

Market Squid MSY Alternatives in Draft Amendment 10

- Alternative 1 (status quo - no action). Set no MSY.
- Alternative 2 (set MSY proxy based on evaluation of historical landings, see *draft Amendment 9*, section 5.2.1).
- Alternative 3 (set MSY proxy based on spawning area expansion method, see *draft Amendment 9*, section 5.2.2).
- Alternative 4 - CPSMT Preferred. (set F_{MSY} proxy based on Egg Escapement method, see *Recommendations for Market Squid Management and Research, CPSMT Report, Exhibit H.2.b*).

CPS LIMITED ENTRY ISSUES IN DRAFT AMENDMENT 10

- **Issue 1*** - Establishes capacity goal for CPS limited entry fleet.
- **Issue 2*** - Establishes conditions for transfer of existing permits.
- **Subissue 2a** - Establishes a process for adjusting permit transferability to maintain the capacity goal.
- **Subissue 2b** - Establishes procedures for issuing new permits.

*** Reviewed and adopted by Council in April 2001**

Issue 1 – Capacity Goal for the CPS Limited Entry Fleet

- Alternative 1 – Adopted. Maintain a larger, diverse CPS finfish fleet, with normal harvesting capacity equal to the long-term potential yield and with physical capacity to harvest peak period amounts. (current 65 vessels with total GRT = 5,642 mt)
- Alternative 2. Work the fleet down to a smaller number of ‘CPS specialists’ with normal harvesting capacity equal to average total finfish landings over the 1981-2000 period. (28-33 vessels)
- Alternative 3. Base the fleet size on our expectations of long-term potential yield of CPS finfish and the number of vessels physically capable of harvesting that yield without an excess capacity reserve. (12 vessels)
- Alternative 4 (status quo - no action). Maintain a fixed fleet of 65 vessels with no capacity goal or limits on fleet GRT.

Issue 2 – Conditions for Transfer of Existing Permits

- Alternative 1 (status quo - no action). No transferability of permits except 1) if the permitted vessel totally lost, stolen or scrapped, or 2) the permit is placed on a replacement vessel of the same or less harvesting capacity.
- Alternative 2. Allow CPS finfish limited entry permits to be transferred without constraints.
- Alternative 3 – Adopted. Allow permits to be transferred with restrictions on the capacity of the vessel to which it would be transferred to: 1) full transferability of permits to vessels of comparable capacity (vessel GRT +10% allowance), and 2) allow permits to be combined up in cases where the vessel to be transferred to is of greater capacity. Each permit would retain the original GRT endorsement.

Subissue 2a – Process for Adjusting Permit Transferability to Maintain the Capacity Goal

- Alternative 1 (status quo). No provisions for adjusting transferability. A CPS limited entry permit would be transferable per conditions under *Issue 2, Adopted Alternative 3*.
- Alternative 2. Restore fleet capacity to target fleet GRT (5,642 mt) by restricting conditions for permit transfer when the upper threshold of fleet GRT (fleet GRT plus 5%, or 5,924 mt) is reached. Once the trigger point is met or exceeded, permits could only be transferred by combining-up on a 2 for 1 basis. Transfer restrictions could be repealed once fleet GRT is reduced back down to the 5,642 mt target.
- Alternative 3 (CPSMT Preferred). Same trigger point as Alt. 2, but once it is met or exceeded, permits could only be transferred to vessels with equal or smaller GRT and the 10% vessel allowance would be removed. The 10% allowance could be reconsidered once total fleet GRT is reduced to 5,642 mt target.

Subissue 2b – Procedures for Issuing New Limited Entry Permits

- Alternative 1. No qualifying criteria in the FMP. Permits would be issued on a first come first served basis (e.g. by lottery or auction).
- Alternative 2 (*CPSMT Preferred*). Use qualifying criteria originally established in Amendment 8 for issuance of new CPS finfish limited entry permits. This would entail continuing down the list of 640 vessels having landings during the 1993-97 window period in order of decreasing window period landings.
- Alternative 3. Establish new qualifying criteria (i.e. new window period, minimum landings). This would probably be desirable if there were reasons to extend the window period further back in time to qualify vessels whose history in the fishery pre-dated the original window period. This option would probably require an amendment to the FMP.