

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE (WDFW) REPORT ON
AMENDMENT 20: TRAWL RATIONALIZATION

With regard to the motions in November 2008 relative to Amendment 20 Trawl Rationalization, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife would like to offer the following clarifications and recommendations:

Motion # 4 – Issue 1: Shoreside Species

Motion # 4 had included the species for which IFQ would be required and specified the number of trawl sectors; however, there had been inconsistency within the motion as adopted.

For the non-whiting sector, the motion stated that:

“IFQ is required for all species, except: longspine S. of 34°27’; minor nearshore rockfish (N & S); black rockfish (WOC); CA scorpionfish; cabezon; kelp greenling; shortbelly rockfish; other rockfish; spiny dogfish. The catches of these species would be accounted for and tracked against the overall OY....”

For whiting fisheries, the motion identified a subset of species that included only whiting, sablefish, widow, canary, and darkblotched rockfish, and Pacific ocean perch.

However, as part of the same motion, the Council specified that there would be three trawl sectors instead of four, indicating that the whiting and non-whiting shoreside fisheries would be combined into a single IFQ program. To ease tracking of IFQ and catches, the species requiring IFQ would need to be the same for both of those shoreside subsectors.

Therefore, WDFW would like to clarify the original intent of the motion had been to apply the species and exceptions listed for the non-whiting sector to the entire shoreside sector.

Motion # 4 – Issue 2: At-Sea Whiting Species

As part of this same section, the species listed for whiting fisheries were intended to apply to the at-sea whiting sectors. The intent had been that the at-sea sectors be held responsible for: whiting, sablefish, widow, canary, and darkblotched rockfish, and Pacific ocean perch. We would note that sablefish was added as a recommendation from Council staff based on the understanding that the motion applied to the shoreside whiting sector; however, our understanding is that holding at-sea sectors accountable for sablefish may prove to be constraining to the fishery while having little benefit to management or conservation.

Therefore, WDFW recommends that, for the at-sea whiting sectors, the species requiring IFQ would be: whiting, widow, canary, and darkblotched rockfish, and Pacific ocean perch. The catches of all groundfish species would be accounted for and tracked against the overall OY.

Motion # 5: Initial Allocation

Motion # 5 specified the allocation formula for catcher vessel permits and included:

“Option 2 – An equal division of the buyback permits’ pool of QS for all groundfish, except overfished species, among all qualifying permits plus allocation of the remaining QS based on each permit’s history”

The section that the motion had referenced referred to the IFQ program, which could be interpreted to apply to only the shoreside sector. However, for clarification purposes, WDFW would like to confirm that the intent of this motion was that an equal division of the catch history from the permits that had been bought back would go to all A permit holders that are contributing to the reimbursement of the buyback loan. This would include all A permit holders in the shoreside and mothership sectors, but not the catcher/processor sector.