

DECISION STEP SUMMARY

The following is an outline of the choices before the Council in the Trawl IFQ scoping results document. A full description of each decision choice together with explanatory text and some analysis is provided in the scoping results document.

There are three main issues to be covered:

- Design of Alternative Management Tools
- The Species to Which Each Tool Will be Applied
- Resolution of Within Trawl Sector Allocations Necessary to Apply the Tools

Leading up to the main issues are consideration of

- Goals and Objectives for the Proposed Action
- Definition of the Status Quo and Baselines That Will Be Used to Assess Impacts, and
- Evaluation of Whether the List of Alternative Management Tools Is Complete.

The following is an overview of the steps the Council will need to take and reference materials:

EIS Decision	Summary Page	Scoping Results Document	November 2004 Tasks ^{a/}
1. Goals and Objectives and Scope for Action	2	1.2.3	Review and Revise as Necessary
2. Definition of Status Quo and Baseline	4	2.1.1	Provide Guidance on Status Quo and Baseline for Use in the Analysis
3. Alternative Tools	6	2.1.1	Is the list of main alternatives for consideration complete?
4. Tool Design			
a. IFQs (potential decisions in 27 sections and subsections)	7 & Appdx A (Ex E.6.a Attach 4)	2.1.1 and Appendix A	Identify options for full development. Accept or modify alternatives recommended by TIQC Identify principles for constructing alternatives
b. Cumulative Catch Limits	8	2.1.1	Identify options for full development.
c. Pooled Species Caps (Sector Catch Caps)	10	2.1.1	Identify options for full development.
d. Other Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-, 4- 6-month, 1-year Lndng Limits • Permit Stacking • Other 	10	2.1.1	Identify options for full development.
5. Specify the Species to Which Each Tool Applies	14	2.1.2	Additional Guidance (Optional)
6. Resolve Any Allocations Needed Among Trawl Sectors	16	2.1.3	Identify options for full development.

a/ Options identified for "full development" will also be the primary focus for analysis over the winter.

This document provides an outline of all the decision steps organized in a structure parallel to that of the scoping results document. It includes the options from preliminary scoping by the TIQ Committee and TIQ Enforcement Group as well as options recommended for consideration during the scoping process. The scoping document provides more complete discussion along with some analysis. There are blank columns and rows provided for Council member notes, including, in particular, notations on options included in the TIQ Committee's recommendations coming out of the TIQC's October 25-26 meeting that were not available for inclusion in this document.

Goals Objectives and Scope of Action

Review and Revise as Necessary

The TIQ independent experts panel has recommended a revision to the goals and objectives (IEP Report). A table on the following page shows the current goals and objectives and those proposed by the IEP.

Related to the goals and objectives for this action is the scope of the problem which the Council is addressing under this process. While the scope has initially been restricted to the groundfish trawl fishery, public comment was received requesting that the recreational fishery be included in the IFQ program.

The EIS in which the IFQ Program is considered will not cover intersector allocation issues. Such issues will be covered under a related but separate process.

Public comments:

Include recreational fisheries and allow cross sector transfers. A hard allocation guaranteeing catch for one sector is unfair.	UASC
--	------

Some Key Issues and Information

Carefully defined goals and objectives will help analysts efficiently focus on providing the most relevant information to support Council decisions.

Expansion of the IFQ program to other sectors might be achieved through full inclusion of those sectors (conversion to management under IFQs in other sectors) or by allowing participants in other sectors to acquire IFQ and thereby individually or as a group, augment their fishing opportunity. The means for individually augmenting fishing opportunity would have to be determined. Alternatives might include expansion of trip limits or providing opportunities to fish during periods that might otherwise be closed. If individual opportunity is augmented, tracking and monitoring system would have to be extended to cover other fisheries. If the other sectors are not under full IFQ programs there is a possibility that the costs of extending the tracking and monitoring system will not cover the benefits. If a means were provided for trawl IFQ to be transferred to a nontrawl sector as a whole, then fishing opportunity for the group might be expanded without the need to incur additional tracking and monitoring costs.

