

SaMTAAC Responses to Top-Five Exercise

Contents

Summary of Responses.....	2
Text of Individual Responses.....	5
Michele Culver.....	5
Bob Dooley	5
Pete Hassemer	9
Maggie Sommer.....	10
Bob Alverson	12
Tyler Besecker	13
David Crabbe	16
Kevin Dunn.....	16
Mike Okoniewski.....	16
Dan Platt.....	17
Steve Scheiblauser (and Bill Blue).....	17

Summary of Responses

The following are the committee member *initial responses* to requests that they identify their top five preferred alternatives. Several committee members identified that these *preferences are very preliminary and subject to change* as the alternatives are modified and the implications of the alternatives are further vetted. The primary exercise is intended to help the committee take a step toward narrowing the suite of alternatives being considered.

Key:

- Y In top five – not ranked
- C In top five, conditional – if something is to be done, then this is in top 5.
- [#] In top five – ranked. Values 1-5, for responses that ranked the top 5.
- m Selected for top five, but with a modification (see footnote for modification).
- P Some elements selected

In addition to the rankings, Bob Dooley submitted a new proposal – see his comments attached. Additionally, Maggie Sommer prioritized a combination of several proposals—see her comments attached. Both Bob and Maggie’s proposals have been incorporated into the alternative summary table provided as SaMTAAC Agenda Item H Attachment 1.

Prioritization/Proposals	Michele Culver	Bob Dooley	Pete Hassemer	Maggie Sommer	Bob Alverson	Tyler Besecker	David Crabbe	Kevin Dunn	Mike Okoniewski	Dan Platt	Steve Scheiblauer
Did the Respondent Prioritize Within Top 5?	Y	?	N	N	Y (tiers)	Y	Y ^a	N	Y (partially)	N	Y
SaMTAAC Meeting Proposals											
S-1: Gear Specific QP and LE Permit Owner Opt-out Options (WDFW)	5 ^b		Y		C ^c	2-m ^d	5-m ^e			Y	
S-2: Move the 36° N Line Used for the Trawl Sector to 42° N. (GMT as proposed by NMFS)	1										
S-3: Move a Portion of the Trawl Allocation from South to North (GMT as proposed by NMFS)	2				Y-m ^f	3-m ^g	1-m ^h				2-m ⁱ
S-4: Allow Southern QP to be Harvested as Far North as 42° N. (GMT as proposed by NMFS)	4		Y								3-m ⁱ
S-5: Trawl Link and Vessel Gear Switching Limits for Sablefish (Lackey)				P ^k			2-m ^l		2	Y	
S-6: Ownership Requirements and Vessel Gear Switching Limits for Sablefish (Pacific Seafood)				Y-m ^m				Y	1	Y	

Prioritization/Proposals	Michele Culver	Bob Dooley	Pete Hassemer	Maggie Sommer	Bob Alverson	Tyler Besecker	David Crabbe	Kevin Dunn	Mike Okoniewski	Dan Platt	Steve Scheiblaue
S-7: Allow Tiered Northern Harvest of Southern Sablefish Quota (Bob Alverson/Tyler Besecker)	3		Y	Y							
CAB Proposals											
CAB - Proposal A: Gear Switching Permit Endorsement – Landings Capped at Annual Vessel QP Limit (No Change)					C ⁿ						
CAB - Proposal B: Gear Switching Permit Endorsement – Landings Capped Based on Permit History		Y-m ^o		Pk							
CAB - Proposal C: Gear Switching Permit Endorsement – Individual Vessel Landings Capped at 70 Percent of the Annual Vessel QP Limit, Southern Quota Fished North		Y-m ^p									
CAB - Proposal D: Gear Specific QP with Active Trawler Designation and Exemption		Y-m ^d	Y	Pk				Y	Y		
CAB - Proposal E (Replacement): Restrict Gear Switching and Trawl Only Harvest of Southern Sablefish Quota in the North (Leave 36° N. lat. Line).		Y-m ^f					4-m ^s				
CAB - Proposal F: Eliminate 36o N Line for Trawl, Reserve Quota for Trawl, Moratorium on New Gear Switching Vessels					C ^t						
GAP Proposals											
GAP - Proposal 1: No Action				Y	Y-m ^u	1-m					1
GAP - Proposal 2: Control Date Only											
GAP - Proposal 3: Gear-Switching Endorsement											
GAP - Proposal 4: Gear Specific QP with Active Trawler Designation and Exemption											
GAP - Proposal 5: Fixed Gear Quota Pound Cap								Y			
GAP - Proposal 6: Aggregate Soft Cap							3-m ^v		Y		

