

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

Sablefish Management and  
Trawl Allocation Attainment Committee (SaMTAAC)  
Pacific Fishery Management Council

[Hyatt Place Portland Airport](#)

Meeting Place #3

9750 NE Cascade Station

Portland, OR 97220

Telephone: 503-288-2808

October 11-12, 2018

Call to Order.....	1
Biological Implications of Geographic Redistribution of Harvest .....	2
Other Analysis .....	3
Barriers to Attainment .....	3
Discussion of Barriers to Attainment of Trawl Allocations in Northern Areas .....	4
Discussion of Barriers to Attainment of Southern Sablefish Allocations .....	6
Principles .....	6
Summary of Committee and Advisor Top-5 Alternatives .....	6
Selection of Candidate Alternatives for Further Development and Analysis .....	7
Refinement of Alternatives .....	8
Finalization of Committee Report.....	10
Scheduling Next Meeting.....	11
Analyses Requested During the Meeting .....	12
Attachments: .....	13
Cross Index of Alternatives.....	13

### **Call to Order**

#### **Voting Members in Attendance**

Mr. Phil Anderson – Committee and Council Chair  
Ms. Kelly Ames – National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)  
Ms. Michele Culver – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)  
Mr. Robert Dooley – California Council Member  
Mr. Pete Hassemer – Council member at large  
Ms. Maggie Somers – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)

#### **Voting Members Absent**

None

#### **Non-voting Members in Attendance**

Mr. Bob Alverson  
Mr. Bill Blue (alternate for Mr. Steve Scheiblauber)

Mr. Tyler Besecker  
Mr. David Crabbe  
Mr. Kevin Dunn  
Ms. Lisa Damrosch (alternate for Mr. Dan Platt)  
Mr. Mike Okoniewski

### **Non-voting Members Absent**

Mr. Dan Platt (alternate present)  
Mr. Steve Scheiblaue (alternate present)

As part of the call to order, the committee reviewed the revised calendar for its work (SaMTAAC Agenda Item A, Attachment 1). The Committee decided to reverse the order in which it addressed Agenda Item D (Principles) and Agenda Item E (Barriers to Attainment). During discussion there were explicit requests or expressions of interest in numerous pieces of additional analysis and information. These are documented in a section at the end of this summary.

### **Biological Implications of Geographic Redistribution of Harvest**

Dr. Melissa Haltuch (NMFS) joined the meeting via teleconference and presented SaMTAAC Agenda Item B, Attachments 1 and 2. Her results showed that harvest north of 42° N. lat. is disproportionately higher than the total estimated survey biomass in the area, and for all other areas harvest is disproportionately lower. Her Attachment 1 report stated:

For a species that does not move much, ideally the fishery would take the catch at approximately the same proportion of estimated total survey biomass in each region. . . . Sablefish are capable of being highly mobile so a mis-alignment between the spatial distribution of the stock and fisheries catch maybe of lesser concern as fish could move into areas that have been more heavily fished. However, the current understanding of movement rates for sablefish within the California Current is limited, with little data available.

During the meeting, Ms. Jessie Doerpinghaus (WDFW) identified some possible concerns about the landings summaries that Dr. Haltuch used to produce the geographic distribution figures. [After the meeting, Ms. Doerpinghaus and Dr. Haltuch worked together to identify that Dr. Haltuch's geographic distribution figures summarized landings based on port of landing, while Ms. Doerpinghaus's summarized landings based on area of catch. These two methods produced different results. Stock assessors generally use port of landing to summarize landings because catch by area is not fully available for historic time series used in stock assessments. For more recent years, landings summaries based on area of catch is available and geographic distribution figures similar to those based on port of landing have now been produced using area of catch. The differences between area of catch information and the port of landing information show how vessels are moving with respect to fishing areas and landing areas. The figures based on area of catch were consistent with the port of landing results in that harvest north of 42° N. lat. is disproportionately higher than the total estimated survey biomass in the area, but to a somewhat lesser degree than is indicated by the port of landing data. The area of catch figures showed that in the areas from 36° N. lat. to 42° N. lat the proportions of harvest and biomass distribution were fairly well matched (while on a port of landing basis, biomass was disproportionately higher than landings). As with the results based on port of landing, the

landings summarized based on the area of catch showed that south of 36° N. lat. the proportion of harvest is less than the proportion of biomass.]

