Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Draft West Coast Groundfish Strategic Plan  
Public Meeting  

*July 31, 2000 - Seattle, Washington*

**ATTENDEES**

**WDFW:** Phil Anderson, Brian Culver, Michele Robinson, and Deb Kuttel  
**PFMC:** Jim Lone, Bill Robinson, Bob Alverson  
**NMFS:** Kevin Ford, Trish Farrell, Robert Schamacher, Yvonne deReynier, Stephen Freese, Kate King, Eileen Cooney  
**US Coast Guard:** Jane Dong, Brian Corrigan  
**Public:** Ron Baehner, Don Green, Mike Deach, Laura Deach, Gerald Gunnari, Jim Hearn, Jack Crowley, Art Hodgins, Janice Jardstrom, Arnold Jardstrom, John W. Sceele, Art Bogen, Gary Bogen, John Haram, Marion J. Larkin, Darby Dickerson, Eric Olsen, Don Jester

**PRESENTATION**

Phil Anderson presented background information on the Pacific Fishery Management Council’s Draft West Coast Groundfish Strategic Plan. He discussed why the plan was developed, how it was developed, the specific recommendations contained within the plan relative to harvest policies, options for addressing overcapitalization, and implementation of the plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Laura Deach:** Provided written testimony (attached).

**Darby Dickerson:** Expressed concern over the exploitation of canary rockfish, especially if Canadian effort on this species increases. General dissatisfaction and distrust with government management efforts.

**Marion Larkin:** The plan needs to be prioritized. Then, as an item on the list of priorities is achieved, examine how that affects the rest of the list. That is, subsequent priorities may be substantially changed as elements of the plan are achieved. It is difficult to consider the elements independently; we need to “integrate all parts.” Stacking is not equitable to those who cannot afford to stack. Marion will be providing written comments.
Art Hodgins: Supports stackable permits, but as a last resort. A buyback program is no good. We need an observer program. “Habitat is everything.”

Ron Baehner: Need to evaluate what happens with stackable permits. Establish the value of a stacked permit, e.g., 70 percent of a trip limit quota. We need some kind of reduction of a full trip limit for each stacked permit to control effort. Would still be interested in stacked permits as long as there were at least 50 percent of a trip limit with the stacked permit.

Jack Crowley: Supports permit stacking, observers, ITQs. Does not support buyback.

Eric Olsen: Supported the testimony of Crowley and Hodgins. We need a longer sablefish season. (Written testimony attached.)

Don Jester: Favors permit stacking; does not favor reducing poundage on the stacked permit. Concern over a longline rockfish permit causing discard in the sablefish fishery, i.e., a sablefish fishery without an endorsement would have to discard their incidental rockfish. We should remove the gear endorsement on fixed-gear limited entry permits, i.e., no distinction between pot and longline. Should not restrict geographic areas.

Gerald Gunnari: Does not support a mandatory permit stacking program. Use the current length/point system for LE permits to scale the value of stacked permits.

Mike Deach: Favors stacking, but does not support mandatory stacking. Would like to see a longer sablefish season. Spent considerable time addressing the need for more informed management of the Washington dogfish fishery, including the need for a formal stock assessment. Use disaster relief funds to promote research. Establish a minimum landing requirement of dogfish to control the current expansion of fishing effort.

Arnold Jardstrom: Supports ITQs. Supports the current 3-tier system as a way to get there. Supports permit stacking and observers.
ATTENDEES

WDFW: Phil Anderson, Brian Culver, Michele Robinson, and Farron Wallace

U.S. Coast Guard: Tom Sparks

Public: Mark Cedergreen, Ryan Beckwith, Mark Fauser, Don Laakso, Gary Fletcher, Denny Stopsen, and Bob Eaton

PRESENTATION

Phil Anderson presented background information on the Pacific Council’s Draft Strategic Plan for West Coast Groundfish. He discussed why the plan was developed, how it was developed, the specific recommendations contained within the plan relative to harvest policies and options for addressing overcapitalization, and implementation of the plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Denny Stopsen: Concerned about where the money is going to come from to buy the permits to stack; he indicated that a lot of people (including himself) did not want to sell their permits. Regarding current groundfish regulations, he did not think that fishing should be allowed for petrale and Dover sole during the winter months on the spawning grounds. He believes that there are far more Dover around now than before (from 40 fm out) because of restrictive trip limits.

Gary Fletcher: He fishes for sablefish in the open access fishery before the limited entry fishery begins and is concerned about having to stack two sets of permits to continue fishing. He was interested in when the moratorium on individual quota systems would be lifted by Congress. *(Phil Anderson indicated that he was currently working with our Congressional Delegation to get an exemption for the West Coast; otherwise the moratorium would not likely be lifted until next year.)*

Mark Fauser: Concerned about geographic limitation in fixed gear sablefish as an option. *(Phil Anderson indicated that while geographic limitation was an option identified in the plan, the committee is not recommending it as a course of action to the Council.)*
Mark Cedergreen: Concerned about black rockfish being managed by the states and what that would mean in terms of allocation among the states; wanted to know if lingcod would be considered nearshore or shelf species. *(Phil Anderson indicated that he thought management of lingcod would be maintained by PFMC; black rockfish and blue rockfish are considered nearshore species.)*

Regarding limited entry for salmon charter boats—wanted to know if there were many non-salmon charter boats in Washington (which are not limited). His concern was that Washington may get a smaller allocation because the size of the charter fleet is smaller compared to Oregon and California. *(Phil Anderson indicated that there were not many non-salmon charter boats in Washington and that the amount of historical catch would more likely be the determining factor in allocation decisions.)*

Bob Eaton: Reviewed the Draft Strategic Plan and wanted to know if the committee considered establishing gear standards and if the committee had discussed gear/species compatibility. *(Phil Anderson stated that the committee addressed exploring gears which were “friendly” to bycatch and habitat and in using that information in allocation decisions.)*

Discussed the possibility of the Magnuson-Stevens Act allowing the Pacific Council to levy a landing tax—the idea being that a portion of the TAC could be set aside and the funds from that portion could be used for research purposes; this would allow industry members to have more control over monies to be used for groundfish research.

Bob also indicated that the Pacific Marine Conservation Council is tracking the development of this plan carefully. He is glad that the Council took this effort on and thanked the state agencies for hosting these public hearings. He stated he would be providing more detailed written comments on the plan to the Council prior to August 18 so that the committee could consider them at its August 24-25 meeting.
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Brookings, OR - July 25, 2000
Attendance Estimate = 55 public + 13 government

Meeting Notes by Subject Heading:

1. Capacity Reduction:
   1. (Fixed Gear) - He said that a 50% reduction in the fleet will not provide a
doubling of the catch per boat.
   2. (Open Access) - Regarding the cut off date, what if you were in the process of
building an OA vessel prior to November 5, 1999. Could you qualify for a
permit if open access was changed to a permit fishery?
   3. (Open Access) - With reference to page 35 (Full Strategic Plan), what would be
the qualifications to get a permit if you were an open access fisher?
   4. (Open Access) - He asked if the Council would want a 50% reduction in OA.
   5. (General Public ?) - If trip limits are in place will we still need a 50% reduction?
   6. (Open Access) - He asked how OA permitted fishery would effect him since he
bought a boat this spring and started fishing.

2. Permit Stacking:
   1. (Trawler) - Wanted to know why permit stacking was considered a
conservation move.
   2. (Fixed Gear) - He asked under permit stacking, if a fixed gear boat could buy
a drag permit?
   3. (LE Fixed Gear with Sablefish Endorsement) - He said that voluntary permit
stacking was okay, but mandatory would lead to fleet problems.

3. IFQ’s:
   1. (LE Fixed Gear with Sablefish Endorsement) - He had a concern with page 31 of
the full Plan Draft.
   2. (Public comment) - Apparently favored IFQ’s and asked how long would our
hands be tied regarding getting IFQ’s?

4. Area Endorsements:
   1. (Open Access) - He favored the concept of area permits and wanted to know if
the Council was ready to accept such permits.

5. Allocation Preference:
   1. (Open Access?) - A nearshore preference should be given to commercial fishers
where there is now little sport presence.
   2. (Open Access) - PFMC should be reminded that commercial fishers obtain fish
for the public that don’t fish.
6. Buy-Back:
1. (LE Sablefish) - CDFG made the mistake of taking permits but allowing boats to switch to other fisheries.
2. (Open Access?) - What has the council done or could do to help get funding for buy-back?

