belonged to the real estate firm of Ryan Elliott and Company, Inc.

The Three Possibilities

Out of all these discussions there emerged only three major possibilities: the MBTA parcel on the Reserved Channel, the BRA parcel on the Little Mystic Channel in Charlestown, and the privately-owned site at the King Terminal, also on the Reserved Channel. (Map 2). In addition to these one other idea was given consideration. This idea came about as a result of a meeting Tate had with the Executive Director of the Boston Marine Educational Exchange, a citizens group that sponsors projects related to waterfront activities. The proposal was to use barges moored in the harbor, perhaps near the Fort Point Channel area, to provide the "land" area needed. The spokesperson from the Marine Exchange felt that the lobster business could serve as an exciting tourist attraction for visitors and residents of the city alike and might do much to serve as a stimulus for further waterfront maritime improvements. Tate and the lobstermen believed the idea had merit. However no one attempted to follow through on the actual feasibility of such a plan.

Repeated attempts by Tate, and by Massport on behalf of the lobstermen, to ascertain the likelihood of the South Boston MBTA site being available to the fisherman, met with little success. Responses were evasive. The most that could be learned from conversations with individuals in the real estate department was that the future of the parcel was under consideration. Finally the department did tell Tate that they had been contacted by the Boston Edison Company who expressed
a strong interest in obtaining the site for coal storage. The utility company was exploring the possibility of converting its plant next door to the MBTA site to coal power and believed they would need more space to be able to do so. However, the utility company indicated that the idea was only in the initial stages of development and their plans remained very uncertain. The MBTA used this situation to avoid being pinned down by Tate and his group. Tate did carry his message to those with more authority in the agency and to leaders in the Department of Transportation itself. He got reassurances that the lobstermen's case would receive serious attention.

The situation with the BRA was no less complicated and "iffy." It seemed that the site in question had received federal and state monies in 1974 to help construct a boat ramp so that the parcel could be used by recreational boaters and function as a city park. The project was completed in 1976. It had never been used for recreation or any other purposes--primarily because vandalism was so high in the area that no one felt comfortable there. The federal government opposed any attempt to convert the parcel to another use and indicated that they would demand their $80,000 portion of the construction cost be returned if the BRA moved to make any change in the use. Tate wrote to the Secretary of Environmental Affairs John Bewick on October 7 outlining the situation and asking for his help in convincing the federal government to relent and allow the conversion to occur. Two and a half months later he received a response from the Secretary saying that his office was willing to meet with the lobstermen and the BRA about the matter. (Attachment No. 6). Because a new state government was even
then being formed and was only a few weeks away from assuming control, Tate did not act on the letter and the meeting never took place. The parcel was no longer on the priority list. Actually, the lobstermen themselves were not at all enthusiastic about the site as the vandalism issue seriously worried them. They decided it was too major a problem with which to become involved.

The only other possible site, the King Terminal on the Reserved Channel, also faded from the picture after the Association met with salesmen from the company to discuss the property. According to Tate, the meeting went fairly well and another session was scheduled. However, the lobstermen failed to show up at the appointed time. There was a storm the night of the meeting and the men got busy securing their boats and forgot about everything else. Relations with the real estate company fell apart after that. Tate claimed that in talking with the representative from another firm (The Pappas Co.) in the area he mentioned the lobstermen's interest in leasing or buying the property. They expressed surprise that the site could be used for such a purpose. After that time his phone calls to the owners of the King Terminal met with no response. Later he was informed by a BRA staff member that The Pappas Co. had filed an EIS on the King property for development of a private marina. Tate believed that he had been the victim of an end run and he chose not to pursue the situation further. Actually, the men's interest in that location was dampened by the fact that access to the dock entailed going under a low bridge, a feat which might not always be possible at high tides. The location did provide a well-protected docking spot which was one of the major considerations
of the group. However, the likelihood of sailing time restrictions presented an obstacle to the lobstermen's independence and at that point they were not willing to think much about the need to compromise.

Other Considerations

At the same time the search for a site was going on, the lobstermen engaged in discussions about the possibility of forming a cooperative and vertically integrating their businesses. They reasoned that if they had to make a major new financial outlay in order to continue to do business in the Harbor, they should at least consider expanding their operations to take advantage of the increased profits to be had by participating in other levels of the marketing process. They believed if they could obtain a reasonably central location with enough land area, they might be able not only to wholesale their lobsters, but also to set up a simple restaurant, (a lobster-in-the-rough affair), which would attract people and generate retail sales as well. The men were aware that several such enterprises operated successfully on the coast of Maine. They were also familiar with various Massachusetts fishing co-ops that had different degrees of involvement in the marketing chain. More importantly the group knew of a lobster co-op in Saugus that had been run successfully for over thirty years.

In spite of their interest in this type of operation and the knowledge to be gained from studying the experiences of others, no systematic research was undertaken on the general feasibility of the idea or on how it might be implemented locally. The group's attitude
was "get the site first"--then the strategies could be devised on how to proceed from there.

Tate realized that before "getting the site" could become possible, the group needed to demonstrate some real, i.e., financial, commitment to the project. He convinced the association members of this and it was decided that each member would put up $500 of "earnest money" to be placed in escrow. This fund would provide a tangible asset for the group and help them build their credit-worthiness so that by the time that actual negotiations began on a particular parcel the group would already have been established as a financially viable entity.

Although verbal support for this plan was readily obtained, the actual follow through was less successful. Payments came in slowly. Seven months after the group agreed to the idea, only fifteen individuals of the fifty members had actually put their $500 contribution in; five more continued to say they would do so; ten were still hedging about their intent; and the twenty remaining members expressed no interest in the idea. Estimates on how firm the remaining possibilities actually were, varied depending to whom one talked.

The Search Stalls

The files on the site search process show very little activity in the late fall and winter months of 1982 and 1983. Although the winter season is traditionally the period when the lobstermen have more "free" time to devote to other projects because they are not fishing, the group did not intensify or even maintain, their efforts to find a satisfactory harbor location. Tate, no longer on retainer by the BHLA,
concentrated his energies on MLA concerns. He did continue to discuss the common domicile idea with the lobstermen and to advance their case with various influential individuals he met in the process of conducting his MLA business.

Partly because the MLA had its annual convention in January on the Cape to which many Boston Harbor lobstermen went, and partly because they no longer had a regular meeting spot, the monthly meetings of the BHLA were erratic throughout this winter period. However, Tate urged the group to put the domicile matter on the agenda for its March meeting so that action could begin again. Because several of the most active harbor lobstermen were among those facing eviction from Pier 1 in December of 1983, support for the plan was still very much alive in the BHLA.

Substantive issues were not to be addressed in this open forum, however, for the March meeting did not have a quorum present so no business was conducted. Instead, Tate, two of the members of the executive search committee, and this writer sat down and discussed strategies for reactiviting the search.