Dr. Haltuch's report also covered regional distribution of landings by gear, regional and coastwide trends in survey biomass, and regional and coastwide trends in the bottom trawl survey sablefish length and age composition data.

With respect to Dr. Haltuch's presentation, the committee requested additional information, listed at the end of this summary.

## **Other Analysis**

Dr. Jim Seger reviewed additional analyses produced in response to SaMTAAC member information requests (SaMTAAC Agenda Item C, Attachment 1). For vessels using trawl gear and vessels gear switching, the analyses showed: seasonality of landings; the geographic distribution of trawl sector landings of northern sablefish (north of 36° N. lat.); and sablefish prices.

## **Barriers to Attainment**

The committee discussed factors that might be creating a barrier to attainment of the trawl allocation. The following is a general outline of the constraints that were identified during the committee discussion. This outline does not reflect an evaluation of the relative importance of any of the points with respect to barriers to attainment. The text following this outline summarizes the discussion.

1. Constraints on attainment of northern trawl allocations
  - a. Insufficient sablefish quota pound (QP) available for trawl vessels limiting harvest of complexes that include sablefish
  - b. Market constraints affecting volume and prices for non-sablefish species, including Dover sole, lingcod, dogfish, arrowtooth and other groundfish species
  - c. Development of markets requires stable supply, which has not been present
    - i. Stable supply is needed to support the processing infrastructure needed to access the markets (e.g. to recruit and retain processing labor)
    - ii. Stable supply is needed for wholesale and retail market planning and to displace competing fish products
  - d. Factors constraining trawl permitted vessels that gear switch from taking more non-sablefish species that are accessible with non-trawl gear (with market development or fishing strategy adjustments, non-trawl gear might be more fully utilized to contribute to attainment of the trawl allocation for some non-sablefish species)
  - e. Closed areas (rockfish conservation areas (RCA)) and gear restrictions
2. Possible causes of limited northern sablefish QP availability
  - a. Purchase of sablefish QP by fixed gear vessels/sale by trawlers (influenced by high sablefish prices)
  - b. Purchase of sablefish QP by processors
  - c. Limited market fluidity: there is unused QP available but
    - i. it is not on the market

(For example, sablefish QP held off the markets for end-of-year trips that get cancelled (e.g. weathered out) or to cover high bycatch rates that don't occur (e.g. whiting trips))

- ii. it is not available at a price that works for trawl vessels (also a function of exvessel prices for sablefish and nonsablefish species)
3. Constraints on attainment of southern sablefish allocations
    - a. Insufficient local infrastructure
    - b. Insufficient local markets
    - c. Buyers from elsewhere along the coast are no longer willing to truck sablefish to northern facilities (in part due to the small size of southern sablefish).

### **Discussion of Barriers to Attainment of Trawl Allocations in Northern Areas**

Because sablefish is part of complexes in which Dover sole and other species are caught, access to sablefish QP was viewed by some as essential to achieving the goals and objectives of the trawl catch share program, which includes more fully attaining allocations. While trawlers rely on other species that can be caught without much sablefish, such as some flatfish and rockfish, the Dover sole, thornyheads, sablefish complex (DTS) is a critical part of profitable trawl operations and a “glue” for processors. Others asked, given the current availability of sablefish QP, why more Dover are not being delivered—are there other limiting factors? With respect to possibilities for increased Dover deliveries, it was also noted that sometimes processors are not willing to take the Dover which vessels were willing to deliver (i.e. the vessels were faced with market limits). Some of the other possible limiting factors discussed included uneven availability of sablefish QP during the year, marketing problems and temporary production constraints (e.g. filleter availability).

Because sablefish QP are available at the end of the year and during the year on Jefferson State Trading Company website, question was raised as to whether sablefish QP are constraining. With respect to sablefish QP availability at the end of the year, some sablefish quota may be held off the market for end-of-year trips and to cover bycatch (e.g. for whiting trips). If trips get weathered out at the end of the year or the QP is not needed to cover bycatch, then the QP ends up on the market. Even when QP is available earlier in the year, some vessels do not take their full market limit of Dover because they have to save their sablefish QP for later in the year. The fact that sablefish QP is always listed for sale on the Jefferson State Trading site could be because asking prices are too high. High asking prices may be the result of volatile trading: sometimes there will be a transaction at a high price then others will put QP on the market and leave it for a long time hoping to get that high price. But at the high prices, purchase by trawlers is not economically viable. So, quota appears to be available but it is at an above market price. Further, it was stated that while trawlers might have some ability to increase their attainment of nonsablefish allocations by avoiding sablefish, that would reduce trip profitability.