Prioritization/Proposals	Michele Culver	Bob Dooley	Pete Hassemer	Maggie Sommer	Bob Alverson	Tyler Besecker	David Crabbe	Kevin Dunn	Mike Okoniewski	Dan Platt	Steve Scheiblaue
GAP - Proposal 7: Sunset Gear Switching		Y-m ^w		Pk				Y ^x	Y		
Council Proposals											
Council-1: Gear Specific QP Designations			Y					Y			
Council-2: Gear Specific QS Designations											

^a For the most part in priority order. Priorities could change depending on amendments to the proposals.

^b I am not advocating for S-1 (or for any of the proposals that go beyond moving the 36 degree N. lat. line). However, if the Council believes that additional regulations are needed at this time to ensure some portion of IFQ sablefish is available to trawlers, then my preference would be S-1.

^c Would support if the Council wishes to look at restrictions to gear switching, except consider a range for dates (July 1 to September 1) for the conversion of all sablefish QP to “Any Gear.” There may be a safety issue with a September 1st conversion.

^d Modifications. Addition in bold: “QP would be issued **to quota share accounts and from there to vessel accounts. When the QP is issued to vessel accounts, it would be issued** as ‘trawl-only’ and/or ‘any gear’.” Plus add options for date that all QP becomes “any gear:” Option 1, August 1; Option 2, August 15; Option 3, September 1. Finally, eliminate the “No Opt-out” option. For the opt-out qualifying criteria option, specify “50%” where it currently says “XX%.” Develop options on the question of whether the opt-out status transfers with the permit or some other entity. Do not apply the control date to the opt-out qualifying criteria. Preference that the opt-out provision be available to everyone and that the date for QP conversion to “any gear” be August 1. If there is to be a qualifying criteria for opt-out, preference is for 50%.

^e Modification to be specified.

^f Supports this for the south of 36 utilization issue but allow south of 36 to be caught up to 42, and no restrictions on gear.

^g Modification: The portion moved north to between 36 and 42 degrees would be decided biennially, based on the amount projected to be left unharvested south of 36 degrees. This element would be a pilot program, with results to be examined and evaluated as part of the overall program review.

^h Modification: Sablefish allocation can be changed to move allocation north or south based off an attainment formula.

ⁱ This is supportable with a change: the re-allocation would occur Sept 1 of each year for the remainder of the year, allowing uncaught southern sablefish to be caught coastwide during that 4 month window.

^j Modification: This alternative would be improved and supportable by adding, for sablefish, the provision 1/3 south of 36 any gear, 1/3 from 36 to 42 trawl only, 1/3 north of 42 line trawl only .

^k See Maggie Sommer’s comments in appendix for the combination of these alternatives. She presents two combinations. The first combines and/or modifies elements of CAB-B, CAB-D, and S-5, the second adds to that GAP-7 (sunset provisions).

^l Modification to be specified.

^m Modification from original proposal: do not include additional requirement that the owned QS was used to gear switch prior to control date.

ⁿ Would support if the Council wishes to look at restrictions to gear switching, except no minimum poundage levels.

^o With the following exceptions: each gear switching endorsement would be limited by historical average participation prior to control date or some proportion thereof; transferability should be a separate discussion possibly in the context of a sunset provision; and no stacking of permits.

^p With the following exceptions: amount of QP Limit to qualified gear switching vessel would be limited rather than arbitrary (70%) (it would be some reflection of historical level of participation by qualified vessel prior to control date); and transferability should be a separate discussion possibly in the context of a sunset provision.

^q With the following exceptions: only agree with # 2 (gear switching requires active trawl or an exemption) and #3 (active trawl qualification requirement) in this proposal; as for # 5 (limit on gear switching is the annual vessel QP limit for sablefish), there needs to be a limit to how much can be gear switched by active trawl vessel; and this should only apply to vessels and not quota ownership to reduce complexity.