Potential Council Action:

- 1. Determine whether or not to revise goals and objectives.*
- 2. Consider whether or not to adjust the scope of action to extend beyond the trawl fishery.*

Reference Materials:

Independent Experts Panel Report
Section 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 of the Scoping Results Document
TIQC Report

<p>Currently Stated</p>	<p>IEP Recommended Revision</p>
<p>Goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide for a well managed system for protection and conservation of groundfish resources. 2. Provide for a viable and efficient groundfish industry. 3. Increase net benefits that arise from the fishery. 4. Provide for a fair and equitable distribution of fishery benefits. 5. Provide for a safe fishery. 6. Capacity rationalization through market forces. 	<p>Goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase regional and national net benefits including improvements in economic, social, environmental and fishery management objectives. <p><i>This goal subsumes the previous very general goal of “providing for a well managed system” and other broad goals including: Provide for a viable and efficient groundfish fishery Increase net benefits that arise from the fishery Provide for a fair and equitable distribution of fishery benefits Provide for a safe fishery</i></p> <p><i>Most of these more specific goals are reflected in Magnuson-Stevens Act national standards and other guiding legislation and executive orders. More specific interpretation and statement of this goal is also provided through the associated objectives. Improved conditions should be considered to include conditions for harvesters, processors, crew, support industries and communities (i.e. all of those with a stake in the industry) as well as the nation as a whole (improved net social benefits).</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Achieve capacity rationalization through market forces and create an environment for decision making that can rapidly and efficiently adjust to changing conditions. <p><i>This goal is intended to address both private and public decision making.</i></p>
<p>Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Takes into account structure of the stocks. 2. Minimize ecological impacts while taking the available harvest. 3. Reduce bycatch and discard. 4. Encourage sustainable fishing practices. 5. Account for total groundfish mortality. 6. Promote individual accountability - responsibility for landed catch and bycatch. 7. Avoid provisions where the primary intent is a change in marketing power balance between harvesting and processing sectors. 8. Avoid excessive quota concentration. 9. Provide certainty/stability for economic planning. 10. Provide operational flexibility. 11. Minimize adverse effects on fishing communities to the extent practical. 12. Promote economic and employment benefits through the seafood catching, processing, and distribution elements of the industry. 13. Provide efficient and effective monitoring and enforcement. 14. Design a responsive review and modification mechanism. 	<p>Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide for a viable, profitable and efficient groundfish fishery (previously Goal 2, with addition of the word of “profitable”) 2. Minimize negative ecological impact while taking the available harvest. (previously Obj 2) <i>(The panel’s perspective is that the clause “while taking the available harvest” can be assumed.)</i> 3. Reduce discard mortality bycatch and discard. (previously Obj 3) <i>(Under the M-S Act bycatch is discarded catch so the terms are redundant. Additionally, through this recommended change in wording the panel is suggesting that perhaps the issue of greatest concern is discards that die rather than total discards)</i> 4. Encourage sustainable fishing practices. (previously Obj 4) <i>This objective seemed vague and is addressed under mandates of the Magnuson Stevens Act and other law.</i> 5. Promote individual accountability - responsibility for <u>catch</u> (landed catch and bycatch discards). (previously Obj 6) 6. Provide Increase <u>certainty/stability</u> for <u>business</u> economic planning (previously Obj 9) 7. Provide Increase operational flexibility. (previously Obj 10) 8. Minimize adverse effects from IFQs on fishing communities to the extent practical. (previously Obj 11) 9. Promote economic and employment benefits through the seafood catching, processing, and distribution elements of the industry. (previously Obj 12) <i>Remove as an objective and address as narrative under the goal.</i> <p>Constraints and Guiding Principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taking into account the biological structure of the stocks including such factors as populations and genetics (expansion of Obj 1) 2. Taking into account the needs to ensure that the total OYs and ABC for the trawl and all other sectors are not exceeded (expansion of Obj 1). 3. Accounting for total groundfish mortality. (previously Obj 5) 4. Avoiding provisions where the primary intent is a change in marketing power balance between harvesting and processing sectors. (previously Obj 7) 5. Avoiding excessive quota concentration. (previously Obj 8) 6. Providing efficient and effective monitoring and enforcement. (previously Obj 13) 7. Designing a responsive review evaluation and modification mechanism. (previously Obj 14)

Status Quo and Baseline

Provide Guidance on Status Quo and Baseline for Use in the Analysis

There are two general categories of information that are useful in the decision process.