Tate said that he thought the timing for approaching both the MBTA and Massport was better now than it had been throughout the summer and the fall when both agencies were suffering from political instability problems due to the state election and the change of control on the Massport Board of Directors. The two association officers also indicated that they felt encouraged by the results of the public hearing held by the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs in November of 1982 on the proposal of the Boston Edison Company to change
their electric generating plant to a coal powered one. Citizens of South Boston had turned out in force to oppose the idea. The men felt this might discourage the MBTA from giving further consideration to saving their parcel for this purpose.

After the men again stated their strong preference for the MBTA site, discussion focused on the best approach to present the lobstermen's case to the agency in order to elicit serious consideration. Tate asked if any of the group had political ties to the Democratic leadership in the state, particularly to the Senate President who lives in South Boston. The men said that as far as they knew no one in the association had any political connections, but they would try to find someone who did have access to the leadership to help generate support for their cause. The idea of obtaining a powerful ally in the public arena made sense to the men, for they believed that political favoritism was one of the major way things were decided in the state.

It was suggested that the public might support their efforts if they knew about the situation. In that connection, mention was made of the fact that The Boston Globe had, in a recent editorial about the East Boston Piers (The Boston Globe, February, 1983), taken a position in strong support of maritime uses for waterfront property. Globe columnist Ian Menzies also took the same stance in two of his articles during the winter months. It seemed likely that the newspaper might be willing to help the lobstermen by at least presenting their circumstance to the public—and perhaps even arguing directly in favor of their request.
This idea was at first enthusiastically received. However, the BHLA president said in his opinion the association should keep their plans very quiet because many of the lobstermen might be hurt if their participation in a group effort became known. He said that at present many of the men had "touchy" relations with the owners of the piers where they docked even though they had not been given any indication that they would be required to move in the future. He felt that if these owners, some of whom were lobster dealers, got the idea that the men were planning to establish their own location and perhaps their own cooperative as well, they might evict them without further thought. Thus before a group solution was reached, additional men might be without a mooring in the Harbor. This would not only hurt these individuals, but would increase the size of the immediate problem as more men would be in actual competition for the remaining dock sites still available. This argument was sufficient to convince the group that they could not take the chance of publicly presenting their situation in hopes of attracting support.

No new ideas were introduced at this meeting. Tate urged the executive search committee to get together with him during the next week to go over once again the land and docking requirements that the group claimed were essential for their businesses. The men agreed that it was most unlikely that they could presently consider outright purchase of a property so their efforts should be primarily devoted to obtaining a long-term lease. They also agreed that because the members' commitment for the project was less than was originally anticipated, it would be wise to concentrate on their more modest needs
at this time. Tate said that once the figures were reconfirmed he would get a formal proposal off to the MBTA and follow this with meetings with the appropriate agency leaders to advance the cause even further. The men seemed satisfied to end the discussion on that note.

The issue of financing was not really addressed. Two government programs, one recently enacted by the federal government and the other under consideration by the state government, were referred to in passing as possible sources of financial aid to be considered when the time came.

The first of these, the Fisheries Obligation Guarantee Program, was designed for long-term financing to be granted for the construction or reconstruction of shoreside facilities for the US fishing industry. In order to take advantage of this source, the beneficiaries are required to be involved in fish processing, not just fish catching. The state bill, House 1877, will provide funds to towns and cities to reconstruct, rehabilitate, expand or build commercial fishing piers and supporting facilities. At this point the lobstermen's situation does not meet all the stipulations of either piece of legislation. No one knows how closely the benefits of these programs may actually meet the design needs that the association has decided upon. The group estimates that they should have a minimum of 129,000 square feet of water area to accommodate their boats and 61,520 square feet of dry land to meet their storage and work area needs. For really optimum space satisfaction, they say they would like 150,360 square feet, not including roadways, walkways and loading areas. (Attachment No. 5).
Realtors who handle the waterfront properties claim that unimproved land is presently selling between $3 to $5 per square foot. The same location if leased would cost between $.50 and $1.50 per square foot. Using the low estimate of $.50 per square foot, one arrives at a lease cost of over $30,000 per year; and a sale price of almost a quarter million dollars. These are significant expenses when one remembers that substantial improvements are likely to be needed on most parcels to make them usable by the lobstermen. The price tag for survival looks as though it will be high.

At the time of this writing (late April, 1983) no further concrete action has taken place by the association on their own behalf. This writer has observed the progress of the association over the last eleven months and has interviewed a number of individuals who are involved with waterfront activities and/or the industry itself. Thus some additional details and insights have been gathered. Based on these observations one can come to a better understanding about the possibility of the groups achieving its goals.
CHAPTER THREE: PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Internal Problems

The BHLA carved out a large task for itself when it decided to find a waterfront location that could serve as a common facility for the harbor fleet. While there are many serious obstacles external to the industry to overcome in order to reach such a goal, these obstacles are not the primary reason the group is still so far from obtaining its objective. The failure to gain more headway is caused by the very character of the individual lobstermen. The men are by nature "loners" who run their own businesses and jealously guard their privacy. No one except their family and perhaps their lobster dealer need ever know just how industrious or inept they really are as fishermen. If some men are seen as being more successful than others, one can always attribute their status to luck or better opportunities.

Joint efforts, except for insurance programs and political lobbying activities, are not common. (The men try to help each other in times of physical crisis, but those times are the exceptions, not the rule.)

In spite of the potential advantages to be gained by economies of scale that might result, for example, from coordinated purchasing of supplies, the men prefer to purchase things alone. The lobstermen like to believe that they are not answerable to anyone as long as they obey the laws that regulate their industry. Other members of the industry are seen as competitors. This type of mind set does not foster trust or cooperation among the fleet.
The BHLA is not a group that has experience in working together. The lack of real commitment to the concept of joint effort has prevented the organization from effectively focusing and sustaining its energy on the projected goal. They have floundered and remain today very much at the same point they were almost two years ago.

For the association, while formally incorporated, is loosely structured and not a strong entity. Its ability to develop sophisticated strategies, exhibit long-term endurance and overcome frequent frustrations is extremely limited. Members are unfamiliar with the dynamics involved in building and nurturing a social organization. They understand that the organization has a task before it, but they do not realize that for the organization to achieve that task, it must provide for the internal organizational needs of its members. According to social organizational theorists such as Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn (Katz and Kahn, 1978) organizations are like all living systems which must devote some of their energy to system maintenance as well as to the more obvious group task or production functions that they organized around initially. At this point the lobstermen are not really reaping any rewards from their membership in the association. Thus no strong sense of identity or loyalty to the group exists. The common concern which caused them to organize in the first place is still present. Therefore, the group survives, albeit in a very weakened state. There is a distinct possibility that a subgroup of the association may go off on its own to seek a solution.

All members do not feel the same degree of urgency about the displacement threat, however, for many have not yet faced the
likelihood of eviction. Because of this, and because the group lacks
dynamic leadership, the men have not become a cohesive force that can pull together. There has been some vacillating on the part of the members over the precise nature of their goal. This is not surprising, for sustaining agreement over time is, at best, difficult. According to S. Sarason in a book on resource networks:

"Agreement on values and goals is not always easy to obtain, but that is far less difficult than to sustain agreement in the course of action, which has a way of tearing apart the fabric of agreement and exposing the fragility of that fabric to the climate of action." (Sarason, 1977: 26).

