

OUTLINE OF KEY DECISIONS IN THE ALTERNATIVES
AND
SUMMARY OF GAC RECOMMENDATIONS

This document provides the following.

A summary of key decision points, the Council’s preliminary decisions,
and identification of new GAC recommendations..... Table 1

A listing of other issues on which the GAC deliberated or on which
additional Council guidance may be needed Table 2

A listing of other decision points for which the Council has already
made a preliminary choice

For IFQs:..... Table 3

For Co-ops: Table 4

Table 1. Key decisions made by Council in June 2008 to craft a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) (shown by sector) and GAC recommendations from its October 2008 meeting.

Issue	-----Sector-----				GAC Recommendation from October 2008
	Catcher Processor	Mothership	Shoreside Whiting	Shoreside Nonwhiting	
IFQs (A) or Co-ops (B-2, B-3, B-4)?	Voluntary Co-ops (IFQs if Co-op system breaks down)	Co-ops	IFQs or Co-ops (if linkage authorized by Congress)	IFQs	Set deadline on shoreside whiting co-op alternative. If needed authorization not provided, commit to IFQs.
Should the primary tool (Co-ops or IFQs) be used for all species? (A-1.1, A-5, and B-1.3)	No, certain spp. excluded				Adopt a consistent list for all trawl sectors
Should the shoreside sector be managed as a single sector or separately? (A-1.3)			Single Sector		No Change to PPA
If Co-ops: Should there be processor linkages. (B-2.4)		Yes	N/A, or yes, if authorized	N/A	Yes new options provided
If IFQs:					
Initial Allocation Formula Should an initial allocation of QS be given to processors? (A-2.1.1.a)	N/A	N/A	20% of whiting, 0% or 20% of bycatch species	20%	No Allocation to Processors
Should the initial allocation formula for permits include an equal sharing element? (A-2.1.3.a)	N/A	N/A	Yes		No Change to PPA
Should allocation of incidentally caught overfished species be based on history or bycatch rates applied to QS allocations using permit specific logbook information? (A-2.1.3.a and d)	N/A	N/A	Use Bycatch Rates (For Whiting, Allocate All Bycatch Species in Proportion to Whiting Landings)		No Change to PPA
Accumulation Limits (A-2.2.3.e, B-2.1.c, and B-2.2.d)	N/A	Yes, for catcher vessels and motherships	Yes (no grandfather clause)		Percentages need to be decided. No recommendation.
Area Management or Regional Landing Zones (A-1.2 & A-8)	N/A	N/A	40° 10' split or Regional Zones		Track catch by area for future consideration. Consider some geographic distribution elements for adaptive management (A-3 & B-1.6).
Adaptive Management (A-3 and B-1.6)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, new options suggested.
Pacific Halibut Individual Bycatch Quota (A-4)	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	No Change to PPA

Gray indicates the issue does not apply to the sector. N/A indicates that based on decisions made further up in the table, no decision on the topic was needed on that issue.

Table 2. Other issues for which choices remained after the June Council meeting or on which additional GAC recommendations were made.

Topic	Section	Decision Points	Page #	GAC Recommendation from October 2008
IFQ Program				
Gears and Fisheries Covered	A-1.1	The gears and fisheries that will be considered within the scope of the IFQ program.	A-21	Specific gears recommended for inclusion and exclusion.
Gear Switching/ Gear Conversion	A-1.1 & A-7	A provision for permanent transition from trawl gear to non-trawl gear.	A-350	Recommend minimum constraint on gear switching, consider conversion provisions in future.
Attributing and Accruing Processor History	A-2.1.1.d	Attribution of catch history to shoreside processors Option 1: first receiver, or Option 3: first receiver with opportunity to reassign if the first receiver did not process	A-117	Recommend Option 3
Permit Holding Requirement	A-2.2.1	Element 4. Exceptions to prohibitions on landing while in a QP deficit. List needs to be refined based on scope of fisheries covered. Element 6. There may be legal concerns about the alternative compliance options.	A-184	Not Addressed
Accumulation Limits	A-2.2.3.e	Decide on percentages to use (Table 2-5)	A-227	Additional data requested
Adaptive Management	A-3	Tracking and monitoring implications if adaptive management QP are issued and transfer to processors receiving an initial allocation of QS is prohibited. Review intent and language. Decide how accumulation limits would apply for those receiving adaptive management QP.	A-341 & B-38	Add regional distribution and potential distribution to regional fisheries associations.
Mothership (MS) Sector Co-op Program				
Groundfish LE Permit Length Endorsement	B-1.	Whether or not to drop the length endorsement for permits with co-op endorsements.	B-40	Not Addressed
Accumulation Limits (catcher vessel)	B-2.2	A grandfather clause is provided which is "the amount of the largest current owner." For what point in time should this be determined?	B-52	Not Addressed
Accumulation Limits (mothership)	B-2.2.2	Maximum share of total deliveries that may be received by any one MS processor company.	B-59	Adjust maximum mothership share of processing to 45%
MS Processor Withdrawal	B-2.4.2	If a MS withdraws without reaching an agreement with its catcher vessels (CVs), how would CVs move between vessels?	B-72	Allow catcher vessel to go to MS of its choosing and form a new tie with new MS.
Shoreside Sector Co-op Program				
In General	B-3	Identify specific elements of shoreside whiting co-ops	B-86	Do not address until needed Congressional action is taken.
Catcher Processor Sector Co-op Program				
				No issues to address.