7. Marine Reserves:
1. (General Public ?) - What benefits would be gained for migratory species by marine reserves. I think he wanted these species excluded?
2. (General Public ?) - Who will determine where nearshore reserves will be placed, the states of Feds.? Will such reserves be just for fish or other resources?
3. (Public comment) - What will the configuration of marine reserves would be like?

8. Deferring Management of Nearshore GF to States:
1. (LE Groundfish and Buyer) - Referring to slide #14, he asked what the state thought about having authority, and if it had the needed information.
2. (Fixed Gear) - If the states take control on nearshore, will they receive any funding?
3. (Open Access) - He asked if Federal funding always required 25% state match?

9. General Questions & Statements:
1. (Fixed Gear) - He asked if there were more species overfished that haven’t been studied?
2. (LE Fixed Gear with Sablefish Endorsement) - He stated that many boats with sablefish endorsements do not try to target other groundfish and should be kept separate.
3. (LE Fixed Gear with Sablefish Endorsement) - He gave a statement of mistrust, because materials were not out with enough time for study prior to the public meeting.
4. (Open Access) - He asked if Council would consider increasing the daily limit for sablefish?
5. (Public comment) - Is the Strategic Plan was just a structured fleet reduction?
6. (Public comment) - He said that Senator Dukes said that the county had jurisdiction from 1 to 3 miles.
7. (Open Access) - stated that he thought participants needed to take their comments to PFMHC.
8. (Fisher) - Many have yet to read the Plan, so with this in mind, he asked what is the time line on implementation of the Strategic Plan and where and when to get comments to.
9. (Public comment) - How accountable is the Council to the process and public comments?
10. (Public comment) - What is being done on the East Coast for fishermen?
11. (Fixed Gear) - He had problems downloading information on the PFMC Web site.
12. (Public comment) - How long will the plan take, that is, 3 to 5 years?
13. (Public comment) - Status of the Science: What if the lingcod stocks were better than managers/science thinks?
14. (Open Access) - He asked what limits and regulations would be like in the near future?
15. (CA inland sport fisher) - Funding: He spoke on CalFed funding and getting organized to work together to get funding.
16. (Public comment) - Is there was any foreign fishing off our coast?

whb 8-8-00
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting  
Brookings, OR - July 25, 2000

Notes from participants comments:

1. Trawler -  
   Permit Stacking: Wanted to know why permit stacking was considered a  
   conservation move.

2. Fixed Gear -  
   a. Capacity Reduction: He said that a 50% reduction in the fleet will not provide  
      a doubling of the catch per boat.  
   b. He asked if there were more species overfished that haven’t been studied?  
   c. Permit Stacking: He asked under permit stacking, if a fixed gear boat could buy  
      a drag permit?

3. Fixed Gear with Sablefish Permit -  
   a. Permit Stacking: He said that voluntary permit stacking was okay, but  
      mandatory would lead to fleet problems.
   b. He stated that many boats with sablefish endorsements do not try to target  
      other groundfish and should be kept separate.
   c. IPO's: He had a concern with page 31 of the full Plan Draft
   d. He gave a statement of mistrust, because materials were not out with enough  
      time for study prior to the public meeting.

4. Open Access #1 -  
   Open Access Cut-off Date: Regarding the cut off date, what if you were in the  
   process of building an OA vessel prior to November 5, 1999. Could you qualify  
   for a permit if open access was changed to a permit fishery?

5. Open Access - Capacity Reduction - OA Permits: With reference to page 35, what  
   would be the qualifications to get a permit if you were an open access fisher?

6. Open Access - Area Endorsements on Permits: He favored the concept of area  
   permits and wanted to know if the Council was ready to accept such permits.

7. Open Access - Capacity Reduction: He asked if the Council would want a 50%  
   reduction in OA.

8. Public comment -  
   a. Marine Reserves: What benefits would be gained for migratory species by
marine reserves. I think he wanted these species excluded?
b. **Capacity Reduction**: If trip limits are in place will we still need a 50% reduction?

Notes from participants comments (cont’d)

9. **Open Access** - He asked if Council would consider increasing the daily limit for sablefish?

10. **Public comment** - if the Strategic Plan was just a structured fleet reduction?

11. **Public comment** -
   a. **Marine Reserves**: He asked who will determine where nearshore reserves will be placed, the states of Feds.? Will such reserves be just for fish or other resources?
   b. He said that Senator Dukes said that the county had jurisdiction from 1 to 3 miles. (Ralph Brown said that this was not the case as the state had authority).

12. **Open Access** - stated that he thought participants needed to take their comments to PFMC.

13. **LE Groundfish and Buyer - Deferring Management of Nearshore GF to States**: Referring to slide #14, he asked what the state thought about having authority, and if it had the needed information.

14. There was a general discussion regarding allocation preferences especially in nearshore waters.

15. **Open Access? - Allocation Preference**: A nearshore preference should be given to commercial fishers where there is now little sport presence.

16. **Open Access - Allocation Preferences**: PFMC should be reminded that commercial fishers obtain fish for the public that don’t fish.

17. **LE Sable - Buy-back**: CDFG made the mistake of taking permits but allowing boats to switch to other fisheries.

18. **Fisher** - Many have yet to read the Plan, so with this in mind, he asked what is the time line on implementation of the Strategic Plan and where and when to get comments to.

19. **A person - Accountability of PFMC**: How accountable is the Council to the process and public comments?

5
20. A person - What is being done on the East Coast for fishermen?

Notes from participants comments (cont’d)

21. Fixed Gear -
   a. Defering Nearshore Management to States: If the states take control on
      nearshore, will they receive any funding?
   b. He had problems downloading information on the PFMC Web site.

22. Public comment: How long will the plan take, that is, 3 to 5 years?

23. Public comment - Marine Reserves: What will the configuration of marine
    reserves would be like?

24. Public comment - Status of the Science: What if the lingcod stocks were better
    than managers/science thinks?

24. Open Access - Future Regulations: He asked what limits and regulations would
    be like in the near future?

25. Public comment - IQF’s: Apparently favored IFQ’s and asked how long would
    our hands be ties regarding getting IFQ’s?

26. Open Access? - Buy-back: He asked what the council has done or could do to
    help get funding for buy-back?

27. Open Access - Funding: He asked if Federal funding always required 25% state
    match?

28. CA inland sport fisher - Funding: He spoke on CalFed funding and getting
    organized to work together to get funding.

29. Open Access - New Open Access Permit: He asked how OA permitted fishery
    would effect him since he bought a boat this spring and started fishing.

30. Public comment: Is there was any foreign fishing off our coast?
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting  
Newport, OR - July 27, 2000  
Attendance = 62 public + 13 government

Meeting Notes by Subject Heading:

1. Capacity Reduction:
   1. (Trawler) -
      a. With reference to marine reserves, the drag fleet has already set aside about 30% of the grounds.
      b. He wanted statement in Plan that Federal programs in the 1970's caused the over capacity of the fishing industry (point blame). He believed that Federal funding should be available to solve the problems they caused.
      c. He made a statement on the need for a law change regarding buying boat permits.
   2. (Trawler) - If a boat sinks, it should loose its permits.
   3. (Trawler) - Didn't like slide #22 with 50% fleet reduction.
      a. Government shouldn't manage people.
   4. (LE Sablefish Pot) - Reference to slide #24 - Minimum landing requirements that change make it difficult for a fisherman to plan, that is, “a moving target is hard to hit”.

2. Permit Stacking:
   1. (Salmon Troller) - He asked that if there were permit stacking, would there be a guarantee that with more permits a vessel could get more fish. He said that vessels need to be able to depend on a return for their investment if they stack permits.
   2. (Trawler) - The number of months a boat could be fish could be controlled with the same effect. You could raise the limits for a vessel if you limited the number of months it could fish in a year.
   3. (LE Sablefish Pot)
      a. Recommends that the maximum number of permits stacked on a single boat be set at three.
      b. Permits should be owner fished and not corporation owned.

3. Area Endorsements:
   1. (LE Sablefish Pot) - Reference to slide #25 - Area limitations restricting opportunity are questionable. Fishers need the ability to move to get the best price for their product.

4. Year Round Fishery:
   1. (Trawler) - Regarding Slide #13 and reference to plan’s year-round fishery preference.... fishers need to be combination vessels having more than one
fishery to make it.