The leadership that does exist in the group is not a natural outgrowth of the members interaction over time and therefore it may be interpreted as self serving and not really representative of the group as a whole. Some of the men have had experience working with the more sophisticated state organization. They have not been able to translate that experience into developing a viable local organization that could not only go after a specific goal, but also help its members understand the implications of that goal for themselves. The men therefore seem to have some latent ambiguity about implementing their major objectives because they are not sure just what effects it will have on their familiar way of life.

In an article on the concept of social networks, Mayer Zald says:

"The more change oriented the goals are, the greater the incentives needed by the practitioner and his agency to accomplish these goals." (Kramer & Specht, 1969: 149).

And the lobstermen's objective implies significant possibilities for change especially if they pursue the idea of a cooperative.
If the men shared a common facility and all had to contribute equally to its operational cost (for all would use about the same amount of space), the financial effort would have different impacts on various members of the group. The less successful lobstermen would end up spending a higher percentage of their income for docking space than their more successful colleagues. If the consensus that there is actually a sizable difference in income among the group is true, that discrepancy could be very significant. Physical proximity and interdependency is likely to create tensions that do not presently exist. These also may lend to a sizable attrition of the fleet over time.

Ironically, the loss of a few of their number is likely to mean increased benefits for the remaining members of the group. This is so because there will be less competition for the same lobster population so the surviving fishermen are almost assured of larger catches.

In summary, the men have social-psychological, organizational and economic obstacles that endanger their success.

**Lack of Constituency Support**

A decrease in the size of the lobster fleet is not necessarily seen as a negative event, other than by those who are directly eliminated. There are several reasons for this. Understanding these reasons also helps to explain why the lobstermen have not found a natural constituency to turn to for support in their effort to secure space on the waterfront.

First, members of other sections of the Boston fishing fleet (fin and shell fish, both) would not be unhappy to see a reduction in the
number of fisherman working the harbor—especially if it would mean fewer lobster trawls stretched across the waters and fewer small boats working near heavily trafficked shipping lanes. These trawls get in the way of all boats, but they are especially bothersome to other fishing boats also operating in the waters. This is mainly because the fishing boat captains are often accused of damaging the lobster pots on purpose. Traditionally there has been little cooperation or support between the lobstermen and the fin fishermen. Many lobstermen are particularly hostile to the inshore draggemen whom they blame not only for damaging their traps, but also for harming the lobster stock and engaging in the harvest of illegal, i.e., short, lobsters. During this session of the legislature the lobstermen again filed a bill to forbid draggers from having lobsters on their vessels if they are outfitted for dragging. Even though the two groups are now trying to reach a workable compromise on this issue, the lobstermen's action on this matter is not viewed as the work of friends by the draggemen.

Second, scientists in the various government agencies would not be adverse to a reduction of fishing effort in the harbor. Many of the professionals in the state and federal fishery departments think that the fishery is being over-fished and although the elimination of some lobstermen from the harbor will not solve this problem, the marine biologists and other governmental bureaucrats have no reason to work actively on behalf of the local fleet unless requested to do so by the men. And the men have not asked them for help although they have friends in these government agencies, fishermen are in general suspicious of professionals who have such an impact on their industry.
and their livelihoods. Even though the men and the professionals share a real concern for the preservation of the fishery, they often differ violently on the means of achieving their commonly-desired end.

Third, another group that at first thought might appear to be the most natural of allies for the fishermen are the large lobster dealers in the city who have waterfront property. However, as was already pointed out, most of these dealers do not trade with the local fleet so they do not have a personal stake in their fate. Presently a few dealers do rent to individual fishermen, but relationships are a matter of convenience rather than of mutual support.

Actually the dealers benefit from the present fragmented system and can be expected to try and prevent establishment of a common facility which might lead to the formation of a lobster cooperative. Lobsters are considered a luxury food in this country, and they are very much in demand. However, like anything else, there is competition for sales. Existing markets need to be continually serviced and new markets need to be developed in order for the industry to remain healthy. A lobstermen's cooperative if it prospered might capture lucrative sections of the market initially cultivated and presently held by the major dealers. The dealers would not welcome that.

Fourth, and finally, one might expect the city and the state governments to be concerned about this historic industry. For reasons not entirely clear, the city government has not demonstrated much interest in helping the lobstermen or in using its influence to encourage others to help them. Perhaps the powers that be are simply unaware of the problem. Or if they are aware of it, they well may be
indifferent. In comparison to new luxury real estate construction, technologically advanced navy installations, expensive container ports and politically profitable waterfront parks, the lobstermen are an unglamorous lot. Furthermore the revenues received from the industry are not concentrated in such a manner that they have a really noticeable impact on the city's income. In the overall scheme of things those leaders bent on building a "world class city" are not likely to be much impressed with the value or the quaintness of a small fishing fleet.

As for the state, they do support programs in fishery management and industry promotion. In comparison to the size of the state fishing industry (both fin and shellfish) its financial commitment is certainly modest. According to figures cited by Ian Menzies in a recent column (*The Boston Globe*, April 1983) although Massachusetts ranks third among the top ten fishing states in the value of its landings, it ranks last in the amount of state money devoted to aiding that industry. It seems that if the individual lobstermen want to insist on considering themselves independent entrepreneurs the Massachusetts legislature is quite willing to let them live out that image.

A matter of even greater concern is that both the city and state are lobbying for the return of the military to the harbor. At present the Navy Department is giving serious consideration to basing an eight-boat cruise missile force in Boston. The decision may be made by mid July as to whether New York, Newport or Boston is to be the new home of this contingent. Of course, if they do locate here the situation for the lobstermen will become more critical for they will
face even more powerful competition for limited waterfront space and prices will likely soar. Therefore, although the city and state may have nothing to gain by a reduction in the size of the harbor fishing fleet at this time, they do not think that they have anything to lose by such a reduction either. The potential waterfront replacements certainly will have more immediate visual and economic impacts on the city. Who is apt to miss the lowly seagull if an American eagle promises to take up residence?

Support Does Exist

All is not entirely negative. Two harbor associations have expressed support for the lobstermen. Both the Boston Harbor Associates and the Boston Educational Marine Exchange are concerned with conditions in the harbor and work actively for the development and rejuvenation of maritime uses on the waterfront. Both groups, however, have limited resources to devote to projects and both are involved with activities that presently tax all their time and funds. The executive directors of both associations believe that the lobster industry with its colorful boats, traps and live catch would be a valuable addition to the downtown tourist spots, especially if it could be located in the Fort Point Channel area which is so easily accessible to thousands of workers and visitors in the city. They have speculated about ways that this might be possible. However, their ideas hinge on the design and execution of several other area projects so at this time they have no immediate relevancy for the BHLA. They certainly should be filed away for further consideration. The resolution of the lobstermen's problem is likely to take a fair amount of time and perhaps occur in separate
stages. The components that their solution may rest on may not be even thought of at this time.

