

TRAWL RATIONALIZATION AND INTERSECTOR ALLOCATION –
PLANS FOR THE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS

Contents of this document:

Review Calendars (Catch Shares and Intersector Allocation).....	1
Proposed Hearing Locations, Dates, and Hearing Officers	3
Catch Share Review Project Coordination and Analytical Effort	4
Catch Share Review Project Coordination Team (PCT).....	4
Catch Share Review Analytical Team and Analytical Effort	4
Subject Matter Leads and Analytical Contributors	6
Scientific Review	8
Community Advisory Board.....	8

Review Calendars (Catch Shares and Intersector Allocation)

Under Amendment 20 (trawl rationalization/catch shares) the Council committed to the required review of the catch share program and under Amendment 21 (intersector allocation) it committed to a concurrent review of the intersector allocations that underlie the catch share program. Resources have been identified for a two year process catch share review process commencing in June 2016 but not the intersector allocations. Pending Council approval, the catch share and intersector allocation issues will be scoped together, including at public hearings this coming September, however, additional work on the intersector allocation review will depend on the identification of additional resources (as reflected in Table 1).

A draft calendar was developed for budgeting purposes and is provided in Table 2. Shaded cells in the hearings column indicate general periods of activity. The speed with which the review can be completed depends on the scope of the review--particularly on the nature of Council requests for more detailed analyses and the degree to which additional elaborations are requested after initial results become available. This calendar would be subject to revision at any point if work products are completed ahead of schedule.

Table 1. Overview of draft calendar for catch share and intersector allocation review.

	Catch Share Review	Intersector Allocation Review
June 2016	Scoping, Background Docs, and Preliminary Analysis	Scoping & Background Docs
September 2016	Public Hearings	Public Hearings
November 2016	Council Guidance	Council Guidance
2017 - Spring 2018	Catch Share Review Continues to Completion	Allocation Review Continuation Depends on Identification of Additional Resources

Table 2. Detailed draft calendar for catch share review (as developed for budgeting purposes).

	Council	Hearings	CAB
2016			
June	Approve Review Schedule and Provide Other Guidance		
September	Appoint CAB	Hearings	
November	Approve Doc Template and Issue Focus		Meeting
2017			Webinar
March			
April			
June	Progress Report & Guidance on Prelim Draft		
September	Council Review Draft		Meeting
November	Approve Public Review Draft	Hearings	
2018			Webinar
March			
April	Final Doc Approved		
June	Omnibus Process Starts		

Proposed Hearing Locations, Dates, and Hearing Officers

The budget and draft review schedule includes two sets of nine hearings, one at the start of the review and one at the end. Two strawman options for hearing sites and a schedule are provided here for Council consideration (Table 3). Both options

- cover the same hearing sites, recognizing that the Council may want to make adjustments to these sites.
- avoid Friday nights in deference to an expectation that folks would rather do something else with their Friday evenings.
- would not start hearings until late in the summer in order to allow time for the production of presentations and user friendly background materials for the hearings.
- would complete all the hearings prior to the end of September. (This is intended to ensure there is adequate time to summarize the hearings for the November Council meeting briefing book deadline and will ensure the completion of all hearing travel before the end of the Federal fiscal year.)

Under the first option, all hearings would occur after the September Council meeting, which would allow the Council to provide last-minute instructions prior to the hearings. This option would require that there be two separate hearing teams. The second option would allow the hearings to be conducted by a single National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)/Council staff hearing team. It is expected that Council member and state representative participation would vary by hearing location.

Table 3 Hearing date and location options.

Dates		Hearings Strawman Option 1		Hearings Strawman Option 2
		Group 1	Group 2	
Weds	Aug-31			Morro Bay
Thurs	Sep-1			Half Moon Bay
Fri	Sep-2			
Mon	Sep-5			
Tues	Sep-6			Fort Bragg
Weds	Sep-7			Eureka
Thurs	Sep-8			Port Orford
Fri	Sep-9			
Mon	Sep-12			Bellingham
Tues	Sep-13			
Weds	Sep-14	Advisory Bodies and Council Session (Boise)		
Tues	Sep-20			
Weds	Sep-21			
Thurs	Sep-22		Bellingham	
Fri	Sep-23			
Mon	Sep-26	Westport	Morro Bay	Westport
Tues	Sep-27	Astoria	Half Moon Bay	Astoria
Weds	Sep-28	Newport	Fort Bragg	Newport
Thurs	Sep-29	Port Orford	Eureka	
Fri	Sep-30			

Prior to the hearings, the Council member hearing officers will need to be identified and the following matrix completed (the final set of locations to be determined by the Council). Table 4 is provided as a worksheet in case the Council decides to make hearing officer appointments at this meeting.