5. Buy-Back:
   1. (Trawler) -
      a. Fleet reduction will be a hardship unless there is a buy-back program.
      b. Buy-back will only work if permits are taken and the vessel is removed from ALL fisheries.
      c. If Federal government wants fleet reduction, then it should fund buy-back.
      d. The environmental community should support buy-back.
   2. (OCZMA) - Unhappy that the Plan was neutral regarding Buy-back. He feels that we need congress to start capacity reduction through buy-back, and that any efforts by PFMC will not work without buy-back.

6. Marine Reserves:
   1. (Salmon Troller) -
      a. Wanted to know if it was already determined which types of habitats would be reserves.
      b. Hard spots (rocky reefs) are important fishery areas for trollers who catch tuna and salmon, and their fishing activity is not harmful to habitat. They should not be restricted from Stonewall Bank and Heceta Bank even if they became reserves.

7. Trans-boundary Stocks:
   1. (Trawler) - He said we need to address the trans-boundary stock issue. He felt it was not fair that U.S. fishers could face lower limits to conserve fish because boundary nations (Canada & Mexico) were increasing their catch of trans-boundary stocks.

8. Deferring Management of Nearshore GF to States:
   1. (State Senator) - He was concerned that “feds” may shift responsibility to the states without providing funding for the states to get necessary information. This would increase state liability.

9. Harvest Policies:
   1. (State Senator) - He had problems with slide #16. He saw a possibility of a conservative spiral with a little information making things more conservative.
   2. (Trawler) - He wanted “discards” to be saved and landed with the value of the fish to go to fishery research. He recommended a Full Retention Program. He noted that Alaska does not allow discards

10. General Questions & Statements:
   1. (Trawler) - **Lobbying Congress**: He felt our council should be able to lobby
congress just like the Eastern Council did.

2. (Trawler) -
   a. He did not like the idea (side # 16) of having cautious ABC’s because biological information was lacking.
   b. He wanted a note about the effects of international trade policy on fisheries.

3. (State Senator) - He asked if effort would be shifted if the tribes expanded into groundfish.

4. (Trawler) - He made the point that Good Science is not the same as “the Best Science”.

5. (Pacific Ocean Conservation Network) - See printed statement. Special points made on allocation, and support for securing funding for science and data collection.

6. (COMES) - Will the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan overshadow or “trump” the present Fishery Management Plan?
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Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Newport, OR - July 27, 2000

Notes from participants comments:

1. Trawler & State Rep.-
   a. **Capacity Reduction:**
     1) With reference to marine reserves, the drag fleet has already set aside `30% of the grounds.
     2) He wanted statement in Plan that Federal programs in the 1970's caused the over capacity of the fishing industry (point blame). He believed that Federal funding should be available to solve the problems they caused.
     3) He made a statement on the need for a law change regarding buying boat permits.
   b. **Trans-boundary Stock:** He said we need to address the trans-boundary stock issue. He felt it was not fair that U.S. fishers could face lower limits to conserve fish because boundary nations (Canada & Mexico) were increasing their catch of trans-boundary stocks.
   c. **Lobbying Congress:** He felt our council should be able to lobby congress just like the Eastern Council did.

2. Salmon Troller -
   a. **Reserves:**
     1) Wanted to know if it was already determined which types of habitats would be reserves.
     2) Hard spots (rocky reefs) are important fishery areas for trollers who catch tuna and salmon, and their fishing activity is not harmful to habitat. They should not be restricted from Stonewall Bank and Heceta Bank even if they became reserves.
   b. **Permit Stacking:** He asked that if there were permit stacking, would there be a guarantee that with more permits a vessel could get more fish. He said that vessels need to be able to depend on a return for their investment if they stack permits.

3. Trawler -
   a. **Harvest Policies** (precautionary): He did not like the idea (side # 16) of having cautious ABC's because biological information was lacking.
   b. **Management Policies** (year round harvest preference): Regarding Slide #13 and reference to plans’s year-round fishery preference.... fishers need to be combination vessels having more than one fishery to make it.
   c. **Permit Stacking:** the number of months that a boat could be fish could be controlled with the same effect. You could raise the limits for a vessel if you limited the number of months it could fish in a year.
   d. **Limited Entry Permits:** If a boat sinks, it should loose its permits.
Notes from participants comments (cont’d):

e. Addition for Plan: He wanted a note about the effects of international trade policy on fisheries.

4. State Senator -
   a. Harvest Policies: He had problems with slide #16. He saw a possibility of a conservative spiral with a little information making things more conservative.
   b. Management Policies - Deferring Nearshore to States: He was concerned that “feds” may shift responsibility to the states without providing funding for the states to get necessary information. This would increase state liability.
   c. Tribes: He asked if effort would be shifted if the tribes expanded into groundfish.

5. Trawler -
   a. Best Science: He made the point that Good Science is not the same as “the Best Science”.
   b. Full Retention: He wanted “discards” to be saved and landed with the value of the fish to go to fishery research. He recommended a Full Retention Program. He noted that Alaska does not allow discards.

6. Trawler - Capacity Reduction: Didn’t like slide #22 with 50% fleet reduction.
   a. Government shouldn’t manage people.
   b. Fleet reduction will be a hardship unless there is a buy-back program.
   c. Buy-back will only work if permits are taken and the vessel is removed from ALL fisheries.
   d. If Federal government wants fleet reduction, then it should fund buy-back.
   e. The environmental community should support buy-back.

7. Pot fisher & LE Sablefish - Options to Reduce Capacity
   a. Permit Stacking:
      1) Recommends that the maximum number of permits stacked on a single boat be set at three.
      2) Permits should be owner fished and not corporation owned.
   c. Geographic Area Limitations: Reference to slide #25 - Area limitations restricting opportunity are questionable. Fishers need the ability to move to get the best price for their product.
   d. Landing Requirements: Reference to slide #24 - Minimum landing requirements that change make it difficult for a fisherman to plan, that is, “a moving target is hard to hit”.

   .............. see prepared statement.
9. COMES - Question = Will the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan overshadow or "trump" the present Fishery Management Plan?

10. OCZMA - Buy-back
    He was unhappy that the Plan was neutral regarding Buy-back. He feels that we need congress to start capacity reduction through buy-back, and that any efforts by PFMC will not work without buy-back.

whb 7-28-00
Groundfish Strategic Plan Comments
7/27/00

As one of the member organizations in the Pacific Ocean Conservation Network, we respectfully submit comments regarding the Pacific Fishery Management Council’s Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan. Although our member organizations have not had a chance to complete a detailed review of the strategic plan, we would like to provide some general comments for the Ad-Hoc Pacific Groundfish Fishery Strategic Plan Development Committee.

1. The Strategic Plan is a well thought out, logical vision of what the groundfish fishery needs to look like in the future.

2. We commend the Strategic Plan Development Committee for the work product produced. We believe that the management requirements and recommendations for management policies, harvest policies, capacity reduction, an observer program, marine reserves, and groundfish habitat are comprehensive, and if implemented, will lead to a sustainable fishery.

3. We have identified two areas of the plan which we believe need an additional step in order to transition to sustainability.

   4. Allocation - Before the allocation provisions are put into place, we would like to see the implementation of gear performance standards which would create incentives for clean fishing with options such as extra allocations for fishers with lower bycatch rates.

   5. Science and Data Collection – Securing funding for science and data collection has always been, and will continue to be a challenge for the Pacific Council. Therefore, the POCN requests that the Strategic Plan Development Committee adds a recommendation to set aside part of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for data collection.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak this evening. Our member organizations plan to take a harder look at the details of the plan and submit formal comments to the Council before it’s September meeting in Sacramento.

580 Market Street, Suite 550 San Francisco, California 94104 • Phone: (415) 391-6204 • Fax: (415) 956-7441
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Charleston, OR - August 1, 2000
Attendance Estimate = about 80 public + 9 government

Meeting Notes by Subject Heading:

1. Capacity Reduction:
   1. (Coos Bay Trawlers) -
      a. Why doesn’t proposed monitoring address all the issues listed in the Plan?
      b. The Plan does not emphasize the need for federal assistance in obtaining capacity reduction. No federal buy-back program is addressed.
      c. Vessels may be unfairly excluded from the whiting fishery (p.32). In Coos Bay area there is not enough whiting for a plant to process, and fish were scattered this year. This could exclude Coos Bay fishers from obtaining whiting permits.
   2. (Processor-Pacific Seafood Group) -
      a. By limiting opportunity and permits, the industry will stagnate. Over the last 20 years, there has already been a 50% reduction in capacity. When people finish in their seasonal fisheries, they leave for Alaska or somewhere else; economic growth is lost. We need competition and healthy vessels.
      b. The mainstay of processing plants is groundfish. It has allowed plants to keep going after seasonal fisheries end. Permit stacking and IFQs will take that away. Plants in Coos Bay area have already consolidated, but can they continue to exist after reductions? Who will process the fish if all the plants fold?
   3. (Trawler) -
      a. Right now we have _ of the boats in _ of the shape they were once in. How can there still be over capitalization. If so, why has the Council made exceptions to the rules such as permit stacking for whiting vessels, and Exempted Fishing Permits?
      b. No socioeconomic impacts to fishermen are included in the Plan. No compensation to fishers for fleet reduction.

