

COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD (CAB) REPORT ON TRAWL CATCH SHARES –  
FINAL RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES (ROA) FOR FOLLOW-ON ACTIONS

The Community Advisory Board (CAB) met March 9, 2018 and reviewed the trawl follow-on action agenda item and the issues that are before the Council at this meeting.

**Item 1: At-sea Whiting Fishery Bycatch Needs and Set-Aside Management**

The CAB appreciates the Council's continued attention to this issue. It reviewed and has no changes to recommend with respect to the alternatives on this issue provided in Agenda Item H.1, Attachment 1. The CAB's intent is to develop a mechanism that provides relief from unduly constraining bycatch while at the same time is least burdensome to the Council and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). It is important that the at-sea sector's bycatch needs are met and the right balance of bycatch be established without negatively impacting the shorebased sector. The CAB believes that the range of alternatives described in Attachment 1 adequately captures bookends that can achieve these objectives.

**Item 3: Shorebased Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) Accumulation Limits**

During its discussion, the CAB noted that there is a tension between providing additional opportunity through higher annual quota pounds (QP) limits and consolidation. Therefore, the CAB recommends pursuing a process that can flexibly change the vessel limits, as opposed to setting permanent specific values. That said, the CAB views this issue as a lower priority than other follow-on actions.

The CAB recommends that the Council adopt the following range of alternatives for purpose of analysis:

Alternative 1: No Action.

Alternative 2: A 50% increase in the annual vessel QP limits for all species except Pacific whiting, petrale sole, sablefish north (a 50% increase for species for which attainment has not reached 75%).

Alternative 3: Eliminate the vessel quota pound limits.

Alternative 4: Adopt a process for adjusting annual QP limits. This might be done inseason, annually based on attainment triggers, or in the spex.

As an example for Alternative 4, if the annual approach were taken, criteria might be set such that in a year that attainment for a species is less than 50% then in the following year the Council would consider increasing annual vessel limits. As part of the final action, the Council would decide whether the increase would be a predetermined amount (above the original annual vessel QP limit) or determined as the situations arise. Staff should explore processes that would involve the minimum possible Council and NMFS burden, enhance flexibility and opportunity, and that provide industry and other stakeholders a voice in the process.

#### **Item 4. Shorebased IFQ Sector Harvest Complex Needs**

Alternative 2 would allow post season QP trading so that vessels could cover end-of-year deficits with QP from the previous year. Some additional language is needed for Suboption B-2, on handling situations in which NMFS is selling quota but the amount of QP available to sell is less than that needed by vessel accounts with deficits. Staff has provided language to complete the specification of that suboption. However, the CAB recommends removal of the entirety of Suboption B. Information provided in the analysis indicates that the unused QP available for transfer to accounts with deficits is generally far greater than the deficits that need to be covered. Under this circumstance, there is no need to have NMFS sell additional QP to cover deficits. Furthermore, the CAB believes developing a new program component whereby NMFS would sell quota to the fleet would require significant analysis and add significant administrative burden.

#### **Purpose and Need Statements**

The CAB reviewed and did not have any comments on the new purpose and need statements. However, the CAB does not have a unified opinion relative to the value of the proposed new quota share (QS) owner data collection process. We reiterate from our November 2017 report:

The CAB no longer has a consensus position in support of this survey. Some members of the CAB thought this was not a high enough priority to displace the pursuit of other follow-on actions and questioned the ultimate value of the information. Others thought the collection would be essential to tracking information that is important to understanding the performance of the program, in particular the ownership of QS and flow of benefits of the fishery to individuals who are not members of the fishing communities. It was also suggested that other methods for collecting some of this data be explored.

PFMC  
03/12/18