

## TRAWL RATIONALIZATION DECISION POINTS

The following table lists the central decisions needed to develop a preferred alternative, along with the GAC recommendations on the issue

Table 1. Central decision points (issues) and GAC recommendations by sector (grey indicates the issue does not apply to the sector, N/A indicates that based on decisions made further up in the table, no GAC recommendation on the topic was needed on that issue).

| Issue  | Sector                          |            |                               |                      |
|--|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
|  | Catcher Processor               | Mothership | Shoreside Whiting             | Shoreside Nonwhiting |
|  | <b>GAC Recommendation</b>       |            |                               |                      |
| IFQs or Co-ps?   | Co-ops                          | Co-ops     | IFQs                          | IFQs                 |
| Should the shoreside sector be managed as a single sector or separately?   |                                 |            | Single Sector                 |                      |
| If IFQS: Should an initial allocation of QS be given to processors?<br>If processors receive an initial allocation   | N/A                             | N/A        | No                            | No                   |
| Should the QS given to processor expire after a set period (limited duration QS)?  |                                 | N/A        | N/A                           | N/A                  |
| Should processing history allow an entity to receive an initial allocation in excess of accumulation limits (i.e. should the accumulation limit grandfather clause apply for QS issued to processors)? |                                 | N/A        | N/A                           | N/A                  |
| If Co-ops: Should there be processor linkages.   |                                 | Yes        | N/A                           | N/A                  |
| Adaptive Management: Should adaptive management be part of the trawl rationalization program?  | Yes                             | Yes        | Yes                           | Yes                  |
| Should the primary tool (Co-ops or IFQs) be used for all species?  | TIQC and GMT comment requested. |            |                               |                      |
| If IFQs: Initial Allocation Formula  |                                 |            |                               |                      |
| Should the initial allocation formula include an equal sharing element?  | N/A                             | N/A        | Yes                           |                      |
| Should allocation of bycatch species be based on history or bycatch rates applied to QS allocations using permit specific logbook information?   | N/A                             | N/A        | Use Bycatch Rates             |                      |
| Accumulation Limits  | N/A                             | N/A        | TIQC comment requested        |                      |
| Area Management  | N/A                             | N/A        | TIQC & GMT comment requested. |                      |

Table 2. IFQ Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed)

| <b>Topic</b>                             | <b>Sections</b>    | <b>IFQ Alternative Decision Points</b>   | <b>GAC</b>                 | <b>TIQC</b>                   |
|--|--------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Scope for IFQ Management</b>          | A-1.1              | <b>Species covered.</b> Analysis has revealed that several species of nearshore groundfish and flatfish in the whiting sector may be as constraining to fishing opportunities as overfished stocks if managed with IFQ. Some believe consideration should be given for managing these stocks with a different management tool (such as retaining cumulative limits) or managing them passively (monitor catch levels, but do not control their catch with quota). See <b>Section 4.7.2.3</b> for analysis of this issue. | Tasked TIQC and GMT        | Recommended List. See Report. |
| IFQ Management Units                     | A-1.2              | Whether to split at 40° 10' or not (for species without geographic splits)<br>Consider utility of specifying a process for subdividing the trawl allocation where there is no subdivision.   | Tasked TIQC and GMT        | Tasked TIQC and GMT           |
| Trawl Sectors                            | A-1.3              | 3 (combined shoreside) or 4 sectors?   | <b>3 Sectors</b>           | <b>3 Sectors</b>              |
| Length Endorsement                       | A-1.6              | Whether to suspend the limited entry permit length endorsement.  | <b>N/D</b>                 | <b>Suspend</b>                |
| Initial Allocation<br>Groups and Percent | A-2.1.1.a          | Groups to include (processors or not) and % of QS for each group.  | <b>None for Processors</b> | <b>N/D</b>                    |
|  | A-2.1.1.d          | Motherships: allocate to mothership owner or charterer?  | <b>N/A</b>                 | <b>N/D</b>                    |
|  | A-2.1.1.d          | Shoreside processor: attribution of catch history (first receiver, first receiver that also processes, first receiver with opportunity to reassign if the first receiver did not process).   | <b>N/A</b>                 | <b>N/D</b>                    |
| Recent Participation                     | A-2.1.2.c          | Shoreside processor recent participation options.  | <b>N/A</b>                 | <b>N/D</b>                    |
| Allocation Formula                       | A-2.1.3.a          | Catcher-Vessel Permits: Whether to include an equal allocation element and whether to use different allocation rules for overfished species.   | <b>Yes</b>                 | <b>N/D</b>                    |
|  | A-2.1.3.b, c and d | Catcher Processors, Motherships and Shoreside Processors: Whether to use different allocation rules for overfished species.  | <b>N/A</b>                 | <b>N/D</b>                    |