2. IFQ’s:
   1. (Coos Bay Trawlers) - Unclear action plan: IFQs, other management options are offered for development later.
   2. (Open Access) - Greatly opposed to instituting IFQs here after dealing with them in Alaska fisheries. He asked why the moratorium was put on IFQs in the first place. He says he was put out of business once before in Alaska, and "the rich man puts the poor man out of business." Thinks presenters of the Plan have a "cavalier attitude" about IFQs, not realizing the consequences.
   3. (Processor - Pacific Seafood Group) -Look at social and economic impacts.
      a. We will have fishery "ghost towns. The Plan represents potential
opportunity to some, but for the most, opportunity will be taken away. The "rich get richer."

b. Fishery participants are more than vessels. IFQs would be more difficult for processors.

4. (LE Fixed Gear; Alaska IFQ fisher) - Not convinced IFQs are a good idea. They may increase bycatch and are expensive to implement.

3. Area Endorsements:
   1. (Charter Boat Operator) - If offshore fishery is taken away, he foresees more pressure on nearshore stocks and gear conflicts with recreational boats.

4. Allocation Preference:
   1. (Coos Bay Trawlers) - Open Access/Limited Entry: Non-target fisheries should be closed when their portion of the quota is reached.
   2. (Salmon Troller) - Trawl allocation: Why are stern trawlers still fishing off our shores when they can fish 200 miles out?
   3. (Open access fisher; Sardine fishery) - Against allowing a sardine fishery because it is a food source for rockfish, lingcod and salmon, and he believes purse seining could also negatively affect those stocks

5. Observers:
   1. (LE Fixed Gear; Alaska IFQ fisher) - Expensive program to implement as witnessed in Alaskan fisheries.

6. Marine Reserves:
   1. (Coos Bay Trawlers) -
      a) How can the scientists remove the quantity of ABC from a reserve? Movement out of and into reserves is not known.
      b) How will evaluation be conducted? This is not mentioned in the Plan.
   2. Trawler) - Why is the OY taken off for reserves? No negative points are included about reserves in the Plan, only positives.

7. Deferring Management of Nearshore GF to States:
   1.

8. Trans-boundary Stocks:
   1. Trans-boundary Stocks: Are we to be accountable for the actions of other nations?
   2. (Candidate for County Commissioner, writer, sport fisher) - Trans-boundary stocks: Foreign governments are called on to accept policies of our government. He doesn’t see that happening.

9. Full Retention:
   1. (Coos Bay Trawlers) - Discard: The Plan does not address discard. Fishers are forced to throw back fish, and now they are being put out of business.
2. (Open Access/Developmental fisheries fisher) - Full Retention: Get rid of quotas so you don’t have to throw fish away just to meet the quota. Full retention should be mandatory, in order to determine what is being caught.
3. (Salmon troller #4) - Discard: Stop throwing fish away. Start managing from there, because everything else is meaningless.

10. General Questions & Statements:
1. (Trawler wife) -
   a. Magnuson Act: Has not been implemented by NOAA (NMFS) the way it was laid out. The Plan will put the industry out of business. When NMFS does not like something in the Magnuson Act, they go to Congress to change it.
   b. Science: She was upset that biologists from the Scientific and Statistical Committee are not using fishermen’s data, listing Rick Methot as an example. Mentioned that she was at a meeting where Paul Crone asked Rick Methot for more data to do a stock assessment. "You all should be fired."
   c. Fishermen’s vote: Let the fishermen vote on fisheries issues.
   d. Council Meetings: They are a waste of time and resources. Representatives have not carried out ideas and suggestions.
   e. Checks and Balances: Need to get someone from outside the industry and government to look at data.
   f. Timeline: Plan discusses implementation. The industry does not have time to wait for implementation. They need action now.

2. (Coos Bay Trawlers) -
   a. Science lacking in Strategic Plan:
      1) Lack of observers is offered as a scapegoat for accountability; science is not addressed.
      2) NMFS is not able to scientifically assess localized fishery stocks. Why not?
      3) There is no mention of fisher-assisted scientific data collection in the Plan.
   b. Unclear action plan: IFQs, other management options are offered for development later.
   c. Harvest policy: (p. 15, b.1)
      1) Appropriate MSY, why are the data so uncertain? If data is uncertain remove uncertainty. Science is not imprecise, so reduce error and uncertainty.
      2) Mortality rates, etc. should not be assumed. Council has not taken steps to reduce mortality. He does not agree that there has been little or no opportunity to measure mortality.
      3) Shore-side sampling should have more weight
      4) Why can’t smaller recruit relationships be established?
      5) Why should industry flounder because of the inability of marine scientists? The industry should not have to prove that fish are there.
Scientists should have to prove the fish are not there.
6) Why is it not a priority to get an appropriate exploitation rate? (Not an estimate.)
7) Why is spawner-recruit data not being collected?
d. Biomass estimates: (p.18)
   1) Taken from catch information only? He doesn’t think so.
   2) Why are sampled fish numbers decreasing? If need be, increase coverage from 2% to 10% (for example)
   3) The Council should assess each stock harvested.
e. Supply/Demand: functions of supply and demand are not factored into the Plan. It impinges on market conditions to get fishers out of their Depression.
3. (Open Access) - Science and Management: Why are species declining when management is implemented? There are too many managers and not enough workers. Stock assessment authors are using extremely flawed information to count fish. Fisheries got along fine for 400 years without management.
4. (Salmon troller #1) - He was upset that there was no NMFS representative at the meeting, and that Plan information was not distributed prior to the meeting. He believes that decisions have already been made prior to the meeting.
   a. Factory Trawlers: Get them off US waters.
   b. Tribal allocation: Thinks allocating to tribes increases separation and promotes unequal rights among US citizens.
   c. Fishermen’s vote: fisheries need a right to vote on fisheries issues. Use fisher data as factual information.
5. (Candidate for Coos County Commissioner; sport fisher, free-lance writer.) Sees many problems with the Plan. It contains lots of "buzz words", but does not reassert PFMC’s position. "The Plan is green as broccoli."
   a. Plan Committee representation: Is concerned that five members of the Plan development committee were government agency people vs. three members of industry.
   b. Sustainable Fisheries Act: There was sustainable fishing before the Sustainable Fisheries Act. That legislation has guaranteed tighter and tighter management.
6. (Salmon troller #2) - Future of fisheries: agrees (with processor #1) that reduction in harvest will stagnate the industry. Fewer and fewer young people are entering the fishery because it isn’t viable.
7. (Processor) - Underutilized or Developmental Fisheries: Fishermen will say, "why bother?" The decline in quotas has spread effort to other groundfish species (e.g. skates). With permit stacking, who will fish on those species?
8. (Trawl Net Builder) - Future of the industry
   a. There are few net builders because it is a failing industry; you almost can’t buy web in the U.S. because of the decline. No one is interested in entering the industry; they can’t make a living.
b. How long can businesses carry inventory and supply fishers in a scaled-down market?

9. (Trawler #1) - Plan cost
He looks at the Plan like he would look at a business plan. He would research it and determine cost. What is the cost? Where is the money coming from? Where is the money for capacity reduction? The Council is asking the public to accept the Plan without cost attached. Need to lay out where the money is coming from.

10. (Plant worker/salmon troller family) - Crisis management
Commented that the managers are the people in crisis and are trying to blame fishermen.

11. (Trawler #2) - Optimum Yield
How often have the draggers bumped up against the OY? Why is OY going down every year? He sees no solutions for this in the Plan.

12. (Open Access/Developmental fisheries fisher) -
Industry/Management Interactions: He worked for years in the cattle industry. Sees similar things happening to the groundfish industry. For example, rules were instituted to manage and the US imports more meat than it produces. He suggests that managers work with the industry and learn more about the industry.