^r With the following exceptions: based only on vessel participation not Quota Share; and limit amount of South quota that can be used North of 36 only by trawl (no gear switching N of 36 of South quota).

^s Modification to be specified.

^t Would support if the Council wishes to look at restrictions to gear switching, except no minimum poundage levels.

^u Supports this for the gear switching issue but specify that the Council will receive ongoing annual data reports on the topic.

^v Modification to be specified.

^w Modification: does not apply to South of 36 provisions, this should be discussed in the context of the goals of the Trawl Rationalization program as outlined at the bottom of page 1 on Agenda Item H.2, Attachment 1, April 2018.

^x Specify that the phase out would be for all vessels (no “Active trawler” exception).

Text of Individual Responses

Michele Culver

I think that many of the proposals on the list are not mutually exclusive and can't fully accomplish the objectives by themselves. As such, I have identified my top two proposals—the first of which include multiple “proposals” as sub-options, which in combination add up to five proposals in total. They are described below in my order of priority:

1. S-2: Move the 36 degree N. lat. line used for the trawl sector to 42 degrees N. lat. (GMT/NMFS) with the following sub-options:
 - a. S-3: Move a portion of the trawl allocation from south to north (GMT/NMFS)
 - b. S-7: Allow tiered northern harvest of southern sablefish quota (Alverson/Besecker)
 - c. S-4: Allow southern QP to be harvested as far north as 42 degrees N. lat. (GMT/NMFS)
2. S-1: Gear specific QP and LE permit owner opt-out options (WDFW)

Please note that as I've explained to the Council during discussion, I am not advocating for S-1 (or for any of the proposals that go beyond moving the 36 degree N. lat. line). However, if the Council believes that additional regulations are needed *at this time* to ensure some portion of IFQ sablefish is available to trawlers, then my preference would be S-1.

Bob Dooley

I began with a review of what I thought was a well defined council direction statement (**H.2, Attachment 1, April 2018**) and to apply it to my vision of a roadmap that could possibly help organize the process for coming to a final recommendation to the council.

I used the H.2, Attachment 1, April 2018 as the basis for the below proposal which is a compilation of segments of the options we were tasked with choosing from for our preferred top

5. I found that to be a difficult task in that there were no options that I fully agreed would fairly solve the problem using the Councils April guidelines.

I started with the 3 bullet points found in the middle of the page 2 of the April 2018 document.

They are:

- *We want to get more sablefish to the trawl fleet.*
- *We want to consider existing operations/investments.*
- *We believe that unlimited catch of sablefish through gear switching is not desirable.*

I also incorporated the next paragraph of the document into my consideration of a roadmap. It read:

“Council discussion also indicated a possible interest in maintaining each trawler’s opportunity for some harvest with fixed gear, even if they have not previously taken advantage of gear switching provisions.”

By using these points from the guidance document (H.2, Attachment 1, April 2018) and adhering to the points made by the Council in the remaining text I developed a possible roadmap.

As an overarching consideration of any plan I paid careful attention to the concern of the Council that any proposed solution be mindful of the *“implementation costs and challenges”*. To that end I have eliminated any linkage to ownership of Quota Share since it was pointed out by staff that this was most difficult to track and link to actual quota pound usage. I was also guided by the fact that **Vessels** catch fish, Quota Share holders **do not** and Quota Share can be held by anyone and not necessarily linked to Vessels. If we were to limit gear switching it should address Vessels since they actually catch the fish and their method (gear switching vs. Trawling) is already being tracked. I took the approach that any changes should be able to be automatically tracked using the existing database by simple programming changes or that any ongoing changes or qualifications to future gear switching be linked to prescriptive instructions that do not require further decision making by the Council.

I also considered the goal of the Trawl Rationalization Program as restated on page 1 in the document:

“The goal of the trawl rationalization program is based on an understanding that trawl gear is the only gear that can viably harvest a number of the groundfish species. The intent of the trawl rationalization program was to make improvements to the performance of the trawl fishery to this end. ”

It further states:

“given the primacy of sablefish to the mixed stock fishery, even if gear switching is not a cause of the immediate attainment problem, consideration of a limitation might be appropriate in order to prevent future problems.”