1. For each alternative what is the change as compared to the present situation (a baseline)? As an example, the present year conditions can be used to provide a reference point that illustrates the additional industry investment or agency funding that will be required under whichever alternative is chosen, as compared to current levels.
2. For each alternative what is the change as compared to status quo? This comparison illustrates the real choices available (maintaining baseline conditions is often not a choice). In a deteriorating situation all choices may be worse than the baseline but better or worse relative to one another, or all choices may be better than the baseline but better or worse relative to one another.

Some Key Issues and Information:

The present situation baseline is what exists and generally there are no policy decisions to make on that issue. The 2003 fishing year is being used as the baseline because nearly complete information is generally available for that year, so the needed comparisons can be made. The cumulative impacts analysis will take into account changes from the recent past as well as concurrent and future events and actions that are not accounted for under the specification of the status quo alternative.

The Council's programmatic bycatch EIS and commitments entailed therein have a significant bearing on the projection of status quo. The IFQ EIS will evaluate for the trawl fishery the main management alternatives adopted under the programmatic bycatch EIS (vessel cumulative catch limits, sector caps and IFQs). Additionally final action under the programmatic bycatch EIS anticipates increased observer coverage. The description of the adopted alternative (Alternative 7) states that over the longer term "the observer program will be upgraded to produce inseason catch data on overfished species." On that basis it might be assumed that there will be increased bycatch monitoring in the future regardless of the management option selected. If this is the case, it would not be appropriate to include the cost of all additional monitoring for bycatch (the change from current conditions) as part of the cost of an IFQ program but rather some increase in monitoring should be included as part of status quo, reducing the change from status quo required to implement IFQs.

There is a similar situation with respect to enforcement costs. The TIQ Enforcement group has identified significant additional resources required to bring enforcement to adequate levels under current management. Once an adequate level is achieved under current management, the additional resources required for a move to IFQs would be substantially smaller, as compared to the move from today's enforcement levels to what would be necessary under an IFQ program.

Elements Defining Comparison Scenarios	Baseline	Status Quo
Bycatch Control	Score card accounting for overfished species including estimates of bycatch	Score card accounting for overfished species including estimates of bycatch
Enforcement	Current Levels (2003)	Approximately double
At-sea Monitoring - Observers	30%	50% (for example)
Harvest Levels	Current (2003)	Projected (see Analytical Team Report)

Potential Council Action:

1. *Provide guidance on projections of status quo management to be used for analysis in the IFQ EIS.*

Reference Materials:

Analytical Team Report section on definition of status quo.
 Enforcement Group Report
 Section 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

Alternative Tools

Is the list of main alternatives for consideration complete?

The following are the tools in the scoping information document and related provisions for the Council recommended alternative from the programmatic bycatch EIS. Details of the design elements for each tool are addressed in subsequent sections of this document. The question here is: “Is this list complete with respect to the purpose and need for the proposed action?”

Tools	Council Recommended Bycatch Alternative (Alt 7)
Status Quo (Trip Landing Limits and Seasons)	“establishing landings limits for target species based on co-occurrence ratios with overfished stocks”
IFQs	“ future use of IFQ programs for appropriate sectors of the fishery” “incorporate the Strategic Plan’s goal of reducing overcapacity in all commercial fisheries”
Trip Catch Limits	[a potential element of the sector specific catch option]
Sector Limits	“sector-specific caps for overfished and depleted groundfish species”
Permit Stacking and Extended Trip Limit Periods <i>(from Sept 2004 Council Meeting)</i>	
NEW (recommendations from advisors)	

Public comments.

Community Development Quotas	CJC, POORT, ED, Survey (ED)
CDQs Opposed	Individual (1)
Individual Processor Quotas	
IPQs Opposed	Individual (1)
Trip Landing Limits with Extended Periods (3, 4, or 6 months)	PMCC
Reduce Season Length	Individual (1)
Consider Marine Reserves and Reduce Quotas (50% in first year and 10% in each year thereafter)	Individual (1)

Potential Council Action:

1. *Identify any other management tools which might address the purpose and need for action (Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 of the Scoping Results Document).*

Reference Materials:

Section 1.2.1 and 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

Tool Design

The following sections go through each of the management tools and address design issues that will need to be resolved in the development of these alternatives.

IFQs

Identify options for full development.