Table 4. Hearing locations and staffing.

Hearing Location	Hearing Officer (Council Member)	State Staff	NMFS Staff	Council Staff
Bellingham				
Westport				
Astoria				
Newport				
Port Orford				
Eureka				
Fort Bragg				
Half Moon Bay				
Morro Bay				

Catch Share Review Project Coordination and Analytical Effort

Catch Share Review Project Coordination Team (PCT)

The overall project and analytical effort will be coordinated by NMFS and Council staff. The following have been identified as the project coordination team.

Ms. Abigail Harley - WCR Staff
 Dr. Lisa Pfeiffer - NWFSC Staff
 Mr. Jim Seger - Council Staff

Catch Share Review Analytical Team and Analytical Effort

Two possible models have been identified for organizing the analytical effort. Under both models the PCT would coordinate the overall effort and subject matter leads would coordinate the contributions of numerous analysts. The large majority of the analytical support for the project is expected to be provided by NMFS staff.

Under Model 1, an analytical team would not be formally convened as a Council body. As available, agency personnel (Federal and state) would be enlisted as subject matter leads and contributing analysts.

Under Model 2, the Council would convene an ad hoc analytical team to help guide the analytical effort. The following is an example of the charge that might be given to a Council-convened analytical team:

Strawman Charge for a Council-Convened Analytical Team: The analytical team will review and help elaborate initial outlines and drafting plans developed by the PCT and subject matter leads. The analytical team will review the initial analytical submissions forwarded from subject matter leads and provide comments on elements of the analysis prior to compilation of the first draft and of the completed analysis prior to its submission to the Council. Based on its close review of the analytical materials, the team will also highlight policy issues for consideration by the Council and its advisory bodies.

The efforts of the analytical team would be coordinated and staffed by the PCT. The analytical team might consist of one representative from each state and the subject matter leads. The Council may also wish to include a representative from the Enforcement Consultants, though budget implications that would have to be considered.

Table 5 provides an example of the process that might be followed under each of these models.

Table 5. Models for the analytical effort.

	Model 1	Model 2
June 2016	Council provides document guidance.	Same as Model 1.
	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors over the summer to plan analyses and develop data sets and rudimentary elements of the analysis.	Same as Model 1, plus a mid- to late-summer meeting of the Analytical Team to review plans and coordinate analyses and data sets.
Sept 2016	Progress report provided to the Council, as needed.	Same as Model 1.
	Preliminary analytical work continues	Same as Model 1.
Nov 2016	PCT and subject matter leads meet with SSC subcommittees. Preliminary report on plans for analyses provided to the Council. Council provides further direction based on results of hearings, CAB meeting, and comments from other Council advisory bodies.	Same as Model 1.
Dec 2016		Analytical Team meets to review Council guidance and further develop plans for analysis.
	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors over the winter to develop analyses based on Council guidance.	Same as Model 1.
	As they become available, elements of analysis are distributed among all subject matter leads, for review and feedback to contributors.	As they become available, elements of analysis are distributed to Analytical Team for review and feedback to contributors.
April 2017		First draft of review compiled
May 2017	First draft of review compiled.	Analytical team reviews first compilation of document and identifies policy issues the Council may want to consider.
June 2017	Council reviews first draft and provides additional guidance, as needed, and develops a preliminary list of possible policy issues for future consideration and related purpose and need statement.	Same as Model 1
		Directly after the Council meeting, Analytical Team meets to review Council guidance and plan additional analysis as needed.
	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors over the summer to revise analyses based on Council guidance.	Same as Model 1
Sept 2017	PCT and subject matter leads meet with SSC subcommittees. Council reviews second draft, refines possible policy areas for future consideration, and approves draft for CAB and Analytical Team review.	Same as Model 1
		Analytical Team reviews policy areas identified by the Council, identifies other policy areas that may warrant attention, and, as needed, develops purpose and need statements for Council consideration.
	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors to finalize draft.	Same as Model 1.
Nov. 2017	Council approves public review draft including policy areas for future consideration and related purpose and need statements. Decision is made on whether to solicit alternatives in response to the purpose and need statements.	Same as Model 1.
	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors on any necessary refinements prior to distribution of public review draft.	Same as Model 1.
Mar./Apr. 2017	Council finalizes review document and recommendations for future consideration.	Same as Model 1.
May 2017	PCT works with subject matter leads and contributors to finalize document.	Same as Model 1.