Regarding the 36 North Latitude line (South Sablefish Allocation) and the possible removal to create a Coastwide allocation, I believe the problem of under attainment is a Market issue not a fish stock problem. Markets and infrastructure are being currently addressed in California on many fronts. Additionally, the regulatory roadblocks, such as the RCA and rebuilding stocks, are being resolved and I believe are jumpstarting the Trawl Industry in California. Removing the line will create uncertainty in the effort to invest in needed infrastructure and hamper the goals of Trawl rationalization as stated. The proposal lays out a roadmap to increase South Sablefish attainment by creating options for South Quota Share holders while not disrupting or

mandating the usage by those quota holders. It also keeps gear switching in the South viable since approximately 90 percent of South Sablefish is currently harvested with Pot Gear and to eliminate that option in the South would do harm to California, further hampering efforts to revitalize the much needed infrastructure and Markets.

This all led me to the development of this proposal which is not new but rather a compilation and reorganization of the proposals that were already offered in previous meetings.

My top 5 choices of options follow the proposal. They are qualified by certain components that support my proposal and list exceptions that do not fit.

Thanks.

Bob Dooley

A Proposal to get more Sablefish to the Trawl Fleet and encourage Attainment of the overall Trawl Fishery including Sablefish

1. More Sablefish to Trawl fleet

-Applies to North of 36 degrees only

-**Active Trawler Designation** -Ability to Gear Switch linked to catch (lbs.) and/or deliveries (number of Deliveries) by **vessel** using Trawl gear in previous year(s) on an ongoing basis.

-Limit on number of lbs. of gear switched Sablefish allowed by Active Trawl **vessels** in any year

a) **vessel** limit calculation options:

i) Limit **vessel** to number of sablefish lbs trawled in prior year or some proportion of lbs. trawled in previous year

ii) Limit lbs gear switched by **vessel** to arbitrary limit (x # of lbs)

2. Consider Existing Gear switching effort (prior to **Control Date**)

-Applies to North of 36 degrees only

- **Vessels** that gear switched X number of lbs. and/or participated X number of years prior to control date qualify to continue future gear switching as an exemption to the Vessel cap/Trawl requirement described above (1.) The **vessel** would be limited to the number of lbs. the **vessel** could gear switch by the choice of alternatives below

a) Highest amount of lbs. of Sablefish actually gear switched by qualified **vessel** in any one year prior to control date.

b) Average of total lbs. of Sablefish actually gear switched by qualified **vessel** in all years prior to control date

c) Same as above but apply a discount to percentage of each qualifying **vessel** to limit total amount of potential gear switching

d) Consider Sunset/ Phase out over time (not exclusive)

e) Consider limiting Transferability

- The total number of lbs established by the above procedure would be expressed as an annual individual vessel limit. This limit will be expressed as a percentage of the current vessel cap at the time of Final Council action but not to exceed the qualifying vessel total poundage used as a numerator (Calculated vessel limit /Current Vessel Sablefish Cap) in this calculation going into future years regardless of Sablefish Annual Allocation or vessel use cap.

3. Sablefish south of 36 degrees latitude

- Status Quo

a) Line and Fishery remains unchanged: No quota reallocation and unlimited gear switching is allowed by **vessels** using South Sablefish in the south (36 degrees)

b) Alternatives

Option for designating a portion of the South for use in the North Trawl Only

i) Index unharvested South Sablefish during biennial Spex process as percentage of total South Sablefish allocation

ii) Use this percentage to specify an additional caption of South Sablefish for each quota holder, meaning two separate designations of South Sablefish: (example; If 50 percent of the South Sablefish is left unharvested in the previous spex cycle then in the next cycle a quota share holder would receive 50 percent of their South allocation as **South only** and 50 percent as *geographically limited to South of 42 degrees North Latitude*. This would be an option for quota holders rather than two specific limited designations. A South quota holder could continue to use the total of both of these designations in the South. It would only limit the amount of South that could be used in the North.

iii) The South portion that is *geographically limited to South of 42 degrees North Latitude*, if Harvested North of the 36 degree North Latitude line, would be limited to **Trawl only**. If it were used South of 36 degrees North Latitude there would be no restrictions on gear switching

iv) For determining future South quota percentages, The number of South quota pounds actually harvested with Trawl North of 36 would be added to the number of unharvested **South only** quota lbs to serve as the numerator as outlined above.

