

## GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON PRELIMINARY PLANS FOR REVIEW OF THE TRAWL CATCH SHARE PROGRAM

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) received a report from Mr. Jim Seger, Ms. Abigail Harley, and Dr. Lisa Pfeiffer on preliminary plans for review and preliminary economic analysis of the trawl catch share program. The GAP offers the following comments and recommendations. Before discussing our specific recommendations, the GAP wishes to highlight the importance of conducting a timely, focused review that will quickly enable us to hone in on specific recommendations to improve the economic performance of the program. The GAP is also concerned that the economic data reports do not seem to correlate with the experience of the majority of stakeholders.

### **Calendar**

Based on the proposed calendar, the GAP is concerned that the five year process will not only be lengthy, but will also not in and of itself fix any problems with the catch share program. After the review, any solutions are scheduled to be incorporated in the 2018 omnibus process. That likely means it will be 2020 before any significant programmatic improvements occur. The GAP recommends investigating whether action could be taken on priority items sooner in a separate package.

### **Locations, dates and hearing officers**

The GAP believes it is not appropriate to hold a trawl catch share program review hearing in Port Orford. There are no trawlers and very few program stakeholders there. It would make much more sense to hold a meeting in Coos Bay or Charleston. The GAP would like the Council to add a meeting in Seattle. Many of the CP and MS participants are based there and it would be inappropriate to skip such a major location. If, because of funding issues, we need to choose between Seattle and Bellingham, the GAP would recommend Seattle given the greater number of stakeholders there.

The GAP does not feel strongly about when to conduct the hearings. If significant additional analysis or guidance is developed at the September meeting, there could be value in holding the hearings after the September Council meeting. If not, hearing option 2, in which a single hearing team would present consistent information at all meetings, might make the most sense.

The GAP feels comfortable that the Council will select appropriate hearing officers.

### **Community Advisory Board**

The GAP discussed the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and strongly recommends that the makeup of the CAB should consist of direct program stakeholders. The GAP also notes the importance of including all stakeholder perspectives, while keeping the CAB nimble enough to make timely, effective decisions.

With those criteria in mind we recommend the following seats for the board:

- One IFQ bottom trawl participant from each state (3 total)
- One IFQ gear switching participant (1 total)
- One CP participant, one MS catcher vessel participant, and one MS processor participant (3 total)
- Three processor seats regardless of geography (3 total)
- One representative from either the service provider, government, retailer or other column (1 total)

Community	IFQ trawl participant	IFQ gear switched	At-Sea sector participant	Non-trawl catch shares participant	Buyer/ Processor	Service Provider (e.g. observers)	Local governmentalities, districts, boards, quota funds etc.	Consumer/ retailer	Other (e.g. crew, NGO, tribal)
WA – Inside Marine WA - Coast	Combine for 1 WA seat	Combine for 1 seat coastwide	1 CP seat, 1 MS processor seat, and 1 MS CV seat regardless of geography	Delete this seat	3 processor seats regardless of geography		Combine into 1 seat		
OR – North Coast OR – South Coast	Combine for 1 OR seat								
CA – Fort Bragg North CA - Central	Combine for 1 CA seat								
CA – S of 36									

\*Visual representation of GAP recommendation based on G.5 Attachment 1 Table 7.

### Analytical effort

The GAP recommends analytical alternative 2 in which the Council would designate an ad hoc analytical team. The GAP believes this approach will create a more transparent, formal process. Moreover, this approach should reduce Council and GMT time dedicated to the 5-year review during scheduled Council meetings.

### Preliminary guidance on content for the review

Overall, the categories and topics for review look appropriate. The GAP would like to see additional metrics included to assess processor outcomes. The GAP also notes that while the topics for review seem appropriate, the review process should be conducted in such a way that enables us to quickly winnow down to focus on areas where the program is underperforming. We do not need to spend significant time and resources analyzing and working on aspects of the program that are working well. Finally, the GAP notes that more than 150 stakeholders met recently in Portland

for a two day workshop to discuss the problems and potential solutions to improve economic performance in the Pacific Groundfish Quota Program. The report that emerged from the workshop incorporates hundreds of pages of notes from hours of discussions and could be useful fodder as the Council contemplates content for the 5 year review.

### **Draft guidance**

The GAP appreciates the staff comments on draft guidance provided in supplemental attachment 3, and the GAP agrees generally with the comments.

PFMC  
06/26/16