Accept or modify alternatives recommended by TIQC in their supplemental report (Nov 2004)

Identify principles for constructing alternatives

The details of the IFQ design elements are covered in **Appendix A** (Exhibit E.6.a, Attachment 4 - Decision Step Summary Appendix) to this document (which corresponds to Appendix A of the scoping results summary). In Appendix A, there is a brief explanation of each design element issue along with options identified by the TIQC during preliminary scoping, options identified by the public, and a listing of some potential Council guidance on the issue. **Blank rows and columns are provided to record results from the TIQC report (that may be provided in supplemental materials) and for Council members to make notes.**

The TIQC is expected to provide the Council with its tentative recommendations on IFQ program alternatives. The Council may wish to work through Appendix A by

1. Identifying whether there are options not included in the TIQC alternatives that the Council would like to see considered.
2. Providing other possible guidance as identified at the end of each section.

After identifying the full suite of options it would like to consider, it is proposed that the Council identify some general principles around which it would like to see alternatives developed to incorporate options not included in the TIQC recommendations. Over the winter, staff and analysts would then work with the general principles and options not included in the TIQC alternatives to develop some additional IFQ program alternatives for consideration by the Council and its advisors. The initial structuring of the alternatives would be done in such a way as to enable analysis that would illustrate key trade-offs among types of design features.

Examples of general principles:

- Provide substantial opportunity for community influence over the geographic distribution of IFQ landings
- Provide maximum opportunity for fleet rationalization.

Potential Council Action:

1. *Provide guidance on the design elements, as noted in each section of Appendix A.*
2. *Decide whether or not to accept for preliminary analysis the alternatives developed by the TIQC.*
3. *Provide general principles that might be used to develop new alternatives that include design options not included in the TIQC alternatives as modified by Council action.*

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

Appendix A of this document and the Scoping Results Document

Cumulative Catch Limits

Cumulative catch limits apply to vessels and would replace cumulative trip landing limits. Under vessel catch limits a vessel would stop harvesting when the limit is reached. Under the current trip limit system vessels continue to harvest but discard fish taken in excess of the limit.

Vessel catch caps were part of Alternative 4 of the programmatic bycatch EIS and were adopted for consideration as part of the Council’s final action on the programmatic EIS (Alternative 7). Under the programmatic bycatch EIS, vessel cumulative catch limits were to be applied only to control harvest taken under sector catch caps, and sector catch caps would be developed for overfished species. It was anticipated that observers or other at-sea monitoring systems would be required to ensure compliance with catch limits. Here cumulative catch limits will be considered for other groundfish species, as well as for overfished species.

Cumulative catch limits may be used to control harvest rates with status quo management targets, such as those reflected in the annual scorecard for overfished species and the OY table for nonoverfished species, or they may be used to control the rate at which sector caps are reached (if a sector cap type management tool is implemented).

Cumulative Catch Limit Design Elements	Options
Vessel Caps	Consider time periods other than the current 2-month periods use for cumulative vessel landing limits.
Tracking and Monitoring	
At-Sea	Option 1: At-sea Compliance Monitors (100%) Option 2: Full retention and Video Camera
Shoreside	Option 1: Spot enforcement presence and Audits Option 2: Shoreside Compliance Monitors (100%)
Data Reporting	Upgrade reporting of at-sea catch data system such that catch data is complete and available at the vessel level in a time frame similar to that for dock receipts and fish tickets

Some Key Issues and Information:

Adequate monitoring would be required to ensure that catch is recorded into a tracking system. The monitoring, and enforcement issues would be similar to those that are anticipated for IFQs except that each vessel to which the catch limits apply would have the same limit. Whatever level of at-sea monitoring is determined to be needed for an IFQ program would also be needed for a cumulative catch limit system. This is reflected in the proposal in the programmatic bycatch EIS that would allow vessels to opt out of management under sector caps to fish under a vessel cumulative catch limit, but only on the condition that they comply with an approved monitoring program, which would likely include observer presence or video monitoring.

Thus the main difference in program administrative costs, as compared to an IFQ program, would be the lack of a need to track IFQ holdings. Catch information would not need to be any more timely than under the current cumulative limit landing system. The main difference in

program benefits would be the lack of improvement in fleet efficiency as compared to an IFQ alternative.