Option 2) A possible option to incentivize more harvest in the South could be a percent reduction to the *geographically limited to South of 42 degrees North Latitude* portion after the above South quota split calculation is completed. This would bind an additional percentage of South Quota in the South to incentivize growth in the South

Option 3) Rather than specifying quota as *geographically limited to South of 42 degrees North Latitude*, Make that allocation designation **Coastwide Trawl Only**. Once again, This is an option for South Quota

holders not a mandate. They can always use their entire South Allocation in the South with no limitation on gear type.

Top 5 choices of proposals:

1.) **CAB- Proposal E (Replacement)**

With the following exceptions:

- Based only on **vessel** participation not Quota Share
- Limit amount of South quota that can be used North of 36 by Trawl only (no gear switching N of 36 of South quota)

2.) **CAB- Proposal C**

With the following exceptions:

- Amount of QP Limit to qualified gear switching vessel would be limited rather than arbitrary (70%). It would be some reflection of historical level of participation by qualified **vessel** prior to control date.
- Transferability should be a separate discussion possibly in the context of a sunset provision

3.) **CAB- Proposal B**

With the following exceptions:

- Each gear switching endorsement would be limited by historical average participation prior to control date or some proportion thereof
- Transferability should be a separate discussion possibly in the context of a sunset provision
- No Stacking of permits

4.) **GAP- Proposal D**

With the following exceptions:

- Only agree with # 2. and #3. in this proposal.
- As for # 5, there needs to be a limit to how much can be gear switched by active trawl vessel.
- This should only apply to vessels and not quota ownership to reduce complexity

5.) **GAP- Proposal 7**

- Does not apply to South of 36
- This should be discussed in the context of the goals of the Trawl Rationalization program as outlined at the bottom of page 1 on Agenda Item H.2, Attachment 1, April 2018.

Pete Hassemer

My top five - in no priority order - are:

- S-1
- S-7
- CAB -D

Council-1

S-4 (although this proposal competes closely with S-2; both consider "moving" the line from 36 to 42 and provide different opportunities or management regimes than other proposals)

Maggie Sommer

Three are essentially unchanged from the proposals (noting that many decision points remain open within the original proposals). Two (my 3rd and 4th bullets) are a combination of elements from multiple proposals (they have some sub-options...probably violates the "5 alternatives" limit but I thought they were all worth further consideration).

In my third bullet, Active Trawler Designation with History-Based Exemption, my goal in selecting and combining these elements, along with a few modifications, was to accomplish the following (you may not be doing anything with rationale at this point, but it's at least an FYI):

- cap or reduce the overall amount of gear switched sablefish catch
- prevent new participation in the trawl fishery by fixed gear vessels
- allow future gear switching by active trawlers
- allow continuing gear switching by vessels with significant participation prior to the control date (proxy for "investment", seems much more straightforward to determine than vessel/permit/QS ownership)
- provide options that avoid creating a permanent "endorsement" that would effectively reallocate access to trawl sablefish quota from trawl gear to fixed gear within the trawl sector on a long-term basis
- provide options that recognize existing business plans which may include vessel transfer

The fourth bullet is the same approach as above, but adding in a time-based sunset of gear switching by either exempted vessels only, or all vessels.

In all of the alternatives, the exact numbers, percentages, years, etc. can be modified of course; where I included specific values they were almost all from the existing proposals (which also noted they are intended as starting points but can be revised). I can bring some analysis of what the result would be of applying the strawman values I've included, which might be useful for committee discussion. Also please note that I have proposed the active trawler designation/exemption be attached to the vessel, not permit, because it seemed to lessen the potential for loopholes, but if permit is determined to be better, that's fine. You and others probably have better insight into that specific issue than I do.

I am very aware that several of these proposals may not work well for the southern area's needs, and am looking forward to discussions on how to best address those needs (certainly including possible modifications of any of these).