Limited sablefish QP availability for trawlers may not be due just to gear switching. Competition with other groups may raise sablefish QP prices above those viable for trawlers. One person stated that Jefferson State Trading shows that it is processors that are buying sablefish QP at high prices. It was noted that, in addition to trawl operations, a processor wanting to acquire sablefish QP in order to facilitate Dover landings will be competing for the sablefish QP with fixed gear vessels and other processors. Another observed that whiting vessels may also be paying top prices for sablefish QP. Quota ownership by non-participants may also lead to the transfer of QP to non-trawl uses: during public comment it was stated that a trawler

that might want to specialize in something else (e.g. crabbing) is going to sell its quota to the highest bidder, which is likely to be a fixed gear vessels since they receive higher prices for sablefish and thus are able to pay more.

The view was expressed that with more certainty about sablefish QP and related product availability, fishers and processors will be able to do better market planning and markets will find a way to take advantage of the available product. Additionally, that stability allows processors to expand capacity by investing in capital and training and retaining fish processing line workers, filleters in particular. In support of the idea that sablefish QP is constraining, it was noted that harvest of rockfish species, for which sablefish is not a constraint, is increasing (e.g. midwater pelagic rockfish). Question was raised as to whether the increase in rockfish landings and fillets in the market might displace Dover in the markets. In response, it was stated that at present filleting capacity is a limiting factor.

While much of the discussion focused on attainment of DTS, question was raised about attainment of allocation of other groundfish species. There are over 70 species that are available in large volumes but have limited markets and so are not being fully utilized (for example arrowtooth and dogfish). With respect to arrowtooth markets, it was noted that the market is quite variable and largely driven by the state of the Eastern European economy. The low price is an issue in inducing vessels to target arrowtooth but concerns about halibut bycatch and the limited availability of halibut bycatch quota may also discourage arrowtooth targeting.

It was suggested that for some under attained species fixed gear might provide another option for harvesting the available trawl allocation (e.g. there used to be a more substantial fixed gear fishery for dogfish). There may be barriers for other non-sablefish groundfish species—including dogfish, lingcod, rockfish, and others—and fixed gear may be of value in increasing utilization of some of these species. In response to this point, concern was expressed that it might be considered a path toward reconsideration of intersector allocation, which is not within the scope of the committee's charge, and it was stated that the focus should be on gear switching as one of the barriers to attainment. However, others disagreed with the idea that gear switching was necessarily a barrier to attainment (though some stated that was not necessarily meant to imply that some limitations on gear switching should not be considered).

With respect to the need to address sablefish QP availability as a barrier, it was suggested that when sablefish exvessel prices drop, there is less gear switching and more sablefish QP left, reducing the degree to which gear switching might impact trawlers. Question was raised about whether there is a need to restrict trawl leasing of sablefish QP, given that trawlers control 90 percent of the sablefish quota shares (QS) and thus have choice about leasing it to a gear switching vessel. Another committee member observed that the situation was more complex than simply leaving it to trawlers to solve the problem by deciding not to lease out their allocations. It was stated that there is a difference between individual rational actions and what benefits communities and the fleet as a whole, and that the committee should be considering the larger perspective.

Concern was expressed that even if limited sablefish QP availability has not been a problem, as other barriers to attainment are reduced there will be a problem if gear switching is left unchecked, and program goals and objectives may not be met. Gear restrictions (trawl gear regulations) and area restrictions (trawl RCAs) have been barriers that contributed to under

attainment of quota and are just now being addressed. Harvesters and processors are increasing their cooperation to develop markets.

### **Discussion of Barriers to Attainment of Southern Sablefish Allocations**

With respect to barriers to attainment of sablefish allocations south of 36° N. lat., it was noted that fish are smaller in the south and bring a lower exvessel price; there is a lack of infrastructure in the area; and it is not cost effective to buy southern sablefish and truck it north. Previously there had been a market for southern sablefish but now buyers don't want to come get it. The same is true with respect to Dover in the south (no market or infrastructure). This reduces trawl participation, which further impacts attainment of the southern allocation.