Table 2. IFQ Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed)

| <b>Topic</b>                    | <b>Sections</b> | <b>IFQ Alternative Decision Points</b>   | <b>GAC</b> | <b>TIQC</b>                  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|------------------------------|
| Permit/IFQ Holding Requirement  | A-2.2.1         | The scope of the fishing prohibitions for vessels with a deficit (set).  | N/D        | Consider Appeals Process     |
|                                 | A-2.2.1         | Whether to allow vessels with deficit to resume fishing after two years.   |            |                              |
|                                 |                 | <p>In consideration of the issue of fisheries affected by the tie-up provision questions came up about the status of California halibut trawl gear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>California halibut trawl is legal groundfish trawl gear</li> <li>Vessels with a limited entry permit using the gear are allowed to discard groundfish and not come under groundfish regs. If they retain catch, groundfish regulations apply and the catch counts against their bimonthly limit.</li> </ul> <p>Vessels without limited entry permits are allowed to use the trawl gear and retain groundfish as long as they stay within open access limits.</p> | N/D        | Discussed. No recommendation |
| Carry-over (Surplus or Deficit) | A-2.2.2.e       | Currently the provision to allow the carryover of a QP surplus only applies to pounds that are in a vessel's account. Should consideration be given to allowing a carryover for QP that have not been transferred to a vessel account?   | N/D        | Discussed No recommendation  |
| Transfer Rules                  | A-2.2.3.c       | Whether to prohibit QS transfers in the first year of the program.   | N/D        | Yes                          |

Table 2. IFQ Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed)

| Topic                              | Sections  | IFQ Alternative Decision Points   | GAC   | TIQC  |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|
|                                    | A-2.2.3.e | Accumulation limit levels (set).  |   | Discussed<br>No recommendation  |
|                                    | A-2.2.3.e | <p>Decide the degree to which a grandfather clause for QS received as part of the initial distribution should be applied (none, maximum of twice the accumulation limits, no limit).</p> <p>Aggregate Nonwhiting Groundfish QS Accumulation Limit. This limit will be evaluated by weighting the non-whiting groundfish QS by the amount of the trawl allocation. What happens when a vessel is inside the aggregate limit but is pushed above when the trawl allocation increase (possibly through an OY increase). Analysts have been thinking they would be grandfathered in but, if so, this provision needs to be added.</p> <p>Matching the shoreside whiting accumulation cap with the nongroundfish species accumulation caps if there is a single shoreside sector.</p> <p>How will the grandfather amount be determined for vessels? Vessels do not receive a QS allocation, will the vessel grandfather amount be based on the permit? Will there be another vessel permit/medallion that specifies the grandfather amount? If so, will it be transferable? How would it expire? (The control cap expires with the addition of a new owner.)</p> | Tasked<br>TIQC  | Discussed<br>Recommendations involve guidance for setting limits, possibility of no grandfather clause, establishing a control date for further permit acquisition. |
| Tracking and Monitoring            | A-2.3.1   | Elements of the tracking and monitoring program (set)   | N/D   | N/D   |
| Program Costs                      | A-2.3.3   | Costs to include for recovery and fee structure (specify)   | N/D   | N/D   |
| Additional Measures for Processors | A-2.4     | <p>For processors, whether to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limit duration of QS issued to processors,</li> <li>• limit application of the accumulation limit grandfather clause,</li> <li>• dedicate adaptive management QP to processors that show they have been harmed.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o N/A</li> <li>o N/A</li> <li>o see A-3</li> </ul> | N/D   |
| Adaptive Management                | A-3       | <p>Whether to create an adaptive management program and set aside 10% of the allocation for it.</p> <p>If adaptive management QP are issued, do they need to be tracked separately, i.e. is it OK for processors to receive them through QP transfers during the year?</p>  | Yes   | N/D   |

Table 2. IFQ Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed)

| <b>Topic</b>             | <b>Sections</b> | <b>IFQ Alternative Decision Points</b>   | <b>GAC</b> | <b>TIQC</b>   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|---|
| Halibut IBQ              | A-4             | How to develop a individual bycatch quota program for Pacific halibut.   | N/D        | Recom-<br>mendations<br>Provided for<br>Info<br>Gathering |
| Alternative Scope        | A-5             | Whether to have IFQ only for whiting in the whiting sectors (i.e. no IFQ for bycatch species).   | N/D        | See A-1.1   |
| Fixed Terms and Auctions | A-6             | Whether to explicitly limit the duration of the QS to 15 years and have biennial auctions of 20% of the QS after the first term expires.<br><br>Might want to use 16 year term thereafter to match up with biennial management cycles. | N/D        | N/D   |

