

SELECT COUNCIL MOTIONS ON TRAWL RATIONALIZATION

This document contains Council motions from the March 2010 meeting pertaining to aspects of it's Amendment 20 recommendations that it might reconsider at this meeting and some key motions and Council discussion on the issue of requiring a permit for a catcher-processor co-op. With respect to the March 2010 motion, it was clarified on the Council floor that the issue of requiring catcher-processor co-op permits would be entailed as part of the consideration of the appropriate deadline for such permits.

March 2010: WDFW Motion # 2:

With regard to trawl rationalization and the clarifications requested of Council (Agenda Item E.6.b, Supplemental REVISED NMFS Report 2), I move that the Council consider the following issues at their April 2010 meeting:

IFQ FISHERY

Vessel Account

Issue 3: 30-day clock. When does the 30-day clock start for vessel overages?

Issue 4: 10% carryover. The 10% carryover provision can be calculated from the vessel account different ways.

MOTHERSHIP AND CATCHER-PROCESSOR CO-OP

Deadline for Co-op Fishery Declaration and Permits

Issue 7: What is an appropriate deadline for a coop permit (MS or C/P) and for a MS/CV endorsed permit to declare in to a MS coop or the non-coop fishery?

At the April 2010 meeting, the Council may reconsider the action taken previously relative to these issues.

Council Minutes Excerpts Pertaining to the Issue of Requiring Permits for Catcher-Processors

June 2008

Mr. Lockhart stated that there was question as to whether the catcher-processor co-op proposal is a LAP and subject to the 3% maximum fee. Under the proposed Amendment #2, if they break up [if the co-op breaks up] they will be a LAP but as the motion is written now they would not be. Ms. Cooney indicated that if the allocation is issued to the co-op and the co-op is required to have a permit then the program would be a LAP but if the co-op is not required to hold a co-op permit

then it would not be a LAP. Amendment #2 passed.

....

Mr. Lockhart said that under the program, as currently designed, the catcher-processor sector would not be under a LAP, unless it broke up, and therefore not subject to a fee. He has heard argument that the catcher-processor sector voluntary co-op costs much less to manage and therefore should not be subject to the fee. However, they gain the benefit of the LAPs of the other whiting sectors. It is fair for them to be subject to the fee because they are part of the overall LAP system. They are being granted a privilege and access to a public resource. Therefore, Mr. Lockhart moved to amend the motion to specify that permits would be issued to co-ops (Amendment #3 to Motion 41). Ms. Vojkovich seconded the motion. . . .

Mr. Moore asked about the benefits the catcher-processor co-op would receive. Mr. Lockhart stated that under current management, bycatch of other sectors affects the catcher processor co-op. Under the new system, that effect is reduced substantially, therefore they are getting a benefit from the program but they are not subject to the 3% fee. Mr. Anderson noted that they are being asked to pay for the cost of government regulations to clean up another sector. Mr. Lockhart stated he viewed it as they are gaining dedicated access to a public resource not just the costs of running the system. Mr. Myer said that the catcher-processor co-op has been doing fine on its own and that they would gain very little for a fee that he does not believe is warranted. Mr. Lockhart responded that they are not running fine citing the large bycatch tow that occurred recently, in part, because of the current system. The new system will allow them to fish at different times. Mr. Anderson commented that there are many people gaining access to a public resource that are not paying a 3% fee. If there is a fee it should be proportional to the costs of their participation in the program. Amendment #3 failed (Messrs. Lockhart and Williams voted yes; Ms. Vojkovich abstained). Motion 41 passed as amended

November 2008

Motion 21 [topic: Amendment 20 catcher-processor sector provisions] passed unanimously.

Mr. Lockhart noted that NMFS has made a preliminary determination that both the mothership (MS) sector and catcher-processor (CP) sector will be defined as a LAPP under the MSA. As part of that, in order to monitor and enforce the system, NMFS would be issuing a permit to the co-ops. This would mean that the cost recovery provisions would apply to these two sectors.

[There was no Council member response to Mr. Lockhart's statement.]