### **Principles**

The committee reviewed the principles that were originally developed by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) along with the SaMTAAC discussion of principles and related objectives from its June 2018 meeting (SaMTAAC Agenda Item D, Attachment 1). On the basis of that review, the committee adopted the following principles.

- A. We want to ensure there is trawl affordable access to sablefish.
- B. We believe that unlimited catch of sablefish through gear switching is not desirable.
- C. We want to consider impacts on existing operations/investments.
- D. We want to maintain the gear switching option for trawl operations.
- E. We will consider industry and community impacts and ensure long-term stability
- F. We will consider the effect on the value of trawl permits.
- G. We want to increase the net economic value of the trawl individual fishing quota fishery.

The recommended alternatives that the committee moves forward are expected to support the principles adopted and the principles, along with the goals and objectives, will contribute to an objective evaluation of those alternatives in the next step of the process. Different alternatives may meet and address the principles to differing degrees. The principles are also expected to provide a tool for communicating to stakeholders the committee's intent with respect to the alternatives it develops.

### **Summary of Committee and Advisor Top-5 Alternatives**

Over the summer, SaMTAAC members ranked their top alternatives among those coming out of their June meeting (SaMTAAC Agenda Item F, Attachment 1). Several committee members spoke to the rationale for their top rankings. During the ranking process, some SaMTAAC members identified new alternatives. Descriptions of the new alternatives and rationale is provided in their explanation of the rankings they had submitted (also in Attachment 1). The new alternatives were assigned numbers S-8 and S-9 and were included in the table of alternatives provided in SaMTAAC Agenda Item H, Attachment 1.

Mr. Crabbe (a new SaMTAAC member appointed at the September Council meeting) presented a proposal that would shift to the area north of 36° N. lat. 50 percent of the unused sablefish quota from the area south of 36°. As attainment in the southern area reached 80 or 90 percent of

the allocation, the quota would be shifted back to the south. Ms. Culver clarified that for Alternative S-1 (gear identifiers on QP) the opt-out status would be tied to the QS account rather than the permit or vessel. Ms. Doeringhaus indicated that Mr. Corey Niles (WDFW) had developed a way to track QP back to the originating QS accounts. This tracking could be used to qualify QS account owners for the one-time opt-out opportunity based on the link between QS accounts and vessels with gear switching history (an option in Alternative S-1).

### ***Implementation Challenges – Discussion***

Mr. Matt Dunlap made a presentation to the committee on the topic of potential implementation challenges (in part, summarizing information that was presented in SaMTAAC Agenda Item G, Attachment 1) and started by identifying the six databases they deal with:

1. Economic Data Collection Program data
2. Office of Law Enforcement declarations
3. Catch monitor data
4. E-tickets
5. West Coast Groundfish Observer Program Database
6. West Coast Region Permit Database

In general, the team he works with is ready to take on the challenges the alternatives present and had not yet identified any elements of the proposals that were not doable. However, the number and complexity of the current proposals was too great for a complete assessment. They will be in a better position to provide an assessment as the number of proposals are narrowed and better defined. Additionally, they are short on staffing at this time. The less complex proposals will be easier to implement and have less of a consequence for delivering current services and program costs. Some committee members suggested that the simpler the better, while others felt that, while an alternative might be more complex than would be liked, the priority should be on design a system that achieved the needed outcome.

### **Selection of Candidate Alternatives for Further Development and Analysis**

The alternatives under consideration by the SaMTAAC are summarized in table form in SaMTAAC Agenda Item H, Attachment 1 and described in full in Attachment 2. Friday morning, refinements to previous day proposals were submitted to the committee by Ms. Culver, Mr. Crabbe, Ms. Sommer, Mr. Dooley, Ms. Damrosch, and Mr. Alverson (those submissions are compiled as SaMTAAC Agenda Item H, Supplemental Attachment 3).

Alternatives S-8 (Sommer) and S-9 (Dooley) were merged (for a description of the original alternatives see each person’s detailed comments in SaMTAAC Agenda Item F, Attachment 1). For Alternative S-8/9, the provision that specified the exemption would expire with a change in the majority of ownership was changed to “any change in ownership,” because tracking changes in majority ownership would be difficult.