In Summary

A poorly organized, fragmented group, such as the BHLA, operating in an indifferent, or perhaps even slightly hostile world, is not likely to be able to successfully negotiate complex transactions in real estate and financing without a great deal of help and a change in its way of functioning. If creative strategies are not developed to take advantage of the resources that are at least potentially available, the lobstermen are apt to fade gradually from the urban scene. They may well follow the path of their soulmates, the American farmers, and not only be reduced in number but also pushed away permanently from high-priced urban land.

The reality then is that no group or agency stands to loss much, if anything, financially if the lobstermen are displaced. Lobsters will continue to be caught and gotten to market. As far as the distribution system is concerned, there is unlikely to be even a ripple of inconvenience for any one--except for the individual lobstermen. The City of Boston may not even recognize that it has let a very unique part of its history slip away to other ports unnoticed and unlamented. For the men will leave no monuments behind to attest to the part they have played in the city's past. They can ebb out silently like the tide, or they can work together and gather the force of repeated wave action. The choice is really theirs.
CHAPTER FOUR: STRATEGIES FOR SOLUTION

The association has met with no real success so far and this has weakened their already shaky internal bonds. This lack of cohesion operates against them when they interact with the public for they are seen as an unstable group and one that would not necessarily constitute a good credit risk. Without a network of supporters and without an independent source of funding, the group has found itself stymied. Further, they have pinned all their hopes and efforts on acquiring one site, the MBTA site in South Boston. In a recent phone conversation with a representative of the Boston Edison Company it was learned that the utility firm is moving along with its plans for coal conversion of the plant next to the MBTA site and they want the parcel for storage of coal. The BHLA, therefore, has a very powerful competitor for the parcel should the MBTA finally decide to divest itself of the land.

Given this discouraging picture, what are the future realities for the group? This writer decided to investigate a few potential avenues that the men might explore to get a feeling about what the prospects for the group actually are. The results of that overview follow.

The Options

The lobstermen have several options.

* They can continue to function as they have all along and handle evictions individually as they are received. Each fisherman would be solely responsible for securing a place for his own business on the waterfront and would continue to do business as usual.

* They can retire from the lobstering business.
* They can rent a spot with other members of the fleet but remain individual businessmen.

* They can move out of the harbor and find docking space at other ports even if it means undergoing a couple of years of harassment and vandalism to their vessel and their gear by local lobstermen who resent their intrusion at the new port.

* They can try to work entrepreneurially with other members of the industry to expand their businesses into processing and distribution through the establishment of a cooperative.

If they decide to look for a common facility, they will need to engage in financial planning that will probably exceed their present level of experience. They will also need to devote time to understanding the implications of the changes that may occur if they adopt the various options.

Many of the men who are in the lobstering business are in it because they like the independent, solitary working conditions it affords them. Being pressured to join a cooperative to survive may not be worth it to them, they will decide to remain loners until the end. Even if the fleet succeeds in staying, its present way of life may indeed be coming to an end. General systems theorists say that for an organism to survive it must be able to adapt to changes in its environment. For those men who are willing to try something new, who are willing to take a risk, there is always the potential for growth and improvement. The group has more possibilities to explore in its search for solutions. Since most things are ultimately dependent upon
financing, perhaps it is best to begin looking at some of those options.

**The Financial Outlook**

The outlook for public money is, at best, uncertain. First, it appears unlikely with the present political climate in the city and in Washington that the BHLA would be the beneficiary of a UDAG grant. The city which administrates the federal monies has, as has been stated, given no indication they are interested in this situation. (The city in the form of the BRA, it must be added, has been helpful about the Little Mystic Channel site and would likely support the association if it decided to go after that parcel. The men are very leery of the vandalism problem and at this time are not enthusiastic about locating there.)

Second, the new Fisheries Obligation Guarantee Program is so new that it is impossible to predict just how it will be administered. The program does appear to be quite generous in its allocations--it provides up to 85% of the project funding and allows for the loan to be written over a 25-year period. However, the lobstermen do not currently meet the eligibility requirements under this program because they only harvest fish, they do not process them. This stipulation that the recipients of the grants must be involved in processing the catch is common to a number of different programs.

Third, the state funding bill, House 1877, which is similar to the federal program but would offer fewer benefits, has not been passed by the legislature so any discussion of it is pure conjecture. The one positive conclusion that can be drawn, however, is that there is
presently a trend toward more help for harbor facilities from all
government sources.

Fourth, the City of Boston has an Economic Development Industrial
Corporation (EDIC) whose job it is to help industries finance projects
located within the city--especially if such funding will add jobs for
local residents. Under the Commission umbrella there are several
programs that provide this funding.

**Possible Programs**

The Finance Manager of BLDC, Boston Local Development Corporation,
one of the subordinated lenders under the Commission, outlined the
programs that are available. The programs he mentioned were:

**SBA 503.** This Small Business Administration loan provides
for a low downpayment, with up to 50% of financing over a 25-year
period for projects that involve real estate, equipment purchases
and property renovations.

**HUD 108.** A new program that has $5 million in all to be
loaned to various businesses to buy or improve land and buildings.
This loan can be used in combinations with other public loans. It
has a 20-year payback stipulation.

**TRL (Target Revolving Loan).** This local fund is capitalized
by EDA (Economic Development Administration) and CDGB (Community
Development Block Grant) funds at $2.7 million. Its criteria are
similar to the SBA 503. It was suggested that this might be the
most likely program for the BHLA to consider.

All three of these funds provide what is known as "gap" financing
for projects at considerably below market interest rates (two points
below the Federal Discount Rate at the moment). Unfortunately the agency is not really interested in working on projects that cost much under $250,000. This is because the unavoidable fixed costs of obtaining cheap money (legal fees, etc.) is so high that projects have to be fairly large in order to benefit from the discount after paying the processing fees. Public lenders feel that this break-even point is definitely over $200,000.

This condition is the same for IRBs (Industrial Revenue Bonds) as well. These bonds are granted through the BIDFA (Boston Industrial Development Financing Authority) and the MIFA (Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency). These two agencies are also possibilities for the lobstermen, although they are not particularly likely ones. The reason for this is that these agencies are usually involved in much larger projects than what the lobstermen expect to undertake.

If the BHLA got approval from either of these two agencies, to sell non-taxable IRB's, they still might have a difficult time getting any bank to buy their bonds. Cost for these bonds is only 75-80% of prime and so they do represent a considerable saving. According to a staff member at MIFA banks are very careful about checking the financial capabilities of anyone selling IRB's. The state agency has made a number of loans in the past to members of the fishing industry especially in New Bedford. The fishermen who were the beneficiaries personally assumed financial responsibility for retiring the bonds. Members of the BHLA might feel reluctant to do this. To qualify for these programs, the group must be involved in a processing operation.
To Be Eligible

When asked how the BHLA should approach the financing of a parcel if they found one they wanted, this writer was told that the group should first concentrate on building a strong organization where the members could demonstrate a real commitment to the group and to the project. The members need to "capitalized the organization" to prove they are a credit-worthy entity. They should determine the extent of their financial capabilities, set priorities and present a united front to the world. Lenders entering into a business proposition will look for certain guarantees to protect their investment on each project. They will look at the past performance of the principles of the group. If the group is not only attempting to buy land for the first time, but was also in the process of changing the nature of its business (as the lobstermen will be if they form a cooperative) they should expect to have to demonstrate their stability even more than others whose record is more established.