Attachment from Maggie Sommer

The following objectives that determined my selection/development of alternatives – the CAB's 3 areas of agreement, along with my own expanded thoughts and several additions:

- Get more sablefish to the trawl fleet

- Provide access to some of the unused southern allocation without harming California’s current or potential fisheries
- Limit catch of sablefish through gear switching
 - At least limit to no more than current levels (as a % of trawl allocation)
 - Include options that would reduce gear switching below current levels, and which are consistent with the other objectives and requirements
- Consider existing operations/investments
 - Include options that support existing GS business plans to proceed, including beyond the current “owner”
 - Consider existing trawl operations/investments
 - Recognize importance of sablefish to trawl trip economics
 - Avoid creating a permanent differently-valued permit asset
 - Avoid creating a long-term opportunity for non-trawl vessels within the trawl fishery
 - Consider infrastructure operations/investments
 - Existing infrastructure needs
 - Future/vision
- “Best practices”
 - Low enough in cost and complexity to be administratively feasible (also, less complexity probably means lower risk of unintended consequences)
 - Maintain flexibility where possible while meeting primary objectives

In my top 5 alternatives, I listed three essentially unchanged from the proposals, but note that many decision points remain open within them and there may be particular challenges with “ownership” criteria; however, I thought it worth keeping it in the mix for further discussion of whether ownership can/should be incorporated in some way.

I also selected elements from multiple proposals to create two “combination” alternatives:

Active Trawler Designation with History-Based Exemption: (elements of CAB-B, CAB-D, S-5):

Gear switching allowed by: Vessels with an Active Trawler designation or an Exemption

Active Trawler qualification (annual): vessel made at least X landings totaling at least Y pounds of sablefish with trawl gear in the prior calendar year

Exemption qualification (one-time): vessel made gear-switched landings of at least X lbs (70,000?) of sablefish in three or more years between 2011 and the control date

Vessel gear-switching limits:

- Active trawler: X% (1.5%?) of the annual trawl allocation
- Exempted vessel: X% (100%? 80%?) of the maximum amount landed (gear-switched) in any year between 2011 and the control date, as a % of the annual trawl allocation

Exemption transferability/expiration:

- Option 1: Exemption is non-transferable and expires when majority ownership of the vessel changes (need further investigation of feasibility/effectiveness for both of these
- Option 2: Exemption remains valid through one change in majority ownership of vessel, and expires with the second change

This alternative is intended to:

- Prevent new fixed gear entrants into the trawl fishery,
- Prevent unlimited catch of sablefish through gear switching,
- Consider existing operations/investments (by using historic participation as a proxy),
- Reduce gear switching from current levels,
- Maintain gear switching as an option for trawlers, and
- Eventually sunset gear switching except by active trawlers.

Notes:

- Vessel is proposed as the entity to which an Active Trawler designation or Exemption applies, as I think it might more directly “freeze the footprint” of current gear switching activity. This could be changed to permit if that is determined to be better.
- Values proposed for qualifying thresholds and vessel gear switching limits are intended as starting points for discussion.
- Control date = September 15, 2017. For the purposes of the Exemption qualifying criteria and determining Exempted Vessel gear switching limits, the period from January 1 through the control date (not the full calendar year 2017) is proposed.

Active Trawler Designation with History-Based Exemption and Sunset (i.e., same as above, with sunset; noting that the sunset timeline proposed here is several years longer than in GAP-7)

- Sunset Option 1: for exempted vessels only (active trawler provision does not sunset):
 - 1.a. “Taper”: Vessel gear-switching limits are as above for years 1-3, 75% for years 4-6, 50% for years 7-9, and no gear switching beginning in year 10.
 - 1.b. “Delayed full stop”: Vessel gear-switching limits are as above for years 1-9. Beginning in year 10 no gear switching allowed.
- Sunset Option 2: for both exempted and active trawl vessels (all gear-switching sunsets):
 - 2.a. Taper (as above)
 - 2.b. Delayed full stop (as above)

Finally, the alternatives I listed may not meet the needs of some or all participants in California, and could be limited geographically or modified (for example, if something like one of the Active Trawler + Exemption alternatives was considered, perhaps different exemption criteria and expiration provisions could apply for CA vessels), and/or combined with or replaced by other alternatives.

Bob Alverson

I took all the options of changing the South of 36 line and put them together. Some of these were part of other forms of solutions to gear switching, for me the unfished sable south of 36 should be a standalone debate.

1. Of all the south of 36 options S-3 seemed to encompass the intent of most of them including the one Tyler and I submitted. This would allow the fish below 36 to be caught up to 42 degrees.

So this is my suggestion for the unfished sable south of 36. Allow to be taken up to 42 degrees without any designations of gear type for harvest.