| Table 3. Co-op Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed) |                                   |   |   |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Sections  | Co-op Alternative Decision Points |   | GAC   | TIQC  |
| <b>For All Whiting Sectors (B-1)</b>  |                                   |   |   |   |
| Annual Whiting Rollovers  | B-1.2                             | Yes or no.  | No  | N/D   |
| <b>Bycatch Species Management</b>   | B-1.3                             | <b>Species Covered.</b> Similarly to what was noted for IFQs with respect to nearshore species (A-1.3), there may be species very rarely taken in the whiting fishery which might be better managed passively.  | N/D   | Recommended Options. See Report.                              |
| Bycatch Allocation Subdivision  | B-1.3.1                           | Options: None. By sector. By sector and between co-op and non-co-op fishery. By sector, by co-op and to non-co-op fishery.  | By Co-op  | N/D   |
| Bycatch Management  | B-1.3.2                           | If there is no subdivision: will there be seasonal releases at the start of the program.<br>If there are subdivisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• will there be a rollover and will</li> <li>• there be bycatch buffers for the non-co-op fishery.</li> </ul> | Allow Rollover. No preferred option on buffers. | N/D   |
| Mandatory Data Collection   | B-1.5                             | Whether to have a mandatory data collection program   | N/D   | N/D   |
| Adaptive Management   | B-1.6                             | Whether to have an adaptive management program  | Yes   | N/D   |
| <b>Mothership (MS) Sector (B-2)</b>   |                                   |   |   |   |
| Participation   | B-2.1                             | The degree to which a vessel may participate as a mothership and catcher processor in the same year   | Not in same year                                | N/D   |
| Catcher Vessel Endorsement Qualifying Requirements  | B-2.2.1.a                         | Options for alternative qualifying periods (1994-2003 and 1997-2003)  | Added 1994-2003 as an allocation period option. | Noted 1994-2003 options should allow dropping of 2 worst yrs. |
| Whiting Endorsement Transferability   | B-2.2.1.b                         | Can the catcher vessel mothership sector whiting endorsement be transferred separate from the limited entry permit?   | Yes   | N/D   |
| Accumulation Limits   | B-2.2.1.c                         | What should be the accumulation limit for catcher vessels   | N/D   | N/D   |
| Mothership Permit   | B-2.2.2.a                         | Does the MS vessel owner or charterer get the permit?   | N/D   | N/D   |
| Transferability   | B-2.2.2.c                         | Can the permit be transferred to a catcher- processor vessel during the year?   | No  | N/D   |
|   |                                   | How many times may the MS permit transfer during the year?  | N/D   | N/D   |

| Table 3. Co-op Alternative, decision points and GAC/TIQC recommendations. (N/A = not applicable based on other decisions made. N/D = not discussed) |           |  |   |      |
|---|-----------|--|---|------|
|   | Sections  | Co-op Alternative Decision Points  | GAC   | TIQC |
| Usage Limit   | B-2.2.2.d | What cap should there be on the amount an entity owning a MS permit may process?   | Add 40% option.                             | N/D  |
| Number of Co-ops  | B.2.3.1   | Should multiple co-ops be required (separate co-ops for each MS)?  | No  | N/D  |
| Co-op Agreement Standards   | B-2.3.3   | To be refined.   | N/D   | N/D  |
| Processor Ties  | B-2.4     | What percent of the deliveries should be tied to a processor?  | 100%  | N/D  |
|   | B-2.4.1   | What period should be used to establish the processor ties?  | “Most recent year”<br>Asked for definition. | N/D  |
| Mothership Withdrawal   | B-2.4.3   | If a MS withdraws and no mutual agreement is reached with vessels, what happens to the ties if the MS returns?             | N/D   | N/D  |
| <b>Shoreside Sector (B-3)</b>   |           |  |   |      |
| Whiting Endorsement Transferability   | B-3.2.1.b | Can the catcher vessel shoreside sector whiting endorsement be transferred separate from the limited entry permit?         | N/A   | N/A  |
| Co-op Agreement Standards   | B-3.3.3   | To be refined.   | N/A   | N/A  |
| Processor Ties  | B-3.4.1   | What period should be used to establish the processor ties?  | N/A   | N/A  |
| Duration and Modification of Ties   | B-3.4.2   | Options on the duration of participation in the non-co-op fishery required to release its vessel from ties to a processor. | N/A   | N/A  |
|   |           | Whether or not linkages are re-established when a vessel returns from the non-co-op fishery.                               |   |      |
| Exclusion of Processor Ties and Processor Licensing   | B-3.6     | Option to exclude from the program all provisions related to processor ties and licensing.                                 | N/A   | N/A  |
| <b>Catcher-Processor Sector (B-4)</b><br>(No Decision Points Within the Alternative)  |           |  |   |      |