The suggestion was made that the association approach a conventional lender such as one of the area banks. The association might interest a traditional lending institution to give them a favorable loan package if all members of the organization agreed to do their personal banking with that one bank. Although this may seem an unlikely occurrence, at least the men should be aware that institutions have been known to make deals in this manner.

Contact was also made with the National Consumer Cooperative Bank which has a regional office in Boston. The Loan Development Officer of that bank offered similar advise for the BHLA. He said the
association’s first priority should be strengthening their organization. All lenders will look for group cohesion—particularly in start-up ventures. The Cooperative Bank was established to make loans to consumer co-ops but has enlarged its services to include craft and producer co-ops as these forms of business ventures have gained in popularity. The bank has provided loans to a number of Maine lobstermen’s co-ops. The BHLA would also be eligible for loans if they became a cooperative. The major contribution the Cooperative Bank has to offer is providing loans to businesses that would otherwise have a hard time acquiring them. The interest rates offered are not much below market rates. Another slight drawback is the fact that the bank is also interested in making fairly substantial deals. However their bottom line of $100,000 is less than that of the subsidized money lenders.

Both finance men consulted indicated they would be happy to talk with representatives from the BHLA once the group had firmly established what magnitude of financial effort it was willing to become a party to and think they have the assets to support.

In the competition to find property and the funding to secure it once found, the victory goes almost invariably to the big operator even if a government subsidy program to help the "disadvantaged" is involved. The real estate markets are certainly structured that way. However, there is room for creative groups or individuals to put together deals by making use of many different programs and lending devices. A cohesive group that knows what it wants and figures how to build a strong case for its ability to handle doing it, can succeed.
Although this is the day of megaprojects, it is also a time when cooperatives are becoming a familiar way to do business.

To Form A Cooperative

Because of this rise of interest in the cooperative model of business activity, several organizations have been started to help groups who are contemplating such a venture. One local group that provides such consulting help is the Industrial Cooperative Association Inc. of Somerville. They help with feasibility studies, with bylaw writing, general educational programs, finding loan sources as well as offering some financing assistance themselves for start-up groups. However, this group is more involved with what are known as worker cooperatives. The type of cooperative that the lobstermen are most likely to start is what is called a marketing cooperative. There is a group in Washington, D. C. that deals more with that type of structure. That group is the Cooperative League of the United States of America or CLUSA.

Help is available if one knows where to look for it. But it takes time to put all the possible pieces together. There are many potential components for each possible solution. Each should be examined.

Some Strategies

First, the group must stop thinking of itself as a victim. It must realize that it needs help beyond its own membership in addition to the type of financing help just discussed. The BHLA does have the potential for generating support among a variety of people and agencies even if none of them have joined their ranks so far. To date the associations efforts have had a very narrow focus, but if that focus
broadens, they may well find many allies willing to make some type of contribution to their objective.

Many groups operate in an environment of scarce resources and find that they can make common cause with others by networking—which is basically a simple concept where people share and barter with each other for use of resources that each may have that could be of help to the other. Not everything needs to be achieved through the market economy mechanism. The existence of the lobster fleet in the Harbor affects many. The men need to capitalize on that. Perhaps the most important thing the fishermen have to offer is the mere fact of their existence. They are historically an important industry located in the heart of a modern city and as such provide a refreshing contrast to a steel and concrete world. People need and want such contrasts. They are frequently willing to fight to keep them.

This generalized sense that there may be supporters "out there" is important, but certainly not enough. The task the BHLA has before it is a difficult one. Waterfront land is both scarce and very expensive. Obtaining control over such a commodity will not come easily. However, there are parcels available, or that could be made available, if pressure were brought to bear in the right places. Furthermore, there are funding programs with which to design a financial package that will meet the needs of the group. These things being so, how should the group continue?

The BHLA has chosen the right strategy by concentrating its site search on publicly-owned land. However, the entire list of options within that category may not have been sufficiently explored. Places
such as Columbia Point where there is city-owned land (some controlled by the sewer and water commission, some by other city departments) are about to undergo major redevelopment. Many new opportunities will be created there. This is true for some of the Harbor Islands. By making their situation known to the appropriate individuals it is possible that the lobsterman's needs can be factored into the planning schemes being devised. It is worth a try.

Of course, one of the problems of publicly-owned land is the layers of restrictions that are often attached to them. The advice of a good legal counsel will be important in dealing with multi-jurisdictional situations. The group should realize that implementation problems are common and that for every decision point there is, there are likely to be delays or complications. However, one powerful ally positioned in the right spot can often do wonders to cut through red tape. If the will is right, much is "doable."

It would be wise for the group to draw up a detailed list of all the parcels that could, by the farthest stretch of the imagination, be possible sites for them. That list should include an analysis of all the known pros and cons related to each parcel. Private land should also be included—especially some of the sites that are presently under-utilized in East Boston. By assigning numerical value to the plusses and minuses one could come up with a balance sheet that might provide a few surprises and add new prospects to the current options.

Possible Sources of Help

Some agencies are more likely to provide help than others. One such agency that the BHLA should put high on its list of resources is
CZM, Coastal Zone Management. This agency was established as a result of federal law to deal with coastal issues of all types. CZM is familiar with the lobstermen's problem and has indicated a willingness to work with the group on the site search process. The Boston Harbor Coordinator should be the first contact within that bureaucracy. This agency does not own land, but it does have influence with those who do. More importantly it is ready to give staff time to work on a solution. This staff time will provide the BHLA with professional help without having to pay for it. This is a good way for a low budget operation to get consulting advice.

In addition to the valuable bureaucratic help, the BHLA should look for someone who is powerful on the political scene who might become a champion for their cause. A number of people who were interviewed during preparation for this paper indicated that Senator Paul Tsongas has shown a lot of interest in issues related to maritime activities. Contact should be made with his office to explore the potential there.

Another contact that the members of the BHLA might wish to cultivate is the Archdiocesan Planning Office for Urban Affairs which is located in downtown Boston. In the past this group has concerned itself mainly with housing developments, but the staff is currently expanding its efforts into economic development issues. They are particularly interested in helping groups form cooperative businesses.

The idea of capitalizing on the tourist attraction potential of the industry should not be overlooked. The members of the fleet could run a clean and fairly odorless (if the bait is well-refrigerated)
operation that would allow them to be a reasonable neighbor in a mixed use urban setting. Perhaps a developer who is looking for a different "angle" or a unique development theme to use as a selling point for his project might be interested in joining forces with the members of the BHLA to design a project that would include, or even focus, on them.

The Chamber of Commerce is still another group that might be interested in building a project around the lobstermen. The rescue of the lobster fleet from displacement on the Boston waterfront could provide all sorts of positive material for the Chamber to use in its promotional efforts on behalf of a "diversified and vital" city. Moreover, besides the two harbor associations already mentioned, there are a number of other civic groups that might be intrigued by the plight of the fleet and be willing to contribute something to a campaign to keep them in the city, if they know about the matter.