2. For gear switching solutions I do not see a problem so I support status quo or a Council action to table with ongoing data collection that advises the Council on this subject on an annual basis.

If the Council wishes to look at restrictions to gear switching here are the options I would support looking at.

3. S-1 Council option 1 from WDFW. Except I would want the date to be a range of options for the Council to consider to include July 1st – September 1st, which the catches of sablefish and all gears can participate without restrictions. Currently this option lifts its restriction on fixed gear on September 1st. We see this as a safety issue, pushing fishing further into the fall and winter months.

4. And 5. If the council chooses to look at options to restrict gear switching it should look at both CAB A and CAB F. CAB A would be a trawl permit endorsement on those trawl permits used prior to the cutoff date. CAB F would be an endorsement on those vessels that were used in gear switching prior to the cutoff date. I do not support minimum poundage levels at this time for either of these options, primarily because a problem has not been quantified, since as of today out of the 5.4 million pounds of trawl sablefish to catch there are still 3.1 million pounds available.

Tyler Besecker

Attached is my ranking. I have ranked my top 3 and have elected not to rank a 4th or 5th.

Number 1

Status Quo

Rationale:

I continue to believe that the perceived “problem” of trawlers not having enough access (availability and price) to trawl sablefish quota is actually a matter of individual trawlers annually making a choice for economic or other reasons to lease out their QP. This season over 3 million pounds of trawl sablefish remain in the water, and trawlers are desperately asking fixed gear harvesters to catch that fish. I am not currently seeing this as a “problem”.

The amount of trawl quota harvested by trawlers is more a function of annual market conditions, processing logistics and other fishery factors. Very little trawl quota is owned by fixed gear operators, but is leased from trawl operators annually at the request of those trawlers.

Notes:

If the council wants to restrict gear switching I would then support S-1 as I find that proposal to be the best option for gear switching.

The additions made to the proposals selected below are in bold, as are answers to questions posed in those proposals. Language removed is in strike-through.

Number 2

S-1: Gear Specific QP and LE Permit Owner Opt-out Options (WDFW)

1. At the start of the year, QP would be issued **to quota share accounts and from there to vessel accounts. When the QP is issued to vessel accounts, it would be issued** as “trawl-only” and/or “any gear” (the Council will determine the percent of each as part of its final recommendation).

2. On **(Option 1) August 1**
(Option 2) August 15
(Option 3) September 1

of each year, all of the remaining sablefish QP becomes “any gear” QP.

~~Sub-option 1: No Opt-out.~~

Sub-option 1 2: Opt-out option for everyone. All permit holders have a one-time opt-out designation. By opting out, 100% of the QP issued to that permit would remain “any gear.”

Sub-option 2 3: Opt-out option for qualified fixed gear participants. All permits that had primarily used fixed gear have a one-time opt-out designation.

Qualifying criteria for the permit:

- a. **50%** ~~XX%~~ of landings with permit had been with fixed gear
- b. 100% of landings with permit had been with fixed gear

Question: Does the opt-out go with the permit when it is transferred? For option 2, if a person was gear switching but bought a new vessel and permit, would that person be the one to receive the opportunity to opt-out. If so, what if there was a partnership, where the partners each got their own permit and vessel?

Answer: The Council could delineate these issues of whether and how the opt-out provision is transferred, in a series of options. The analysis will clarify the regulatory challenges and potential outcomes of each option.

Question: For the qualifying criteria, would the control date be used?

Answer: No, the existing control date should not be used. That control date was an arbitrary date chosen at a Council meeting early in the process, reflecting conclusions prematurely determined, in response to concerns the causes of which were incompletely understood. If the Council finds it necessary to establish a control date, it should be done at a stage when the causes for concern are agreed upon, and the alternatives are rationally presented.

Rationale:

This proposal only works for us with the inclusion of the opt-out provision, which emphasizes that it is the responsibility of each harvester to make a choice.

I prefer the Suboption listed here as #1, the opt-out provision applied to everyone. This provides the most flexibility for participants.

Also, under Number 2, I prefer Option 1, August 1, as the date after which all sablefish quota pounds can be harvested by any gear. This earlier date will allow optimum harvest in a timely fashion, and avoid rough weather issues and the onset of other fisheries in the fall and winter.