In terms of further development of many of the alternatives, it was noted that implications for how end-of-year QP carryover would be administrated will need to be considered.

For the proposals that would shift some quota from the north to the south each year, implementation details will need to be worked out with respect to the timing of the decisions to make the shift, the information available at the time, and the time it takes to implement the decision. Some sort of a biennial process might be considered, including the possibility of averaging across years.

Alternative S-3 would temporarily shift quota from south to north prior to the issuance of QP, therefore, the southern QP would be available in the north under whatever gear switching rules apply there. This alternative just addresses utilization of the southern quota, not limits on gear switching, and might be combined with one of the alternatives addressing the gear switching issue. Rather than a reallocation, this might be conceived of as a temporary shift until the fishery in the south develops. It was noted that one of the concerns in the south has been competition between the trawl and open access sector on the fishing grounds. The shift to the north might reduce the potential for such conflict.

The CAB-E proposal would allow individuals that owned their own QS to use the QP they receive to gear switch and limit gear switching by others. This requires a linkage between the vessel account and a QS account. This linkage could be established through a question asked at the time of annual permit renewal.

The committee decided that for a suite of alternatives, it would focus on: gear specific QP (trawl only or any gear) (Alternative S-1); a variation of reallocating some of the southern sablefish to the north prior to the issuance of QP (Alternative S-3); allowing southern QP to be used to the north but only with trawl gear (Alternative S-X); vessel exemption/endorsement and active trawler designations (a combination of Alternatives S-8 and S-9 ); a gear switching endorsement based on past gear switching activity (a combination of portions of CAB A and CAB F); and vessel exemption/endorsement with limits scaled based, in part, on QS owned (CAB E). These alternatives were compiled into SaMTAAC Agenda Item H, Supplemental Attachment 4. This suite of alternatives covers most of the variations that had been previously identified and would provide a basis for further refining and narrowing. It was noted that in the process of continuing to develop alternatives not every suboption had to be in every alternative.

## **Refinement of Alternatives**

After narrowing the alternatives, the committee worked through the alternatives, making refinements. A list of consideration for proposal design was provided as SaMTAAC Agenda Item I, Attachment 1.

For Alternative S-1 the committee added more date options for the conversion of “trawl only QP” to “any gear QP:” August 1 and October 1 (in addition to the original September 1 conversion date). Concerns with the September 1 date were that it might create a crunch before crab season and would not accommodate the ramp-up in gear-switching effort that tends to occur toward the end of the season (potentially compressing that ramp-up into a shorter period). August 1 might alleviate these concerns and October 1 will provide a further contrast.

For Alternative S-1, the committee also considered but voted to not provide a suboption that would eliminate the date on which “trawl only” would convert to “any gear.” Not having the conversion date would leave a portion of the QP as trawl-only, year-round. This was rejected



because the intent of the proposal was to not take the opportunity to gear switch away from those who might have invested in QS and equipment in order to gear switch. With the conversion date, their original opportunity would still be preserved for at least part of the year, even if they do not opt out of the gear designation for QP. Elimination of the date would run counter to the proposal as a whole. However, the proposals are at early stages of development and an option to remove the conversion date can be added back in at a later time.

Because the cost of getting the policy wrong would be high (particularly for some individuals), a 10 year sunset option was added to Alternative S-1. This option would require affirmative action on the part of the Council to continue the policy and a suboption was added to build in a review period prior to the sunset date. The possibility of tying the review of this policy to the next catch share review was discussed. Also, it was suggested that some evaluative metrics might be developed and published biennially in the SAFE document. The committee also discussed the possibility that a review and sunset provision for all of the alternatives might be appropriate.

Some concern was raised about the applicability of the published control date to the alternatives under consideration and, in particular, the opt-out qualification provisions of Alternatives S-1. The committee asked for a NOAA General Counsel opinion on the issue.

Under Alternative S-3, southern sablefish would be temporarily shifted to the north. There would be annual adjustments to the amount shifted to the north. Allocation might be moved back in the same increment by which it was moved to the north, as needed to accommodate any growth trends. This approach will impact those who hold southern sablefish QS and the analysis should identify the potential adverse impacts on those individuals and the operation of vessels they own, as well as the difficulty those individuals might have in obtaining additional quota. Committee members asked for an assessment of whether Alternative S-3 would incentivize the sale or a shift in the ownership of QS to the north.