The media is a powerful wielder of influence and should be included in any and all strategic plans. Columnist Ian Menzies of The Boston Globe should be among the first approached for help. Obviously the timing of any publicity is critical, but such details can be worked out to the advantage of the BHLA with a modest amount of advanced planning and coordination.

Other sources of help, and ones that may not be so obvious, are the graduate planning schools in the local area. Professors might be more than willing to have a class devote a semester to site location, site planning and financial analysis, centered around the lobstermen's needs. Students might provide just the fresh view and the vital enthusiasm that the group needs to advance its efforts.
Organizational Approaches

In order to be effective, the suggested approaches should be worked on simultaneously. The manner in which these contacts are made is extremely important. BHLA members should work out coordinated and carefully-orchestrated presentations. Each member of the executive search committee should be assigned a responsibility for thoroughly exploring the possibilities of a particular alternative. The executive committee should arrange to meet frequently to exchange ideas and give progress reports. The free flow of information within the organization is very important. A reasonably tight time schedule should be set up to accomplish each task. Meetings should be set up with the lobstermen from Beverly and New Bedford to learn how they fought off efforts to take over their docking areas by condominium developers. And new ideas should be pursued as they surface. Flexibility is critical. No one can predict all the possibilities at the start. However, it is crucial that as one moves through the process no opportunities that arise are left unexplored. This may mean changing the group's entire strategy somewhere down the road, but if doing so helps to realize the desired result, so much the better.

All these suggestions will be effective only if someone takes responsibility to see that they are implemented. Since organizational activity is not the strong point of most of the members of the BHLA, this writer suggests that the association hire a full-time temporary executive director to facilitate all aspects of the game plan. If the men make a commitment to pay someone to oversee their efforts, they may find they have a renewed interest in working on them themselves. There
are many details that have to be covered if the men are to arrive at a satisfactory solution. The process may be divided into four basic categories: site selection, finances, networking and public relations. The search committee should be formed around those groupings. As was suggested before, public agencies may be prevailed upon to provide much of the professional planning needed. The staff person would function as a coordinator and a motivator of the organization members. This person will provide the vital system maintenance for the organization.

The lobster fleet is a unique part of Boston Harbor. As more attention is focused on making the harbor a vital recreational and environmentally pleasing setting for the residents of the city to enjoy, the presence of the lobstermen should become even more desirable. The fleet contributes to the overall ambiance of the harbor and the waterfront. It provides a romantic link to the sea as well as to the past. There definitely should be a place for them in the Boston Harbor of the future. Armed with the right attitude and a willingness to work hard, members of the BHLA and their supporters should be able to find a new home for the fishermen.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Additional Information</th>
<th>Interview Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adler, William</td>
<td>Marshfield lobsterman, President, South Shore Lobstermen's Association; Delegate, MLA; Secretary-Treasurer, Marshfield Lobstermen's Association</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker, Jeff</td>
<td>Realtor, Ryan Elliott Co.</td>
<td>March 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boelter, Alice</td>
<td>Senior Port Planner, Massachusetts Port Authority</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennen, Tom</td>
<td>Executive Director, Boston Harbor Association</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferent, Alexander</td>
<td>Boston lobsterman, President, Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair, James</td>
<td>Marine biologist, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gantmen, Milton</td>
<td>Lobster salesman, Mass Bay Lobster Co.</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines, John</td>
<td>Owner, Hines &amp; Smart Lobster Dealers</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, James</td>
<td>Finance Manager, Boston Loan Development Corporation, EDIC</td>
<td>March 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrell, Dan</td>
<td>Boston lobsterman, Treasurer, Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrell, Tom</td>
<td>Boston lobsterman, Delegate, MLA</td>
<td>March 1 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes, Ray</td>
<td>Marshfield lobsterman, Past President, MLA</td>
<td>February 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Malley, Margery</td>
<td>Boston Harbor Coordinator, CZM</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitterino, Jack</td>
<td>Former lobsterman, Lobster Dealer--Yankee Seafood</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEWS (Continued)

Schaaf, Michael  Loan Development Officer, National Consumer Cooperative Bank  March 30
Tate, Roy  Lobbyest, MLA  February 18, March 1 and 17, April 1
Wells, Pat  Executive Secretary, Boston Educational Marine Exchange  February 28
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BOSTON HARBOR DOCKING SITES, SPRING 1983

Fort Point Channel

Pier 7
Pier 3

Fort Point Channel
Truck laden with lobster traps makes its way along the Southeast Expressway.

Courtesy of The Boston Globe

April 26, 1983
Massachusetts inshore lobster landings; 1888-1906, from annual catch reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Lobsters &gt;10 1/2&quot; T.L.</th>
<th>No. Pots</th>
<th>Av. Catch/Pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1,740,850</td>
<td>21,418</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1,359,645</td>
<td>20,016</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1,612,129</td>
<td>19,554</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1,292,791</td>
<td>15,448</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1,107,764</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1,249,732</td>
<td>17,012</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1,096,834</td>
<td>20,303</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>956,365</td>
<td>17,205</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>995,396</td>
<td>22,041</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>896,273</td>
<td>18,829</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>720,413</td>
<td>16,195</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>644,633</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>646,499</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>578,383</td>
<td>16,826</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>670,245</td>
<td>20,058</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>665,466</td>
<td>20,121</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>552,290</td>
<td>19,539</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>426,471</td>
<td>13,629</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>487,332</td>
<td>21,918</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Massachusetts inshore lobster landings 1907-1921, from annual catch reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Lobsters &gt;9&quot; T.L.</th>
<th>No. Pots</th>
<th>Av. Catch/Pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1,039,886</td>
<td>21,342</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1,035,123</td>
<td>19,294</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1,326,219</td>
<td>29,996</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>935,356</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>822,107</td>
<td>19,773</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>631,595</td>
<td>16,665</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>543,129</td>
<td>13,877</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>566,191</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>15,042</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>491,940</td>
<td>13,707</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>402,469</td>
<td>12,355</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>806,796</td>
<td>18,928</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,123,881</td>
<td>27,488</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,262,241</td>
<td>34,321</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,618,988</td>
<td>38,514</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Massachusetts inshore lobster landings; 1922-1976, from annual catch reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pounds Landed</th>
<th>No. Pots</th>
<th>Av. Lb./Pot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2,341,882</td>
<td>47,531</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1,368,502</td>
<td>42,569</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1,614,999</td>
<td>39,744</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1,573,207</td>
<td>39,033</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1,445,212</td>
<td>39,942</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1,668,157</td>
<td>44,213</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1,788,774</td>
<td>40,873</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1,644,885</td>
<td>40,202</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2,568,796</td>
<td>62,131</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2,134,826</td>
<td>68,507</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1,967,556</td>
<td>19,970</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1,439,224</td>
<td>57,361</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1,767,440</td>
<td>57,836</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1,033,673</td>
<td>57,217</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1,827,521</td>
<td>58,984</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2,106,716</td>
<td>64,030</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2,274,069</td>
<td>70,418</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2,338,365</td>
<td>64,232</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2,226,748</td>
<td>62,776</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pounds Landed</td>
<td>No. Pots</td>
<td>Av. Lb./Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2,238,846</td>
<td>60,567</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,701,910</td>
<td>39,568</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2,340,997</td>
<td>49,616</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2,793,250</td>
<td>63,325</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,958,809</td>
<td>73,415</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>3,235,183</td>
<td>101,740</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3,663,363</td>
<td>103,175</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>3,211,010</td>
<td>94,390</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3,557,243</td>
<td>99,362</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,110,280</td>
<td>98,855</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3,716,381</td>
<td>82,432</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3,433,187</td>
<td>86,788</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3,828,118</td>
<td>93,639</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,573,240</td>
<td>118,519</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3,456,284</td>
<td>93,483</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3,279,686</td>
<td>91,392</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3,579,953</td>
<td>95,209</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,149,615</td>
<td>95,532</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,715,830</td>
<td>97,807</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pounds Landed</td>
<td>No. Pots</td>
<td>Av. Lb./Pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,335,877</td>
<td>88,861</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4,073,610</td>
<td>108,675</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3,736,894</td>
<td>91,959</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2,866,793</td>
<td>90,265</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4,167,195</td>
<td>104,809</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3,097,952</td>
<td>113,291</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3,280,383</td>
<td>120,912</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3,102,970</td>
<td>130,691</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>3,673,014</td>
<td>141,072</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3,598,929</td>
<td>141,526</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,780,776</td>
<td>152,260</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3,843,180</td>
<td>162,276</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3,555,166</td>
<td>175,573</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3,680,554</td>
<td>169,749</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3,882,535</td>
<td>158,987</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975*</td>
<td>5,172,345</td>
<td>211,108</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976*</td>
<td>5,765,898</td>
<td>222,325</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977*</td>
<td>5,431,355**</td>
<td>218,037</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Moratorium in effect
30% increase in reporting

