

## MISCELLANEOUS TRAWL RATIONALIZATION CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO THE WHITING FISHERY

Three issues for Council clarification are summarized here:

1. Dropping the same two years for permits participating in both the shoreside and at-sea whiting sectors.
2. Whether or not there would be a rollover of unused whiting between at-sea sectors.
3. Whether or not buffers would be used to control bycatch in the non-co-op fishery.

### 1. Dropping the Same Two Years

In calculating the initial allocation for a catcher vessel permit with whiting history the worst two years will be dropped. This provision is included in the IFQ alternative for both the shoreside and mothership sectors and in the co-op alternative for both the mothership and shoreside co-op programs. Further, the IFQ alternative identified that **if IFQs were adopted for both the mothership and shoreside whiting sectors, a permit with history in both of those sectors would have to drop the same two years** in the calculation of its shoreside whiting quota and the calculation of its mothership whiting quota. There were similar provisions under the co-op alternative. While **there was no provision which specified what would happen if IFQs were adopted for one sector and co-ops for the other**, it appears that application of that rule across the IFQ and co-op programs would be consistent with the options that were considered. The Council is asked to either confirm this interpretation or provide alternative direction.

### 2. Whiting Rollover

There were options that specified a whiting rollover and no whiting rollover. The preliminary preferred alternative was no whiting rollover; however, the Council's motion did not provide explicit direction on this point during final action. **Under status quo there is a rollover.** The Council staff therefore interpreted **the Council's final action as not changing status quo** (maintaining the rollover). The Council is asked to either confirm this interpretation or provide alternative direction.

### 3. Buffers

For the mothership sector, the Council's preliminary preferred alternative specified that there would be no buffers used to manage bycatch in the non-co-op segment of the mothership fishery. The following is the relevant section from the co-op program:

A sector's bycatch allocation will be divided between the co-op and non-co-op fishery of the sector, in proportion to the whiting allocated to each fishery. The co-op fishery will close based on attainment of its allocation.

**Option 1:** For the non-co-op fishery there will be a bycatch buffer. When only the buffer remains, the fishery would close temporarily while a determination is made as to a

possible re-opening. If the fishery is reopened it will close based on attainment of its allocation. The buffer amounts considered will be:

**Sub-option i:** 20 percent

**Sub-option ii:** 10 percent

**Sub-option iii:** 5 percent

- ▶ **Option 2:** For the non-co-op fishery there will not be a buffer. The fishery will close based on projected attainment of its allocation.

Since an affirmative action would be required to implement buffers and there was no explicit direction on this point, **the Council staff assumed that at this time buffers would not be one of the tools used to manage bycatch in the non-co-op fishery.** The Council is asked to either confirm this interpretation or provide alternative direction.

PFMC

03/19/09