

## **Groundfish Allocation Committee Intersector Allocation**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101  
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384

September 27, 2007

### **Allocating Overfished Species**

The GAC acknowledged that it is difficult to discuss Intersector Allocation (IA) without also thinking about trawl rationalization. The IA and trawl rationalization processes would have to be reconciled.

In the trawl individual fishing quota (IFQ) alternative, there is an option for surplus individual quota pounds (QP) (or a deficit of QP) to carryover to the next year. The GAC was reminded of a staff paper regarding the overage/underage provision in the trawl IFQ alternative. The trawl sector would get a percentage of the total allocation for a species in a given year, and that sector allocation is further divided into QS which could then be traded amongst the players in that sector. The rules for the QP carryover mechanism would be spelled out in the IFQ alternative. There is no provision for the sector level rollover or buffers that would be needed to accommodate the individual vessel carryover without violating harvest caps, and the IA could potentially provide for that. The GAC wanted to keep the overage/underage concept alive for now and should provide more direction at the November Council meeting.

Without the Intersector Allocation process, there is no way to divide the available Optimum Yield (OY) for each of the fisheries. It seems that the IA could be simplified, and still allow the Council to accomplish their goals. The big threat of going over the OY is outside of the trawl sector, and managers cannot act quickly enough inseason to protect from the risk of non-trawl sector catch overages. If the Council is worried about another sector exceeding their allocation, then specifying a buffer for the sector from their allocation would be logical. The Council may wish to implement a multi-year OY, rather than a single-year OY, and put sector restrictions on individual sector allocations.

The GAC discussed the possibility of not making a long term allocation of non trawl-dominant overfished species (i.e., bocaccio, canary rockfish, cowcod, and yelloweye rockfish). There are an infinite number of possible allocations and management regimes dependent on the relative harvestable surpluses of these species. Therefore, non trawl-dominant overfished species should be allocated using short-term (2-year) allocations developed as part of the biennial specifications process. Such an allocation framework would be more flexible and more manageable for species that tend to constrain fishing

opportunities for trawl and non-trawl sectors. Longer term allocations for the trawl-dominant species (i.e., darkblotched rockfish, Pacific ocean perch, and widow rockfish) can be more readily considered since it is easier to understand the implications of alternative allocation schemes.

**Recommendation:** *Move forward with analysis of modified alternatives 1, 2 and 3, which contemplate long-term allocations for the non-overfished species (except Pacific whiting, sablefish, and nearshore species) and the trawl-dominant overfished species (Pacific ocean perch, darkblotched rockfish, and widow rockfish). Remove the non-trawl-dominant overfished species from the analysis.*

### **Open Access Allocations**

The GAC acknowledged that it should provide guidance to the working group for this issue. Understanding the future needs of the non-trawl sectors would be helpful in developing this guidance. Having this information would not change decisions to be made at the November Council meeting, but down the line it will inform decisions. Alternative 2 considers a split in the allocation to the sectors, and the GAC may need additional information to assess that alternative, although there is some information readily available. If Alternative 2 is not selected by the Council, there will be less need to have more refined information on open access. A more detailed discussion by the GAC would help guide the working group, but that GAC discussion can be deferred.

Discussion deferred to a later GAC meeting.

### **IFQs: Halibut Intersector Allocation (A-4)**

[Note: This discussion took place during the trawl rationalization portion of the GAC meeting.]

The International Pacific Halibut Commission is proposing a new stock assessment that would dramatically reduce how much Pacific halibut is allocated to Area 2A off of Washington and Oregon. The trawl portion of the halibut catch comes off the top of the area's total halibut quota, and thus limits other halibut fishing opportunities. A mechanism to allocate halibut to the trawl fishery might help save some halibut for the other sectors.

The GAC discussed the means by which an allocation of halibut to accommodate expected trawl bycatch might be established. It was stated in the GAC meeting that the Intersector Allocation process is the appropriate venue for discussing the halibut allocation to the trawl sector, but there should be further Council discussion in November. Halibut is not on the list of species currently being considered in the current IA process.

**Recommendation:** *Determine the appropriate forum for addressing an allocation of halibut bycatch for the trawl sector. Consider the Council agenda.*