** Does not include recreational fishery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pot Stock Buoys</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.60-5.00</td>
<td>5.00-6.00</td>
<td>6.00-7.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>+ 101.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads Pw. (MM)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>+ 186.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails Per Pound</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>+ 64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks (Each)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>+ 191.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoys Per Buoy</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoys in 50 Box</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope Per Pound</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint (Gallon)</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>+ 84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilouses (Dozen)</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>+ 117.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Price Per Gal</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>+ 69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Price Per Gal</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>+ 200.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bait Redfish</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>+ 121.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRON</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>+ 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfage Pw. Mnth</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>+ 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobster Pw. Pile</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>+ 37.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Notes: | | | | | | | | | |
|-------| | | | | | | | | |
| (A)   | Seconds Per 72 Box | | | | | | | | |
| (B)   | Sale Price on Seconds at Rockport Tuna | | | | | | | | |
| (C)   | Frozen in Box | | | | | | | | |
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Mr. Gino Palnacci
M.B.T.A.
50 High Street
Boston Mass. 02110

March 15, 1982

Dear Mr. Palnacci,

We as the B.H.L.A. have a great desire to find a docking facility for the Boston Harbor Lobstermen which is both permanent and guaranteed.

As the Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Assoc., we represent approx. 50 lobstermen who work Boston Harbor waters and are in need of a docking facility which will give us this security, which to date is not available anywhere in the Boston area. Forming our association in the spring of 1981, we are duly chartered by the Commonwealth of Mass.

Some of the Objectives of our association are as follows:

1. The preservation of the lobster fishing in the Boston Harbor as a commercial fishery.
2. To implement a self-imposed trap limit for the conservation of the fishery.
3. And to have a platform available for fishermen to air their views on problems, suggestions and general discussions pertaining to our industry.

The economic impact Boston Lobstermen impose on this area is both local and far reaching into the economy of the city and the port of Boston. The monies spent locally for support services and by the operators and crewmen in their own communities benefit the general public and merchants.
we sincerely believe that by acquiring a secure docking facility, we as an association will have achieved a great step forward in accomplishing our goals as an association and will be able to pursue other objectives to better serve the fishermen, the industry and the Port of Boston.

We thank you for your interest in our need for a permanent dockage for Boston Harbor Lobster boats. We look forward to working with you and Massport in developing such a site. Please feel free to contact me at anytime for any information you may require for this project. I have enclosed a brief and general economic impact report for your review.

Sincerely Yours.

Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Assoc.

Alexander E. Ferent
President B.H.L.A.
The following figures represent a cross check of our membership for gear in 1979

1. Total pounds of lobster caught
   1,846,788 lb. of lobster.

2. Fuel consumed during this time was
   309,600 gallons at an average cost of
   $164,400, purchased locally.

3. Salt used and bought mostly in Boston was on an
   average of 3 barrels a day per boat at a price of
   $656,600.00 total of 23,220 barrels.

4. Sternmen and crew members were paid
   $425,700.00 payroll.

5. Products and services purchased from local merchants
   trucks and services, boat engines repair, supplies,
   traps, bouys etc. $900,000.00
MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY

1. CURRENT DOCKING AND STORAGE SPACE

A. 1. Where do you currently dock your boat?

2. How much square and/or linear footage are you using for docking?
   _______ square feet    _______ linear feet

3. What is the draft of your boat? _______ ft.

4. Do you require any storage space at site of docking facility?
   _______ yes    _______ no

5. If yes, is this storage space inside or outside?
   _______ inside    _______ outside

6. How much storage space do you use?
   _______ square feet/inside    _______ square feet/outside

7. For what purpose do you use storage space? (e.g. traps, equipment?)
   purpose of inside space:_______
   purpose of outside space:_______

8. What are you currently paying for your docking and storage space?
   docking: $_______
   + inside space  $_______
   + outside space $_______
   + Other        $_______
   = Total        $_______

9. Do you have a lease for the space you use? _______ yes    _______ no

10. If yes, how long is the term of the lease? _______

B. Utilities

1. What utilities are available at docking space? (please check)
   _______ water    _______ heat
   _______ sewer    _______ refrigeration
   _______ electricity    _______ none

C. Parking

1. Do you drive a: _______ truck    _______ car    _______ van

2. Do you have other crew members joining you in separate vehicles?
   _______ yes    _______ no

3. If yes, how many people? _______ How many vehicles? _______

4. What sort of vehicle do they use?
   _______ truck    _______ car    _______ van
5. Is adequate parking available to you at docking site? yes no

6. If no, please describe inadequacy.

D. Storage
1. Where do you store your boat in the off-season?

II. OPERATIONS
A. Scheduling
1. What months of year do you operate?
2. What is your departure time in morning?
3. What is your return time in evening?