Table 3. General description of other decision points in the IFQ program for which the Council has already made a preliminary choice and positions taken in the Council preliminary preferred alternative (refer to referenced sections for complete details).

Topic	Section	Decision Points	Council Preliminary Preferred Alternative
Groundfish Limited Entry Permit Length Endorsement	A-1.6.	Whether or not to drop the length endorsement?	Drop the length endorsement.
Recent Participation Requirements	A-2.1.2.	Whether or not to require recent participation to qualify for an initial allocation and the amount to required?	Require recent participation for shoreside processors but not for others (certain levels of deliveries required from 1998-2003).
Allocation formula for catcher vessel permits	A-2.1.3.a	For Target Species 1. Allocation years? 2. Drop worst years? 3. Measure of History (pounds or annual percent of landings)? See Table 1 for decision points on other species	1. 1994-2003 2. Drop 3 year for non-whiting, 2 for whiting. 3. Measure landing history as annual percent of landings.
Allocation formula for Shoreside processors	A-2.1.3.d	For Target Species 1. Allocation years? 2. Drop worst years? 3. Measure of History (pounds or annual percent of landings)? See Table 1 for decision points on other species	1. 1994-2003 2. Drop 2 years 3. Measure landing history as annual percent of landings.
Carryover	A-2.2.2.b	Should there be a carry-over provision?	Yes, 10% of QP overages and underages can be carried over from one year to the next.
Eligibility to own or hold	A-2.2.3.a	After initial implementation who should be eligible to acquire QS?	Anyone eligible to own a US documented fishing vessels plus some excepted under the American Fisheries Act.
Temporary Transfer Rules	A-2.2.3.c	Should there be a prohibition on the transfer of QS in the first year(s) of the program?	Yes, QS transfers should be prohibited in the first two years of the program (transfer of QP will be allowed).
Tracking and Monitoring	A-2.3.1	1. Should discarding be allowed? 2. What level of at-sea monitoring should be required? 3. What level of shoreside monitoring should be required? 4. Should enhanced tracking mechanisms be required (e.g. electronic landing reports)? 5. Should there be other cost control mechanisms?	1. Yes, except for maximized retention vessels in the shoreside whiting fishery and at-sea deliveries can be discarded only by at-sea processors. 2. 100% observer coverage (including maximized retention vessels in the whiting fishery). 3. 100% shoreside monitoring 4. Yes. 5. Yes, including limited landing hours and mandatory licensing for shoreside delivery locations
Data Collection	A-2.3.2	Should mandatory submission of socio-economic data be required of harvesters and processors?	Yes
Program Costs	A-2.3.3	Should there be cost recovery and fees?	Yes
Program Duration and Modification	A-2.3.4 and A-6	Should there be an explicit limit on the duration of the program or the QS issued?	No, except as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The program will be modified through plan and regulatory amendments.

Table 4 General description of other decision points in the co-op alternative for which the Council has already made a preliminary choice and positions taken in the Council preliminary preferred alternative (refer to referenced sections for complete details).

Topic	Section	Decision Points	Council Preliminary Preferred Alternative
General Provisions			
Whiting rollovers	B-1.2	Will there be a roll-over of unneeded whiting from one sector to another?	No
Bycatch management	B-1.3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will bycatch be allocated down to the co-op level? 2. Will there be seasonal releases of bycatch? 3. Will rollover of bycatch be allowed? 4. Will bycatch in the non-co-op fishery be managed with buffers? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No 3. Yes 4. No
Mandatory data collection	B-1.5	Should mandatory submission of socio-economic data be required of harvesters and processors?	Yes
Mothership (MS) Co-ops			
Processor participation	B-2.1a & c B-2.2.c	Should catcher vessels and catcher processors also be allowed to participate as motherships?	Not in the same year.
Catcher vessel allocations	B-2.2.a	For catcher vessel permits what should the qualifying and allocation periods be?	Qualification: more than 500 mt in 1994-2003 Allocation: Best 8 of 10 years from 1994-2003
Whiting endorsement transferability	B-2.2.b	Should the whiting endorsement be transferable separate from the permit?	Yes
MS Processor Permit Qualification	B-2.2.a	Who qualifies for the mothership processor permit?	The owner, unless it is under a bareboat charter, in which case the charterer qualifies.
MS Processor Permit Transferability	B-2.2.c	Should there be a limit on the frequency of mothership processor permit transfers?	Yes, not more than twice a year.
Co-op Formation	B-2.3.1	Should catcher vessels be allowed to form themselves into a single co-op?	Yes
Initial Ties to the Motherships	B-2.4.1	What year should be used to form the ties between catcher vessels and processors?	2009
Shoreside Sector Co-ops			
	B-3	Numerous topics	To be addressed if Congressional action is taken to allow processor ties and/or processor limited entry.
Catcher Processor Sector Co-ops			
	B-4	Maintain the voluntary co-op system.	A catcher processor endorsement is created. If the existing voluntary co-op system breaks down, it will be replaced by an IFQ program and QS will be allocated equally among all the catcher-processor permits.