Under “qualifying criteria”, I inserted “50%” in (a), and I prefer (a) over (b). We believe that best reflects the flexibility that was purposely built into the program.

Number 3

Note: I believe the proposals addressing the North/South line are in a separate category and respond to a different problem.

I have labeled this proposal my Number 3 choice, but it is our Number 1 choice to address the North/South issue.

S-3, Modified: Move a portion of the Trawl Allocation from south of 36 degrees to the area between 36 degrees and 42 degrees

Currently, there is a coastwide ACL which is then divided north and south of 36° N. lat. after which is it allocated among sectors. Under this proposal, after the northern and southern inter-sector allocations are established, a portion of the southern trawl allocation would be reallocated to the area between 36 degrees and 42 degrees. The portion moved north to between 36 and 42 degrees would be decided biennially, based on the amount projected to be left unharvested south of 36 degrees.

This element would be a pilot program, with results to be examined and evaluated as part of the overall program review.

Rationale:

This proposal retains the ability for the area south of 36 degrees to continue to develop the ability to harvest and process trawl-caught sablefish, but also allows for the trawl allocation to be used further north if it remains largely unharvested south of 36 degrees. This allows flexibility of allocation between the two areas every other year, based on demonstrated use south of 36.

As a pilot program, it allows the Council to review the outcome and adjust as needed after the program review.

David Crabbe

Here are my top five picks. All my picks require amendments which I listed for my first selection but not the others. I expect to hear and learn a lot more about all the options at the next meeting and reserve the right to adjust my selections.

Kevin Dunn

Here are my 5 options in NO particular order!

- 1) CAB proposal D
- 2) Council # 1
- 3) GAP #7(a)
- 4) GAP #5
- 5) Pacific Seafood

Mike Okoniewski

Selections from Mike Okoniewski:

1. S-6 Pacific Seafood
2. S-5 Trawl link and vessel gear switching limits
3. CAB D QP Cap
4. GAP Proposal 6 Aggregate soft Cap
5. GAP Proposal 7 Sunset Gear Switching – note: for vessels that are not active trawlers as explained in the first sentence

Note: I have spoken at length with Bob Dooley. He did not submit a proposal as he had originally intended after his departure from the SaMTAAC, however as he is now a voting member, and back amongst the group he does have some ideas that interest me. I am not authorized to bring in a new proposal nor would I attempt to do it for Bob but I do think his ideas merit evaluation and that if at all possible he should be given an extension to get his thoughts on paper. If he had I might have substituted a proposal from Bob for one of the above picks. One particular aspect of Bob's thinking that I liked is that he is attempting to find a solution for CA that may be different from other parts of the coast while still encouraging the long term redevelopment of the groundfish trawl fishery in CA.

Dan Platt

I only came up with a top 3. S1-S5 and S6. I am not supporting any proposals that remove the line for trawl or allow northern access to Southern Sablefish. All three of the options I picked have good ideas that could possibly be combined.

Steve Scheiblaue (and Bill Blue)

Please find attached my scoring sheet, which was completed by myself and Bill Blue. As you can see, we ended up with only three alternatives that we are comfortable with...and two of those need some changes from what has been proposed, in our opinion

Comments from Steve and Bill (excerpted from their attachment). Top alternatives are in priority order.

1. GAP - Proposal 1: No Action

“The large price fluctuation in sablefish and fish being left uncaught (likely a million pounds of n sable will not be landed in 2018) tells me that it is too soon to be making important rule changes.”

2. S-3. Move a Portion of the Trawl Allocation from South to North (GMT as proposed by NMFS)

“This is supportable with a change: the re-allocation would occur Sept 1 of each year for the remainder of the year, allowing uncaught southern sablefish to be caught coastwide during that 4 month window. Forcasting what the N-S allocation should be based on last years catch will could be wildly inaccurate.”

3. S-4. Allow Southern QP to be Harvested as Far North as 42° N. (GMT as proposed by NMFS)

“This alternative would be improved and supportable by adding, for sablefish, the provision 1/3 south of 36 any gear, 1/3 from 36 to 42 trawl only, 1/3 north of 42 line trawl only . With this alternative, the likelihood of unsued southern sablefish will diminish; should unused s. sable remain an issue, solutions can be considered at a future date.”