13. (Salmon troller #3) - Inherited a boat from his father and now he is out of business. "You people make me sick."

14. (Charter boat operator #2) -
a. Science: He didn’t see a problem with the fishery until the managers and biologists showed up. Data taken by dock-side samplers is more appropriate than chartered at-sea research because it notes what is actually being caught.

b. Reduced sport bag limits: When 3-fish bag limit on canary was introduced, he lost a lucrative fishery. That is difficult to manage on a charter vessel, because fishers will continue to fish after three canaries are caught. This only encourages discard and high grading.

15. (Trawler) - a. Uncertainty: In order to gain trust, you have to add accountability to the Plan. The uncertainty is never in the fishermen’s behalf. He sees uncertainty as a justification for any management action undertaken by the Council.

16. (LE Fixed Gear; Alaska IFQ fisher) - Research: Testing and research should be conducted by hired fishing vessels instead of government research vessels in order to put money back into the industry.
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Coos Bay, OR August 1, 2000

Notes on Public Comment:

1. Trawler family member
   a. Magnuson Act: Has not been implemented by NOAA (NMFS) the way it was laid out. The Plan will put the industry out of business. When NMFS does not like something in the Magnuson Act, they go to Congress to change it.
   b. Science: She was upset that biologists from the Scientific and Statistical Committee are not using fishermen’s data, listing Rick Methot as an example. Mentioned that she was at a meeting where Paul Crone asked Rick Methot for more data to do a stock assessment. "You all should be fired."
   c. Fishermen’s vote: Let the fishermen vote on fisheries issues.
   d. Council Meetings: They are a waste of time and resources. Representatives have not carried out ideas and suggestions.
   e. Checks and Balances: Need to get someone from outside the industry and government to look at data.
   f. Timeline: Plan discusses implementation. The industry does not have time to wait for implementation. They need action now.

2. Coos Bay Trawlers Assn.
   He noted that he had read the Plan four times and found it lacking in many areas.
   a. Science lacking
      1) Lack of observers is offered as a scapegoat for accountability; science is not addressed
      2) NMFS is not able to scientifically assess localized fishery stocks. Why not?
      3) There is no mention of fisher-assisted scientific data collection in the Plan.
   b. Unclear action plan: IFQs, other management options are offered for development later.
   c. Harvest policy: (p. 15, b.1)
      1) Appropriate MSY, why are the data so uncertain? If data is uncertain remove uncertainty. Science is not imprecise, so reduce error and uncertainty.
      2) Mortality rates, etc. should not be assumed. Council has not taken steps to reduce mortality. He does not agree that there has been little or no opportunity to measure mortality.
      3) Shore-side sampling should have more weight
      4) Why can’t smaller recruit relationships be established?
      5) Why should industry flounder because of the inability of marine scientists? The industry should not have to prove that fish are there. Scientists should have to prove the fish are not there.
      6) Why is it not a priority to get an appropriate exploitation rate? (Not an
7) Why is spawner-recruit data not being collected?
   d. Biomass estimates: (p.18)
      1) Taken from catch information only? He doesn’t think so.
      2) Why are sampled fish numbers decreasing? If need be, increase coverage
         from 2% to 10% (for example)
      3) The Council should assess each stock harvested.
   e. Trans-boundary Stocks: Are we to be accountable for the actions of other
      nations?
   f. Reserves:
      1) How can the scientists remove the quantity of ABC from a reserve?
         Movement out of and into reserves is not known.
      2) How will evaluation be conducted? This is not mentioned in the Plan.
   g. Supply/Demand: functions of supply and demand are not factored into the
      Plan. It impinges on market conditions to get fishers out of their Depression.
   h. Capacity Reduction:
      1) Why doesn’t proposed monitoring address all the issues listed in the Plan?
      2) The Plan does not emphasize the need for federal assistance in obtaining
         capacity reduction. No federal buy-back program is addressed.
      3) Vessels may be unfairly excluded from the whiting fishery (p.32). In Coos
         Bay area there is not enough whiting for a plant to process, and fish were
         scattered this year. This could exclude Coos Bay fishers from obtaining
         whiting permits.
   i. Open Access/Limited Entry: Non-target fisheries should be closed when their
      portion of the quota is reached.
   j. Discard: The Plan does not address discard. Fishers are forced to throw back
      fish, and now they are being put out of business.

3. Open Access Longline fisher
   a. IFQs: Greatly opposed to instituting IFQs here after dealing with them in
      Alaska fisheries. He asked why the moratorium was put on IFQs in the first
      place. He says he was put out of business once before in Alaska, and "the rich
      man puts the poor man out of business." Thinks presenters of the Plan have
      a "cavalier attitude" about IFQs, not realizing the consequences.
   b. Science and Management: Why are species declining when management is
      implemented? There are too many managers and not enough workers.
      Stock assessment authors are using extremely flawed information to count
      fish. Fisheries got along fine for 400 years without management.

4. Salmon troller #1
   He was upset that there was no NMFS representative at the meeting, and that Plan
   information was not distributed prior to the meeting. He believes that decisions
   have already been made prior to the meeting.
   a. Factory Trawlers: Get them off US waters.
   b. Tribal allocation: Thinks allocating to tribes increases separation and promotes
unequals rights among US citizens.
c. Fishermen’s vote: fisheries need a right to vote on fisheries issues. Use fisher
data as factual information.

5. John Griffith; nominee for Coos County Commissioner; sport fisher, free-lance
writer. Sees many problems with the Plan. It contains lots of "buzz words", but
does not reassert PFMC’s position. "The Plan is green as broccoli."
   a. Trans-boundary stocks: Foreign governments are called on to accept policies of
      our government. He doesn’t see that happening.
   b. Plan Committee representation: Is concerned that five members of the Plan
      development committee were government agency people vs. three members
      of industry.
   c. Sustainable Fisheries Act: There was sustainable fishing before the Sustainable
      Fisheries Act. That legislation has guaranteed tighter and tighter
      management.

6. Salmon troller #2
   a. Trawl allocation: Why are stern trawlers still fishing off our shores when they
      can fish 200 miles out?
   b. Future of fisheries: agrees (with processor #1) that reduction in harvest will
      stagnate the industry. Fewer and fewer young people are entering the fishery
      because it isn’t viable.

7. Processor-Pacific Seafood Group
   a. Capacity Reduction:
      1) By limiting opportunity and permits, the industry will stagnate. Over the
         last 20 years, there has already been a 50% reduction in capacity. "When
         people finish in their seasonal fisheries, they leave for Alaska or
         somewhere else; economic growth is lost. We need competition and
         healthy vessels.
      2) The mainstay of processing plants is groundfish. It has allowed plants to
         keep going after seasonal fisheries end. Permit stacking and IFQs will take
         that away. Plants in Coos Bay area have already consolidated, but can they
         continue to exist after reductions? Who will process the fish if all the
         plants fold?
   b. IFQs: Look at social and economic impacts.
      1) We will have fishery "ghost towns. The Plan represents potential
         opportunity to some, but for the most, opportunity will be taken away.
         The "rich get richer."
      2) Fishery participants are more than vessels. IFQs would be more difficult
         for processors.
   c. Underutilized or Developmental Fisheries: Fishermen will say, "why bother?"
      The decline in quotas has spread effort to other groundfish species (e.g.
      skates). With permit stacking, who will fish on those species?
8. Trawl Net Builder: Future of the industry
   a. There are few net builders because it is a failing industry; you almost can’t buy web in the U.S. because of the decline. No one is interested in entering the industry; they can’t make a living.
   b. How long can businesses carry inventory and supply fishers in a scaled-down market?

9. Charter boat operator #1: Science
   He sees only biologists and enforcement personnel on the docks. Every fish gets documented, making him believe that more money is spent on that than he makes from his customers.

10. Trawler #1: Plan cost
    He looks at the Plan like he would look at a business plan. He would research it and determine cost. What is the cost? Where is the money coming from? Where is the money for capacity reduction? The Council is asking the public to accept the Plan without cost attached. Need to lay out where the money is coming from.

11. Plant worker/salmon troller family: Crisis management
    Commented that the managers are the people in crisis and are trying to blame fishermen.

12. Trawler #2: Optimum Yield
    How often have the draggers bumped up against the OY? Why is OY going down every year? He sees no solutions for this in the Plan.