An option for shore-side monitoring was not included in the programmatic bycatch EIS but was added here. Inclusion of this design option will help evaluate the need for this element of the monitoring program under either vessel cumulative limits or IFQs.

The effect of alternative time periods (longer than 2 months) will be discussed in the section on extension of the current cumulative landing limits to a longer time period.

Public comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider a management system under which vessel catch limits would be available for vessels opting out of fishing under sector caps. Vessels opting out <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ receive a “proportionate” share of the sector cap for overfished species for their individual use. ○ must carry an at-sea compliance monitor or otherwise assure 100% accounting of catch. ○ receive higher cumulative landing limits for nonoverfished species than for other vessels in the sector ○ can continue fishing even if their sector is shut-down due to exceeding a cap ○ can pool caps with others who have opted out. 	PMCC
Sector Bycatch Caps - Nontransferable	PMCC
Sector Bycatch Caps - Transferable	ED

The last two comments may be intended to reference vessel cumulative limits for incidentally caught overfished species (as opposed to bycatch as specified under the Magnuson Stevens ^{1/}).

Potential Council Action:

1. Consider whether there are any additional details which should be added to the specification of this management tool.

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

1/ Magnuson Stevens Act definition of bycatch: “The term ‘bycatch’ means fish which are harvested in a fishery, but which are not sold or kept for personal use, and includes economic discards and regulatory discards. Such term does not include fish released alive under a recreational catch and release fishery management program.

Pooled Species Caps (Sector Catch Caps or Incidental Catch Allowances)

Identify options for full development.

Various names have been applied to the sector catch caps of the type identified in the programmatic bycatch EIS, including pooled species caps and incidental catch allowances (ICAs). All would be based on specific annual limits on the amounts of groundfish that could be caught by the trawl sector.

Sector catch caps were part of Alternative 4 of the programmatic bycatch EIS and were adopted for consideration as part of the Council's final action on the programmatic EIS. Under the programmatic bycatch EIS sector catch caps were to be applied only to overfished species. It was anticipated that sector catch caps would be monitored with stratified, partial observer coverage. Catch rates and closure dates for each sector would be projected based on observer reports. However, to the degree that individual vessel catch caps were employed, every vessel fishing under such a vessel cap would be monitored while fishing. This EIS includes consideration of sector catch limits for overfished as well as other groundfish species when taken by trawl gear.

Sector Catch Cap Design Elements

Sector Catch Cap Design Elements	Options
Tracking and Monitoring At-Sea	Stratified, partial observer coverage
Data Reporting	Upgraded inseason catch monitoring and verification program to ensure limits are not exceeded.

TIQC Preference

Public comments:

Sector Bycatch Caps for Overfished Species <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Caps for the trawl fleet or possibly subdivisions of the trawl fleet (explicit allocation of an amount of overfished species) ● Sector stops fishing on attainment of the cap. ● Adequate monitoring (not necessarily 100% monitoring) ● No action recommended with respect to nonoverfished species. 	PMCC
Sector Bycatch Caps - Nontransferable	PMCC
Sector Bycatch Caps - Transferable	ED

These comments are likely using the term bycatch to refer to incidental catch rather than only to discards (bycatch as defined under the M-S Act).

Potential Council Action:

1. *Consider whether there are additional details which should be added to the specification of this management tool.*

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

[This Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Permit Stacking and Extended Trip Limit Periods

Identify options for full development.

Permit Stacking

A permit stacking program for the limited entry sectors of the groundfish fishery would allow a vessel to land more than the monthly or bimonthly trip limit by assigning and using two or more permits on the same vessel.

In 2002, the Council's Trawl Permit Stacking Committee identified four major approaches to determining the size of the stacked trip. The options are briefly described as follows.