Subject Matter Leads and Analytical Contributors

Contributions will be coordinated by the subject matter leads. Subject matter leads will help plan the analysis, compile work from contributors, identify gaps or potential problem areas, and be accountable for ensuring that particular sections of the analysis are completed on schedule.

Informal working group or one-on-one meetings with contributors will be scheduled as needed. Subject matter leads will maintain awareness of areas where analyses may intersect (fishery classification, sector identification, data calls, etc.) and coordinate with other leads to minimize duplication of work across groups.

Contributors will help develop and carry out implementation of analytical tasks related to their areas of expertise. They may also be asked to assist in the review of components of the analysis developed by others.

The individuals listed in Table 6 have been identified as potential contributors. Some will likely be subject matter leads.

Table 6. Initial list of potential contributors to the review.

Potential Contributor	Affiliation	Working group theme (main area)	Expertise
Ms. Sarah Towne	WCR	Program Management	Communities, Accumulation limits, Allocation, Catch accounting, Eligibility
Dr. Suzanne Russell	NWFSC	Communities/anthropology	Communities, New entrants
LCDR Gregg Casad	USCG	Communities/anthropology	Safety, Enforcement
Ms. Jennifer Isé	Regional Administrator's Office	Communities/anthropology	Communities, Policy
Dr. Lisa Pfeiffer	NWFSC	Economics	Safety, Economic analysis, Net benefits
Ms. Erin Steiner	NWFSC	Economics	Communities, Economic analysis, Net benefits, Data collection
Dr. Robby Fonner	NWFSC	Economics	Accumulation limits, Economic analysis
Dr. Dan Holland	NWFSC	Economics	Economic analysis, Quota market
Mr. Jerry Leonard	NWFSC	Economics	Economic analysis, Economic impacts
Ms. Marie Guldin	NWFSC/UW	Economics	Economic analysis, First receivers
Ms. Abigail Harley	WCR	Economics	Economic analysis
Dr. Ed Waters	Consultant	Economics	Economic analysis, economic impacts, data analysis
Ms. Amanda Warlick	ECS in support of NWFSC	Economics	Data collection
Dr. Wendy Morrison	NOAA HQ Sustainable Fisheries	Biology/Environment/Ecology	Bycatch, environmental impacts
Mr. Jon McVeigh	NWFSC	Biology/Environment/Ecology	Bycatch,

Scientific Review

Scientific review will be provided by the SSC. Two special joint meetings of the SSC groundfish and economics subcommittees will be scheduled to ensure that there is adequate time for thorough review. One of these meetings will occur in November 2016, to ensure that the plans for the review are sound, and another toward the end of the process (currently September 2017), to review the quality of the analyses.

Community Advisory Board

To help address community concerns, Amendment 20 called for the appointment of a Community Advisory Board (CAB) to advise the Council on its review of program performance. The budget developed for this project included two in-person meetings of a 20-person CAB and two webinar meetings. The following is a strawman CAB charge for consideration.

Strawman Charge for Community Advisory Board: The Community Advisory Board is charged with providing the perspective of geographic communities on performance of the trawl catch share program and other advice requested by the Council that may inform the program review. These perspectives may include but are not limited to the views of local harvesters, fish buyers and processors, materials and service providers, and others impacted by the trawl rationalization program. Harvest interests include the perspective of vessel, permit, and quota share owners as well as crew members. Others impacted may include service providers such as observers and observer providers.

Because the CAB will need both geographic diversity and sector diversity rather than specific seats a matrix is provided that can be filled in based on the geographic region and interest areas of the nominations received (maximum of 20). The vacancy announcement text would read in part:

The Council is soliciting nominations for a newly-constituted trawl catch share Community Advisory Board (CAB). The Council will select from nominees to ensure representation across the interest groups and areas represented in the following table.

Table 7. Regions and interests for which nominations are sought (maximum of 20 seats).

Community	IFQ Trawl Participant	IFQ Gear Switched	At-Sea Sector Participant	Non-Trawl Catch Shares Participant	Buyer/ Processor	Service Provider (e.g. Observers)	Local Governmentalities, Districts, Boards, Quota Funds etc.	Consumer/ Retailer	Other (e.g. crew, NGO, Tribal ???)
WA – Inside Marine									
WA – Coast									
OR - North Coast									
OR - South Coast									
CA - Fort Bragg North									
CA - Central									
CA – S. of 36°									