13. Open Access/Developmental fisheries fisher:
    a. Industry/Management Interactions: He worked for years in the cattle industry. Sees similar things happening to the groundfish industry. For example, rules were instituted to manage and the US imports more meat than it produces. He suggests that managers work with the industry and learn more about the industry.
    b. Full Retention: Get rid of quotas so you don’t have to throw fish away just to meet the quota. Full retention should be mandatory, in order to determine what is being caught.

14. Salmon troller #3: Inherited a boat from his father and now he is out of business. "You people make me sick."

15. Salmon troller #4: Discard
    Stop throwing fish away. Start managing from there, because everything else is meaningless.

16. Charter boat operator #2
    a. Science: He didn’t see a problem with the fishery until the managers and
biologists showed up. Data taken by dock-side samplers is more appropriate than chartered at-sea research because it notes what is actually being caught.  
b. Reduced sport bag limits: When 3-fish bag limit on canary was introduced, he lost a lucrative fishery. That is difficult to manage on a charter vessel, because fishers will continue to fish after three canaries are caught. This only encourages discard and high grading.  
c. Capacity reduction: If offshore fishery is taken away, he foresees more pressure on nearshore stocks and gear conflicts with recreational boats.

17. Trawler #3:
   a. Uncertainty: In order to gain trust, you have to add accountability to the Plan. The uncertainty is never in the fishermen’s behalf. He sees uncertainty as a justification for any management action undertaken by the Council.
   b. Capacity Reduction:
      1) Right now we have _ of the boats in _ of the shape they were once in. How can there still be over capitalization. If so, why has the Council made exceptions to the rules such as permit stacking for whiting vessels, and Exempted Fishing Permits?
      2) No socioeconomic impacts to fishermen are included in the Plan. No compensation to fishers for fleet reduction.
   c. Reserves: Why is the OY taken off for reserves? No negative points are included about reserves in the Plan, only positives.

18. LE Fixed Gear; Alaska IFQ fisher:
   a. IFQs: Not convinced IFQs are a good idea. They may increase bycatch and are expensive to implement.
   b. Observers: Expensive program to implement as witnessed in Alaskan fisheries.
   c. Research: Testing and research should be conducted by hired fishing vessels instead of government research vessels in order to put money back into the industry.

19. Open access fisher: Sardine fishery
Against allowing a sardine fishery because it is a food source for rockfish, lingcod and salmon, and he believes purse seining could also negatively affect those stocks.

dmke 8-3-00
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Astoria, OR - August 2, 2000
Attendance = 40 public + 8 government

Meeting Notes by Subject Heading:

1. Capacity Reduction:
   1. (Fish Plant Manager) - Does the Capacity Reduction goal of 50% reflect active fishers or permit holders?
   2. (Fish Plant Manager) - Help Requested for Support Industries in Capacity Reduction: Processors and support industries are not part of Magnison Act Considerations. Both regulations and capacity reduction effect processor operations. Down time has a high cost. Capacity reduction will have big economic challenges for communities. Consolidation of plants is a common way of of processors dealing with a smaller volume of fish.
   3. (Trawler) - He was concerned that in September the PFMC process would start towards capacity reduction when industry was without the ability to respond.
   4. (Trawler) - If things really improve, how can you bring people back into the fishery?
   5. (Trawler) - How good is the SSC’s analysis of calculated capital utilization rates (LE Fixed Gear - 9 to 10%, etc.)?
   6. (Support Business - (gear or net shop): effects on Support Industries:
      a. PFMC must consider coastal communities and support businesses.
      b. If fleet is cut by 50% it will be difficult to hold inventory and businesses will have to consolidate.
      c. Support businesses need to be in the information loop to plan, and recommend that business be informed about changes that will effect them economically.
      d. Businesses need help, and since they are taxed on their inventory, they should receive Federal Tax Credits or exemptions so they can transition to reduced capacity.
   7. (Oregon Trawl Commission) -
      a. With new conservative HG estimates, how so you factor in 50% capacity reduction? Now this could be a fleet reduction of 70% Why are we not telling the public the whole picture?
      b. The whiting fleet is now over capitalized.

2. Permit Stacking:
   1. (LE Fixed Gear Fisher) - Favors keeping size limitations on permits. Does not want radical change in permit qualifications.
   2. (LE Fixed Gear Fisher) - Endorsements on Permits: General question if PFMC would consider:
      a. Species endorsements on permits?
b. A nearshore or shelf of slope endorsement on permits?
c. Depth or area endorsement on permits?

3. (Trawler) - Permit stacking looks like an industry funded program, so is there any guarantee that a person will be able to get enough fish with his stacked permits? Fishers need a guaranteed share of the quota. People with money will be favored in permit stacking.

4. (Trawler) - Permit stacking is a nightmare. It creates insurance headaches. If a permit is part of a vessel’s worth, what happens when a boat sinks?

5. (Trawler?) - Stacking would put more pressure on certain areas creating a big problem.

6. (Fisher- unknown gear) - He favors the ability to sell a portion of his permit, such as, certain depth areas or species of fish.

7. (Fixed Gear) - Permit Leasing: It costs a small vessel less to fish. If a boat catches more than it's limit there could be the ability to use a portion of another boats quota rather than discard.

3. IFQ's:
   1. (Commercial Fisher #1) - He favored transferable IFQ over permit stacking.
   2. (Commercial Fisher #2) - He favors elimination of the moratorium on IFQ's. He wanted to know how he could support ending of the moratorium.

4. Area Endorsements:
   1. (LE Fixed Gear Fisher) - Not in favor of stated sport or commercial preference on areas (nearshore, shelf and slope), because there are even nearshore species that sports don't catch while commercial fishers catch and want. He has used traps nearshore to take fish sports don't take.
   2. (Fixed Gear) - Geographical limitations do not work on highly migratory fish.

5. Year Round Fishery:
   1. (LE Fixed Gear Fisher) - Don't need a year round fishery, because he and others fish crab for 1/2 their year.
   2. (Trawler) - How do processors feel is there is no stability in product flow?

6. Buy-Back:
   1. (Trawler) - Why can't we do buy-back on the West Coast when it has been done on the East Coast and in Alaska?

7. Observer Program:
   1. (Trawler) - The average cost of an observer in Alaska is $7,000 per month. (note regarding high cost to vessels)
   2. (Fixed Gear Fisher) - Alaska program exempts vessels under 60 feet. This is not fair to large boats, and small boats must absorb part of the cost on an observer program.
   3. (Fixed Gear Fisher) - Supports only enough observer coverage to estimate
discard...so keep the coverage to a percentage of the fleet and don't keep the
program going when you have a good estimate.
4. (Shrimper) -
a. Not in favor of observer program. The cost is too high for boats to pay.
   Observers cause hardships for vessels, such as delays.
b. Recommends using a fixed video recorder showing vessel deck rather than
   observers.

8. Marine Reserves:
   1. (Trawler) - Fishers use a very small part of the ocean, so don't need reserves.
      Regulations have now moved trawlers out of the rocks. Cables limit fishing
      areas.
   2. (Shrimper) - How can exclusion zones or sanctuaries be enforced?

9. General Questions & Statements:
   1. (Trawler) - What happens if a strategic Plan is not adopted?
   2. (Trawler) - It is best to spend money on science to narrow variance estimates.
   3. (Support Business- gear or net shop) - Improved communication with
      support industries is requested, and it could come in the form of conference
      calls.
   4. (Commercial Fisher) - Congress recently authorized 5-million for the west
      coast fisheries. Where did that money go?
   5. (Pacific Marine Conservation Consortium) -
      a. Recommends a financing plan or business plan to accommodate the
         support industry, including tax incentives and funding for research.
      b. Thanks the committee for staying the course on a hard job. Thanks the
         states for holding the 9-coastwide meetings.

whb 8-8-00
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan Meeting
Astoria - August 2, 2000

Notes from participants comments:

1. Fish Plant Manager -
   a. **Capacity Reduction**: Does the Capacity Reduction goal of 50% reflect active fishers or permit holders?
   b. **Help Requested for Support Industries in Capacity Reduction**: Processors and support industries are not part of Magnison Act Considerations. Both regulations and capacity reduction effect processor operations. Down time has a high cost. Capacity reduction will have big economic challenges for communities. Consolidation of plants is a common way of of processors dealing with a smaller volume of fish.