Option	
1A	Whole Trip Limit for Additional Permits. In this approach, a vessel would need one permit endorsed for the size of the vessel. Additional permits could be for any size vessel. Each additional permit would allow a vessel to harvest an additional whole trip limit. This approach is simple, but with substantial participation would lead to reductions in per-permit limits.
1B	Fixed Fractional Trip Limit for Additional Permits. This option is a variation on Option 1A. A permit of any length could be stacked with a suitable primary permit, but a single stacked permit would not carry a full additional limit. The percentage of an additional limit provided would be invariant with permit length, but could conceivably be expressed as a function of a variable, such as groundfish abundance, that would vary over time.
2	Same Size Requirement. Another approach is to require that all stacked permits be endorsed for the size of the vessel on which they are used. From a regulatory standpoint, this approach would likely be the easiest, since limits that are currently specified on a per-vessel basis could be changed to apply per-permit, with no additional changes to the structure of the limited entry program. A full additional limit would be provided for each stacked permit, but with substantial participation per-permit limits would decline.
3	Additional Fractional Trip Limit Linked to Size Endorsement or Fishing Power Points of Stacked Permit. This approach would establish a formula that links the magnitude of additional landing limits to the size endorsement of the permits that are stacked. Additional permits could be for any size vessel. Thus, a vessel could operate with fractional limits depending on the size endorsements of the stacked permits. This approach would give vessel operators greater flexibility to obtain a desired level of monthly landings.

The most apparent means of implementing a length-based program would be to utilize the fishing power formula ("points" system) defined in the implementation of Amendment 6.

In evaluating options, the following are some of the key trade-offs to be considered.

Key Trade-off 1: When a permit is stacked, if the harvest of a species or species group taken under the permit is greater than the harvest of the species or species group taken under the permit prior to when it was stacked, the cumulative limit for that species or species group would need to be reduced in order to keep the fleet within the annual harvest (within the OY).

Key Trade-off 2: If permits are allowed to move between segments of the groundfish fishery, there will be a greater likelihood opportunity that per-permit cumulative limits would have to be reduced in the segments to which permits are moved.

One concern about the stacking of permits is the potential transfer of effort from one segment of the fishery to another segment, for example, the stacking of a permit used in the whiting trawl fishery onto a permit mainly used in the DTS fishery. In this situation, the only way to prevent

the erosion of the per-permit limit in the DTS fishery would be to provide no additional DTS cumulative limit for the stacked permit. If prevention of such transfers is desirable, then consideration of some kind of a species group endorsement might be appropriate.

Extended Trip Limit Period

The current trip limits are for two month periods. The limit periods might be extended to 3, 4, 6, or 12 month period. As the length of the management periods are extended, opportunity for inseason actions effective at the start of the subsequent cumulative limit period is reduced, and the potential need for mid period correction could lead to more derby type fishing. In the extreme, with a 12 month period, cumulative limits would either have to be set such that they represent vessel quotas, or set such that if every vessel took its limit, the allowable harvest would be exceeded (as is the case under the current trip limit system). In the latter case, a derby fishery would be created under which vessels would race to achieve their limit before the fishery is close through inseason action.

Potential Council Action:

- 1. Determine whether the list of alternative management tools is now complete.*
- 2. Consider whether or not full option development and analysis is desirable for each of the identified options.*

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1 of the Scoping Results Document

Decide on the Species to Which the Tools Apply

Additional Guidance (Optional)

The overriding question before the Council is one of how to best control total catch, including bycatch, of the limited entry trawl fleet. Different management tools may be used for different species. Different combinations of management measures and species are used to structure alternatives. To stimulate discussion and bring issues into focus, the TIQC constructed a number of initial alternatives for public consideration during the scoping process.

Nonwhiting Sector Management Alternatives

Alternative 1 (Status Quo).

All species are managed under one of the following: cumulative limits, season closures (Pacific whiting), catch monitoring only (no regulatory constraints).

Alternative 2 (IFQ Only for Primary Trawl Targets).

- IFQ management for groundfish species that are primarily trawl targets with minimal harvest by other sectors (whiting split by sector, DTS, slope rockfish, nearshore flatfish) and target species for which there is already trawl allocation, i.e. sablefish.
- Vessel cumulative catch limit management for other species with OYs, except those with extremely low OYs. Vessel limits would be transferable only within the cumulative limit period. Transfers would be temporary. Trawl shares for would be determined as under status quo.
- Monitoring only for other species.
- Sector catch caps for nonIFQ species with extremely low OYs (threshold criteria to be determined). Harvest rates controlled through nontransferable vessel catch limits. Other measures to keep bycatch rates low remain in place (e.g. RCAs).
- Pacific halibut, salmon, crab. Prohibited species status stays in place.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2, except

- IFQ applied for all species with OYs, and
- Cumulative catch limits applied to control harvest of other species (those without OYs).
- Sector catch caps apply to any species for which the OY is extremely low (under such circumstances, IFQ management would be suspended and the low OY species would be managed with sector catch caps instead of IFQ).