Under Alternative S-3 and S-X, an evaluation will be needed on risks of exceeding northern ACLs. A 5-year hind cast might help in that evaluation. Also, the likely performance of the alternatives when there are dramatic changes in the ACLs from one year to the next should be evaluated (particularly, dramatic declines). It was suggested that a sunset clause be included under these alternatives to reassess their performance, but this was not included in the alternatives at this time.

For Alternative S-X, that would allow QP to be fished in the north, the committee considered but voted to reject a suboption that would have allowed the use of any gear to catch southern QP in the north (rather than limiting the use of those QP just to trawl gear, as proposed in the alternative). Advocates for the suboption said it would help rebuild the trawl industry by making it more likely the sablefish would be harvested, providing the flexibility for trawlers to use a gear that would generate greater revenue, and thus promoting the development of supporting infrastructure. The rationale for rejecting the proposed suboption was that the focus of the program was to benefit the trawl fishery and requiring the use of trawl gear for pounds shifted to the north would be more certain of directly benefiting those vessels, their multispecies strategies, and the communities which rely on them. While rejecting the suboption, it was agreed that it would be appropriate in the analysis to discuss allowing the use of any gear as a contrast to the proposal to restrict the usage to trawl only. Additionally, under the approach provided in S-3, it would be possible for any gear to use the quota shifted to the north.

Alternative S-8/9 is primarily intended to freeze the gear switching footprint as of the control date and allow it to be phased down or out over time, while preserving opportunity for active trawlers. The intent would be to make the changes in a manner that would be fair to fixed gear vessels and others that have made investments based on current provisions, while possibly avoiding the creation of a permanent gear-switching opportunity for vessels that do not trawl. At the same time, the options and potential values that are included could allow more gear switching. It was stated that the degree of limitation and whether or not to phase out gear switching for fixed gear vessels is a policy call that is not yet ready for decision.

For Alternative S-8/9, the committee considered but voted against a suboption that would have eliminated all gear switching after 10 years (by active trawlers as well as vessels that primarily use fixed gear). This would have been a bookend in line with one of the Groundfish Advisory Panel identified alternatives. While there were differing views as to the full intent of the original program, at a minimum it was intended to provide an opportunity for vessels that use primarily trawl gear to access sablefish with fixed gear in situations where other conditions affecting multispecies strategies might limit sablefish access. This intent is reflected in one of the principles adopted by the committee: “We want to maintain the gear switching option for trawl operations.”

Alternative S-8/9 includes phase-out of the gear-switching exemption endorsement. Three options were included (5, 10, and 15 years). Concern was expressed that time periods on the shorter end, e.g. 7 years, would be too short—some people would have to start making plans right away to leave the industry.

The committee agreed that CAB- E could be incorporated as a suboption in S-8/9. This option provides vessels an opportunity for gear-switching, depending on QS ownership, rather than solely based on previous year participation. Therefore, if someone had a bad year and did not qualify as an active trawler, they might still be able to engage in a gear-switching the following year.

CAB A/F would require vessels to qualify for an endorsement in order to gear switch. Concern was expressed that this might run counter to the principle related to maintaining gear switching option for all trawl vessels. As the discussion unfolded, it was noted that the principles were agreed to relatively rapidly and with good intent but the way some are worded, with black-and-white standards, may have unintended consequences. Part of the discussion centered around whether a trawler that had never gear-switched would be considered to have been left “whole” if the opportunity to gear switch in the future were eliminated. This was contrasted with Alternative S-8/9 which would provide every vessel that qualified as an active trawler the opportunity to gear switch. It was pointed out that under Alternative S-8/9 a person with QS that does not own a vessel would not be able to qualify their QP for gear-switching (although the QP could be sold to a vessel which then might use it for gear switching).

The alternatives as they stood at the end of the meeting are provided in Agenda Item I, Supplemental Attachment 2.

## **Finalization of Committee Report**

A committee progress report will be developed for the Council to be presented as an information report at the November 2018 Council meeting. It is not an action item for the Council.

### **Scheduling Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be scheduled for the Winter of 2019. A doodle poll will be sent out.

## **Analyses and Information Requested During the Meeting**

During committee discussion there were explicit requests or expressions of interest in the following analyses and information.