B. Bait
1. Where do you pick up your daily supply of bait?
2. If you pick up your bait at a location other than docking space, how do you get there? boat car/truck
3. How far is pick-up location from docking space? miles minutes

C. Catch
1. What is the size of your daily catch?
2. Where do you unload this catch?
3. Do you unload any of your catch at your docking space? yes no
4. If yes, how much of catch do you unload at docking space?
5. Do you require a truck or van at your docking space to transport catch? yes no

D. Cleanup
1. Where do you wash down your boat?
2. How do you dispose of refuse?
3. Are clean-up/disposal facilities available at your docking space? yes no
4. If no, how far is clean-up/disposal facility from docking space? miles minutes
E. Fueling
1. Where do you fuel your boat? ____________________
2. How far is this location from your docking space?
   ___________ miles ___________ minutes
3. How often do you need to fuel boat? ____________________

F. Relocation
1. If docking facilities were available for your use in East Boston,
   Would you consider docking your boat at the facility?
   ___________ yes ___________ no
   If yes, what are the advantages you see to the East Boston site?
   ____________________
   ____________________

3. If no, what are the disadvantages you see to the East Boston site?
   ____________________
   ____________________

G. Comments: - If you have any further comments or observations concerning
   your current docking space or the operation of your boat, which would
   be useful to Massport in determining the feasibility of developing a docking
   facility, please add them on a separate sheet.

Thank you very much for your assistance on this project.
August 9, 1982

Mr. Mark Older  
Boston Redevelopment Authority  
1 City Hall Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02201

Subject: Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association  
- Waterfront Property Procurement Project

Reference: Our telephone conversation on the above subject on  
Friday, July 16, 1982

Dear Mark:

By way of a brief recap of our last conversation; there are approximately 50 commercial lobster fishermen who conduct their business from a number of docking and land support facilities which permit or accomodate commercial fishing activities in the Boston Harbor area.

Whether as individuals or as small groups, the docking and connecting land use agreements are historically arranged on the basis of "tenants at will". Consequently, at all too frequent intervals, these individuals or small groups of commercial lobster fishermen are asked, on short notice, to vacate the property they rent.

For many valid reasons, the "tenant at will" arrangement is no longer a viable circumstance under which the Boston Harbor commercial lobstermen can continue to operate their business.

Recently, the membership of the Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association formed a small working committee, which is charged with the responsibility, to procure waterfront property in Boston Harbor so that the full membership of the Association can begin to operate from one centralized area on a long term basis.

In general terms, the group's requirements are that the water docking facility is of sufficient area to accomodate upto 50 commercial lobster fishing boats, and, that the connecting land area is of sufficient size to allow for drydock storage of the boats, and for the storage of traps, gear, bait and support equipment. Unencumbered vehicular access to the land and docking area is essential as is adequate parking for the vehicles.
For the purpose of lending some dimension to the description of the type of property being sought, we believe that it would be helpful to use, as an example, the MBTA parcel which is located in South Boston and fronts on the Reserved Channel. (A rough layout plan of the property is enclosed.)

As a minimum, to accommodate the water docking of 50 boats, the existing basin which is approximately 250 ft x 516 ft or 129,000 sq ft is needed.

The connecting land area needed is:

- Gear Storage Outdoors 65 ft x 496 ft. or 32,240 sq ft.
- Truck Parking Outdoors 25 ft x 496 ft. or 12,400 sq ft.
- Driveway Outdoors 30 ft x 496 ft. or 14,880 sq ft.
- Bait Storage Cooler 20 ft x 100 ft. or 2,000 sq ft.

This total minimum water and land area of approximately 190,520 sq ft is outlined in red on the rough layout plan.

Optimally, the Association would prefer to acquire a piece of property of about the size of areas 1, 2 and 3 of the MBTA property as outlined in blue on the rough layout plan so that a fully operational and self-sufficient fishermen's cooperative can be accommodated at a centralized location. The property would be utilized as follows:

- Water Docking for 50 Boats 250 ft x 516 ft. or 129,000 sq ft.
- Gear Storage Outdoors 65 ft x 496 ft. or 32,400 sq ft.
- Truck Parking Outdoors 25 ft x 496 ft. or 12,400 sq ft.
- Driveway Outdoors 30 ft x 496 ft. or 14,880 sq ft.
- Drydock Outdoors 130 ft x 496 ft. or 64,800 sq ft.
- Bait Storage Cooler 20 ft x 100 ft. or 2,000 sq ft.
- Lobster Pound 60 ft x 125 ft. or 7,500 sq ft.
- Lobster Retail/Wholesale Store 60 ft x 20 ft. or 1,200 sq ft.
- Finfish Retail/Wholesale Store 60 ft x 40 ft. or 2,400 sq ft.
- Cold Storage Locker 60 ft x 105 ft. or 6,300 sq ft.
- General Offices 60 ft x 20 ft. or 1,200 sq ft.
- Trap Manufacturing/Repair 60 ft x 60 ft. or 2,600 sq ft.
- Machine Shop 60 ft x 30 ft. or 1,800 sq ft.
- Drydock Equipment 60 ft x 20 ft. or 1,200 sq ft.

150,360 sq ft.

The combined water and land square footage, based on the above breakdown, is approximately 300,000 square feet. The breakdown does not include the necessary roadways, walkways, loading docks or safety zones which would take up the remaining 170,000 square feet within areas 1, 2 and 3.
Also, please note that the specific dimensions for building and outdoor areas are calculated on the assumption that the MBTA property is acquired by the Association. Obviously, if some other waterfront location is available for consideration the plans will be rearranged.

While we are in fact highly interested in the MBTA property because it is ideal in so many respects, there is some question as to its actual availability. We are therefore anxious to consider other sites as soon as possible.

We trust that this general description is helpful to you in your efforts to assist the Association in its search for waterfront property which will accommodate a commercial fishing operation of the size and diversity we have outlined.

Please feel free to contact me at any time for information or clarification of our presentation.

I will contact you in approximately a week for the purpose of arranging a meeting with you in the hopes of moving our effort ahead.

Thank you for your interest and help.

Best wishes,

[Signature]

Roy D. Tate
ATTACHMENT NO. 6

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02202

December 20, 1982

Roy D. Tate
Boston Harbor Lobstermen's Association, Inc.
287 K Street
South Boston, MA 02127

RE: Little Mystic Channel,
Charlestown, MA

Dear Mr. Tate:

Thank you for your letter dated October 7 concerning Little Mystic Channel. Subsequently, I understand that you have met with the representatives of the affected agencies within the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs to discuss your project as arranged by this office.

It appears that all parties within the Executive Office including Coastal Zone Management office, the Office of Conservation Services and the Public Access office within Fisheries, Wildlife and Recreational Vehicles agree that it would be in the interest of the Commonwealth to investigate the potential for using the Little Mystic Channel property for a commercial lobster fishing boats dockage area as long as compensating public access property could be obtained from the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the conditions of federal grants used in obtaining the site could be met.

Therefore, this office is willing to meet with the Boston Redevelopment Authority to discuss this matter whenever such a meeting can be arranged.

Please contact my Assistant Secretary, Bernice McIntyre; she will represent the office at such a meeting.

Sincerely,

John A. Bewick
Secretary

cc: Joel Lerner, Conservation Services
Bob Austin, Public Access Board
Marjorie O'Malley, CZM