Alternative 4

Same as Alternative 2, except

- Total IFQ management. IFQ applied for all groundfish species (catch limits would be established even for those species without OY).
- Pacific halibut bycatch would be managed with individual bycatch quota (IBQ). A suboption will be considered that allows retention of IBQ when taken by gear legal for that species.

Whiting Sector Management Alternatives

Alternative 1 (Status Quo).

Season management for Pacific whiting and bycatch monitoring for other species with possible season closure on attainment of any bycatch allowance established for OY species.

Alternative 2 (IFQ Only for Primary Trawl Targets).

- IFQ for whiting.
- Sector catch caps for nonwhiting groundfish with OYs. Managed as a pool with sector closure on cap attainment. Allow transfer of caps between whiting sectors and allow expansion of fleet caps through the purchase of IFQ from the nonwhiting sector. Maintain the current seasonal sequence of fishing opportunity.
- Monitoring for nonOY species.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2, except

- IFQ applied for all species with OYs. Individuals would be allowed to form a coop and pool their IFQs if they desired to do so. IFQ could not be transferred between whiting and nonwhiting sectors.

Alternative 4

Same as Alternative 3, except

- Transfer of IFQ between whiting and nonwhiting sectors would be allowed.

Management of prohibited species with respect to the whiting fishery has not been addressed by the TIQC.

Public comments:

Bycatch caps for overfished species	ED, PMCC (see Bycatch Cap Design Elements)
IFQ for All species	WCSPA

Potential Council Action:

1. *Consider whether there are additional options or if provided options need refining; or defer action until an initial report is received from the allocation committee.*

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1.2 of the Scoping Results Document

Address Allocation Among Trawl Sectors

Identify options for full development

Whiting and Nonwhiting Sectors

Thus far, one approach for allocating between whiting sectors has been suggested:

One of the principles on which the following allocation approach is based is to not reward individuals or sectors that have historically had higher incidental catch rates than other individuals or sectors.

1. Establish an incidental catch rate for the whiting fishery as a whole. This rate would be established by determining the incidental rate for each year of the allocation period, and then determining the average of the annual incidental rates. Annual incidental rates would be calculated by summing the estimated catch of incidental species for all whiting sectors and dividing by the sum of whiting catch for all whiting sectors.
2. To establish the whiting fishery allocation of a nonoverfished incidental species in any particular year, multiply the incidental rate from Step 1 by the nontribal directed whiting sector OY. For overfished species a set-aside would be determined by the Council.
3. Allocate the incidental catch species among the three whiting sectors (catcher processors, vessels delivering to motherships and vessels delivering shoreside) based on the formula used to allocate whiting between these sectors (i.e. shoreside 34%, catcher-processor 42%, motherships 24%).

A policy call will need to be made as to whether to use only landings/deliveries or to include estimated discarded catch in the landings history for purpose of allocation. Some additional allocation decisions may be needed with respect to crediting sectors with landings history accounted for by permits removed by the buyback program.

TIQC Preference:

NEW OPTION (IF ANY)

use another sheet of paper, as necessary

Between LE Trawl Vessels Fishing with Groundfish Trawl and LE Trawl Vessels Fishing with Open Access Gear

The need for this allocation depends on a decision on the scope of the IFQ program. This decision is covered under Section A.1 of the appendix. If IFQ is to cover all catch taken by LE trawl vessels, no allocation decision will need to be made. If IFQ is to cover only that catch

taken with trawl gear then the trawl allocation will have to be split and the portion of the allocation taken by LE trawl vessels with open access gear either managed separately or managed jointly with some other sector (LE fixed gear or open access). In either case an decision will be needed on how to split the current trawl allocation. (If the decision is to manage the open access gear catch by LE trawl vessels jointly with some other group, consideration should be given to referring the matter to the allocation committee where there is broader representation of the groundfish sectors than on the TIQC. This issue is addressed in Section A.1.)

Potential Council Action:

1. *Provide any additional guidance on options based on TIQC Report recommendations, if any.*

Reference Materials:

Section 2.1.3 of the Scoping Results Document