2. L E Fixed Gear -
   a. **Year Round Fishery**: Don’t need a year round fishery, because he and others fish crab for 1/2 their year.
   b. **Stacked Permits**: Favors keeping size limitations on permits. Does not want radical change in permit qualifications.
   c. **Endorsements on Permits**: General question if PFMC would consider:
      1) Species endorsements on permits?
      2) A nearshore or shelf of slope endorsement on permits?
      3) Depth or area endorsement on permits?
   d. **Preferences**: Not in favor of stated sport or commercial preference on areas (nearshore, shelf and slope), because there are even nearshore species that sports don’t catch while commercial fishers catch and want. He has used traps nearshore to take fish sports don’t take.

3. LE Trawler & Insurance:
   a. **Permit Stacking**: Permit stacking looks like an industry funded program, so is there any guarantee that a person will be able to get enough fish with his stacked permits? Fishers need a guaranteed share of the quota. People with money will be favored in permit stacking.
   b. **Capacity Reduction**: He was concerned that in September the PFMC process would start towards capacity reduction when industry was without the ability to respond.
   c. **Permit Stacking**: Permit stacking is a nightmare. It creates insurance headaches. If a permit is part of a vessel’s worth, what happens when a boat sinks?
   d. **Buy-back**: Why can’t we do buy-back on the West Coast when it has been done on the East Coast and in Alaska?
   e. **Observer Program**: The average cost of an observer in Alaska is $7,000 per month. (note regarding high cost to vessels)
Notes from participants comments (cont’d)

4. LE Trawler -
   a. What happens if a strategic Plan is not adopted?
   b. **Capacity Reduction**: If things really improve, how can you bring people back into the fishery?
   c. **Processors**: How do processors feel is there is no stability in product flow?
   d. **Marine Reserves**: Fishers use a very small part of the ocean, so don’t need reserves. Regulations have now moved trawlers out of the rocks. Cables limit fishing areas.

5. LE Trawler? -
   a. **Capacity Reduction**: How good is the SSC’s analysis of calculated capital utilization rates (LE Fixed Gear - 9 to 10%, etc.)?
   b. **Best Science**: It is best to spend money on science to narrow variance of estimates.

6. LE Trawler? -
   **Permit Stacking**: Stacking would put more pressure on certain areas creating a big problem.

8. Fixed Gear -
   a. **Permit Leasing**: It costs a small vessel less to fish. If a boat catches more than it’s limit there could be the ability to use a portion of another boats quota rather than discard.
   b. **Area Limitations**: Geographical limitations do not work on highly migratory fish.
   c. **Observer Programs**:
      1) Alaska program exempts vessels under 60 feet. This is not fair to large boats, and small boats must absorb part of the cost on an observer program.
      2) Supports only enough observer coverage to estimate discard....so keep the coverage to a percentage of the fleet and don’t keep the program going when you have a good estimate.

9. Commercial Fisher -
   **Permit Stacking**: He favored transferable IFQ over permit stacking.

10. Support Business- (gear or net shop):
    a. **Capacity Reduction - effects on Support Industries**:
       1) PFMС must consider coastal communities and support businesses.
       2) If fleet is cut by 50% it will be difficult to hold inventory and businesses will have to consolidate.

Notes from participants comments (cont’d)

3) Support businesses need to be in the information loop to plan, and recommend that business be informed about changes that will effect them
economically.
4) Businesses need help, and since they are taxed on their inventory, they should receive Federal Tax Credits or exemptions so they can transition to reduced capacity.
5) Improved communication with support industries is requested, and it could come in the form of conference calls.

11. Commercial Fisher -
   a. **Funding**: Congress recently authorized 5-million for the west coast fisheries. Where did that money go?
   b. **IFQ's**: He favors elimination of the moratorium on IFQ's. He wanted to know how he could support ending of the moratorium.

12. Shrimper -
   a. **Observer Program**:
      1) Not in favor of observer program. The cost is too high for boats to pay. Observers cause hardships for vessels, such as delays.
      2) Recommends using a fixed video recorder showing vessel deck rather than observers.
   b. **Marine Reserves**: How can exclusion zones or sanctuaries be enforced?

13. Oregon Trawl Commission -
   a. **Capacity Reduction**:
      1) With new conservative HG estimates, how so you factor in 50% capacity reduction? Now this could be a fleet reduction of 70% Why are we not telling the public the whole picture?
      2) The whiting fleet is now over capitalized.

14. PMCC -
   a. **Funding**: Recommends a financing plan or business plan to accommodate the support industry, including tax incentives and funding for research.
   c. **Thank You**: Thanks the committee for staying the course on a hard job. Thanks the states for holding the 9-coastwide meetings.
Draft Groundfish Strategic Plan
Comments Given Over Phone Following Public Meetings

1. Doug Morrison (fishes the LE sablefish with F/V Paso 2) made the following statements on 7/28/00:
   a. **Capacity Reduction**: The present tiered system works for longline.
   b. **Buy-back**: Buy-back favors large vessels, and he is a small boat not liking buy-back.
   c. **Capacity Reduction**: Why not let 100-small vessels with little bycatch catch fish instead of a few large boats with permits?

2. Ken Martinson a Newport Shrimper called on 7/28/00 and made the following comments:
   a. **Full Retention**: Supports Jim Seavers comment at the Newport meeting regarding wanting “discard” to be landed.
   b. **Full Retention**: He would support using the ex-vessel value of shrimp discard to be used or dedicated for fishery research.
   c. **Buy-back**: When reducing capacity in one fishery and removing a vessel’s fishing permit, the vessel should be eliminated from all types of fishing or it could enter and impact another fishery.

3. Kenyon Hensel (speaking for a Crescent City, CA Open Access Group) on 8/1/00 stated that he is in favor of:
   a. **Capacity**: Freezing effort and freezing changes to new gear (not allowing open access vessels to switch to new gear that they have not fished in the past).
   b. **Area endorsements**: Area endorsements are favored.

4. Newport Combination Fisher - (GF Trawl, Shrimp Trawl, Crab, LE Longline Sable) on 8/3/00 stated the following comments to Rod Kaiser:
   a. **Permit Stacking**: Does not want mandatory permit stacking because it would be very costly. Voluntary permit stacking would be okay.
   b. **Fleet diversity** is important including types and sizes of vessels along with the availability of ports along the coast.
   c. Recommends that the state of Oregon review its permits for crab and shrimp in light of the new strategic Plan.

whb 8/3/00
Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Draft Groundfish Fishery Strategic Plan Public Hearing  
Santa Rosa, California  
July 27, 2000

Summary of Participant Comments

When will the observer program be implemented and how will it be funded? The sooner the program is in place, the sooner we can resolve the discard and bycatch issues. The plan also calls for more research and improved data collection techniques. Where is the funding going to come from to support these programs, and how long will it take from the time the data is collected to analysis to final recommendations?

The current plan recommends marine reserves as a management option, but the PFMC committee responsible for policy issues as they relate to marine reserves is unaware of this recommendation. Therefore, this recommendation should be struck from the plan until the Marine Reserve Committee comes to a consensus on this issue. In addition, the plan needs to have a glossary appended to it.

The Council needs to address the socioeconomic impacts of the plan. Small vessel owners are concerned that they will be eliminated from the groundfish fishery because they cannot compete with the minority of a larger processor/fishing vessels. They deliver a unique high quality, low volume product to the fresh fish markets, whereas the large processor/fishing vessels provide a low grade, high quantity product. Additionally, their gear has a minimal impact on the ocean bottom when compared to the larger processor/fishing vessels and should be regulated separately. Capacity reduction should be applied equally to small, medium, and large vessels.

The plan needs to be more specific regarding the issue of allocation. Groundfish are harvested by a wide variety of gears that a deployed from boats of various sizes. The current plan supports the elimination of the small scale trawler fleet and advocates the monopolization of the groundfish fishery by factory boats. Capacity reduction should apply equally to small, medium, and large length class vessels.

The bycatch and discard issue needs to be seriously considered during the allocation process. Non-discriminate gear (trawl gear) should be penalized in the allocation process. Develop an index that profiles the least destructive to the most destructive groundfish gears. Values obtained from the index should be integrated into an allocation formula.

When considering catch limits, the council should increase the time period from one to two months. Also, catch limits should be increased during the winter months when less fishing effort is being conducted because of foul weather.
The discarding of fish at sea should be illegal, but the council should consider a 10% retention policy for fish taken on the shelf or slope.

How does the Council plan to deal with state-managed groundfish species?

There was concern that the Council may not be receptive to criticism of the strategic plan because the committee consisted of Council members. Individual fishing quotas (IFQ) will not work under the current and recommended management policies.