1. With respect to Dr. Haltuch's presentation, the committee requested additional information:
  - a. data on landings and biomass by region be presented in total metric tons (in addition to the percentages displayed in the report provided by Dr. Haltuch)
  - b. data on landings by region grouped by sector rather than gear, then, within the trawl sector, also show the breakout by gear (trawl/nontrawl).
  - c. additional information and discussion indicating the degree to which a mismatch between harvest and bioimass becomes a problem (as you go to finer scales there will always be more mismatches).
2. How much QS continues to be held by those who have sold their vessels?
3. In-depth analysis of QP market fluidity and availability, including amount of cash trades vs barter.
4. What is the monthly and total catch by trawlers that gear switch compared to vessels that only gear switch (also vessel counts and geographic distributions).
5. How much sablefish would it take to catch all the Dover at current catch rates?
6. What would the Dover price have to be to make up for the value of all sablefish caught or 50% of sablefish caught?
7. Show economic and multiplier effects by gear type for community
8. In terms of further development of several of the alternatives, it was noted that implications for how end-of-year QP carryover would be administrated will need to be considered.
9. What are the rules for changing ownership listed on a QS account (relevant to transfer provisions)?
10. Ask NOAA GC whether the control dates apply to all alternatives, particularly to the Alternative S-1 opt-out provisions.
11. For consideration of Alternative S-1, what percent of the gear switching occurs prior to September 1.
12. For the alternatives that would shift QP from south to north:
  - a. Historical analysis of utilization of the southern trawl allocation
  - b. How would the vessels that operate in the south (use southern QP) be affected and would they have difficulty obtaining additional quota?
  - c. Would the alternative incentivize the sale or a shift in the ownership of QS to the north?
  - d. Look at a 5-year hindcast on the probability of an ACL overage?
  - e. Consider what would happen if there was a major decrease in the ACL from one year to the next?
  - f. Identify an alternative means of specifying allocations so that ACLs would not be exceeded.
13. White paper on the differences between vessel and permit ownership (related to Alternative S-8/9). The analysis should look at equity and legal issues around alternatives that impose limits on a vessel as compared to a vessel owner, including a discussion of the mechanism that would be used to apply the limit to a vessel.
14. For Alternative S 8/9 how many vessels will qualify and what is the total amount of possible gear switching by those vessels given different gear switching limits.

**Attachments:**

- Agenda Item A, Attachment 1: Committee Charge and Calendar
- Agenda Item B, Attachment 1: Sablefish Management and Trawl Allocation Attainment Committee (SaMTAAC)
- Agenda Item B, Attachment 2: Sablefish Management and Trawl Allocation Attainment Committee (SaMTAAC) (POWERPOINT)
- Agenda Item C, Attachment 1: Other Analysis
- Agenda Item D, Attachment 1: Where Do We Want to Go?
- Agenda Item F, Attachment 1: SaMTAAC Responses to Top-Five Exercise
- Agenda Item G, Attachment 1: Implementation Challenges
- Agenda Item H, Attachment 1: Summary Table of Alternatives
- Agenda Item H, Attachment 2: Proposal Descriptions
- Agenda Item H, Supplemental Attachment 3: Day 2 - Morning Proposal Modifications Provided by SaMTAAC Members
- Agenda Item H, Supplemental Attachment 4: Draft – Narrowed Proposal Descriptions (As of Noon: October 12, 2018)
- Agenda Item I, Attachment 1: Design Elements for Limited Access Alternatives
- Agenda Item I, Supplemental Attachment 2: Draft – Narrowed Proposal Descriptions (As of End of Day: October 12, 2018)

**Cross Index of Alternatives**

After completion of the October SaMTAAC meeting, the alternatives were renumbered. The following is a cross index from the alternative numbers discussed in these summary minutes to the numbering that will be used in the next phase of developing alternatives.

October 2018 Alt Numbers	Post Oct 2018 Alt Numbers	Short Titles
S-1	3	Gear Specific QP and LE Permit Owner Opt-out Options
S-3	1	Temporarily Shifting Trawl Sablefish South Allocation to the North
S-X	2	Allow Some Southern QP to Be Harvested as Far North as 42°
S-8/9	4	Action Alternative 4: Active Trawl or Exempted Vessel Designation Required for Gear Switching
CAB-A/F	5	Gear Switching Endorsement
CAB-E	Incorporated as option in Alt 4	Gear Switching Limits Based on QS Ownership