Current landing quotas are so low, only those boats with the highest catch volume will profit from IFQs.

Some fishermen would like to see more flexibility in their longline permit endorsement. Originally, these permits had no minimum landing requirements, but according to your plan, these permits will be void if we have not made landings recently.

Small vessels are able to fill specialty markets with high quality, high value product. This fishery has little discard and maximizes the value of the resource. Because of the high prices, some fishermen can get by with current low trip limits. This fisher should be protected.

There was concern that needed funds for research are not available. The observer program needs to be implemented as a top priority.
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Summary of Participant Comments

To what extent has the Council examined the socioeconomic ramifications of this plan? All aspects of the industry will be harshly impacted. Small operations are just as important as big ones. Fish processing plants are currently overcapitalized, and they cannot remain operational for a minimal amount of groundfish and seasonal crab landings. Plant operators are concerned that lending institutions will not loan them money to down size their facilities because of uncertainties of the industry. Not only will those people from the service sector be impacted but the consumers will be as well.

When defining participants, it needs to go beyond fishermen and include participants. Capacity reduction without respect to geographic area has the potential to close ports, especially small ones. Movement of permits can result in no vessels to deliver to some ports. Processors have made substantial investments, and need to service debt load. If groundfish is forced out of some ports, other fisheries in those ports could be affected. Closure of processors could eliminate opportunity to unload shrimp, crab, etc. Processors have already gone through substantial consolidation, so that is not an option.

The Council needs to look at the economic impact of IQ systems. Some people will be forced out, and capital will dry up without expectation of ability to access catch. The domino effect of smaller fleet size will have serious impacts on communities, because a large fleet supports numerous other businesses.

Historically we feel the Council has done a very poor job of informing us about the severity of these issues, and the scheduling of meetings. For example, this meeting was scheduled during the blackcod opening. In addition, small vessel owners have no voice at the Council meetings because of the location and the cost to attend. Therefore, the Council dictates to us how, when and where we can fish. How many commercial fishermen sit on the Council?

We are concerned that the Council’s plan will cause a shift in fishing effort from the groundfish fishery to other fisheries, resulting in overcapitalization of the existing and emerging fisheries. There was concern specifically about transfer of effort to the salmon fishery. How do you plan to deal with this shift in effort? Great effort shift can affect other businesses than fishermen.

The Council makes its decisions based on the best available data which is poor at best. What is being done to collect more reliable data to support your findings? It’s going to cost a lot of money to collect reliable data and to implement your strategic plan. Where is the money going to come from?
What does a 50% reduction in capacity mean? Will there be 50% across the board for all vessels and gear types or will the reduction be specific only to certain gear types? Is sportfishing included? Tier 1, 2 and 3 should each be reduced 50%.

Some of the meeting participants indicated that indiscriminate fishing gear such as trawl gear should be heavily regulated when compared to the hook-and-line fishery.

What about the following options: IFQs by species or multiple species; allow operators to transfer quotas; regional management to prohibit a shift in fishing effort from one region to the next.

In terms of management, will there be parity between the open and limited access fisheries? Fish market and restaurant owners expressed concern that closure of the open access nearshore fishery will put them out of business. A majority of their customers rely on premium live fish.

There was concern that additional landing requirements under a future capacity reduction program for A permits would cause unneeded hardship and financial loss. Under that proposal, it is important to provide a ranked list of vessels so that current participants would not invest in improving vessels that will ultimately be eliminated from the fishery. Under permit stacking, will length endorsements be applied to vessels that choose to stack? For example, will a 60-foot vessel need to obtain another 60-foot permit to stack? Mandatory stacking for trawl vessels may not be affordable for small boats.

Credibility is low, and some other neutral body is needed other than the current managers and the Council.

If a comprehensive approach is going to work, it is important to accurately anticipate the effects of future or longterm measures such as reserves, before going forward with other measures that will be taken first. Otherwise the economic impacts will not be balanced when all measures are finally put in place.

Quit managing fish businesses and start managing fish. Let economic and individuals decide whether it is in their best interest to stick it out. Otherwise, the little buys always get hurt the most.

Need to add regional management to the plan, otherwise big ports will dominate and cause localized depletion, i.e. Newport. Also, without regional management, southern nearshore catches may cause closure of health northern nearshore fishery.

Reduced capacity will stagnate the industry and stifle development of new fisheries. Once participation is limited, what is the provision to allow an increase when the resource recovers?
For the trawl fisheries, establish a series of species or species complex endorsements that are transferable. This could circumvent the IQ provision, while achieving similar results. If someone wants more Dover or widow, they could go out and get it.

What was the result of the buyback program on the east coast? Can we learn anything from it?

Local markets have been developed based on landings by the OA fleet. If that allocation is given to the recreational fishery, local people will not have access to fresh fish. The OA fleet represents those people who like to eat fresh fish.

Years of participation should count as much as catch volume in determining who is included under capacity reduction.
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Comments at June Council meeting on Strategic Plan

Mark Cedergreene -

Bob Eaton - the Council will need to prepare itself and the public for the hard decisions that will be necessary to achieve the vision and goals of the plan. For the public hearings, the two messages to the public should be “help us improve the plan” and “keep focused on the plan as a whole, rather than little pieces of it.”

Kenyon Hensel - supports reduction of the open access sector and suggests a vertical hook-and-line permit be established. Vertical gear is clean, with minimal bycatch, and has no impact on essential fish habitat. He suggested qualifying criteria for this “V” permit be that the fisher was active in 1994 (and earlier) and is still participating in the fishery.

Denny Burke - he was surprised and shocked when he read the strategic plan; “All I’ve heard is ‘reduction.’” His shock turned to fear as he thought about what it means. His is a small boat enterprise that supports three families. How do we provide an exit with equity? How are we going to make the necessary changes?

Mike Pettis - expressed concern about new minimum landings requirements (MLRs). He wants a longer sablefish season, and believes it can be done through a permit stacking program. [Phil Anderson replied that MLRs were considered for both open access and limited entry sectors, but the committee recommendation is to provide permit stacking for the limited entry fleet and then move to individual quotas. MLRs would be used only for the open access fleet at this time. Hans Radtke asked Mike what would happen to permit prices; Pettis replied “it’s a crap shoot.”]

Jack Crowley - appreciated the vision of IQs, based on his Alaska experience. He said they make management easier, provide the public of benefits such as fresh fish all year. An IFQ program is essentially an industry funded buy-out, and fishers get compensation.

Peter Leipzig - wants to be constructive in this process, but believed the plan hasn’t brought forward anything new. This will be an official document that will be a tool (and a club) for talking to Congress and the states. He said the vision statement is the good dream. He suggested the alternative “nightmare vision” should also be provided, that is, what will happen if we don’t do anything?

In the management section, he suggested the preferred option be right up front. We need buy back or ITQs right now, but neither is available to the Council right now. Responding to Dave Hanson’s question about the benefits of permit stacking, he responded that no one has the money to acquire additional permits right now, and the full cost would have to be paid up front. He also questioned where will the vessels go that lose their permits?

Mark Powell - echoed Bob Eaton’s comments. He had expected a “warm and fuzzy” plan, and was stunned by the transition message.

John Crowley - said this is the first step in the rest of the history of the west coast groundfish fishery. We need to move forward with permit stacking as quickly as possible.

Joe Easley - said that “sometimes stating the obvious is pretty hard to swallow.” He believes permit stacking won’t reduce capacity enough, and doesn’t believe a 50% reduction is enough. The whiting fishery is also overcapitalized. He suggested the goal not be 100% capacity utilization; also, before moving to reduce capacity, the Council needs to establish the program infrastructure (such as allocation). He also stressed the need to involve the communities and not just the industry. He suggested the Council identify all the data it needs to manage this fishery and send the package to the Secretary of Commerce. The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires the Secretary to implement the data collection programs the Council says are essential for management of the fishery, unless the Secretary determines the information is not necessary. With
respect to the plan document, it's important in the plan to name the committee members and say why they were chosen.

Michele Eder - endorsed releasing the draft document immediately for public review, stressing the need to get the word out as quickly and broadly as possible. She suggested the need to develop more "exit strategies" for the 50% that are eliminated, including such ideas as transferal of Capital Construction Funds to individual retirement accounts; permit stacking; "B" and "C" permits. With respect to geographic registration of permits, she said this is a wild idea that should be dropped.