

COUNCIL JUNE ACTIONS ON THE TRAWL RATIONALIZATION ALTERNATIVES (07/11/07)

At its June 2007 meeting, the Council made the following modifications to the trawl rationalization alternatives (alternatives for Amendment 20 to the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan). Documents referenced can be found under Agenda Item E.9 of the Council's June briefing book materials: <http://www.pcouncil.org/bb/2007/bb0607.html#E9>.

IFQ Alternative

The following are the sections in which changes were made as compared to the alternative approved by the Council at its March 2007 meeting: http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/gfifq/Twl_Rat_Alt_070414.pdf.

Descriptions of the changes approved by the Council are provided for each section. A revised set of alternatives will be posted soon.

Section A-1.1 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Add an option for the whiting sectors under which individual fishing quota (IFQ) would be used for whiting but bycatch species would be managed using bycatch caps (bycatch pools). If there is a single shoreside sector (shoreside nonwhiting and whiting trips combined into a single sector) the new option would not apply to whiting trips for the shoreside sector.

Section A-1.2 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Eliminate the option for geographically subdividing IFQ management units to levels finer than specified in the acceptable biological catch/optimum yield table as part of the trawl rationalization amendment. Direct staff to fully develop options that specify the methods to be followed if management areas subdivided or area management lines moved after an IFQ program is implemented. (Section A-2.1)

Section A-1.3. Allocation of groundfish among the trawl sectors will be determined as part of the Amendment 21 intersector allocation process (initial allocation of quota shares [QS] among initial recipients will be addressed as part of the Amendment 20 trawl rationalization program).

Section A-1.4 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Recommended language adjustment, no change in policy effect.

Section A-1.5 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Add options specifying how bycatch species in the whiting fishery would be managed if IFQ are not used for these species (see Section A-1.1). The bycatch management options specified for the co-op programs (pages 38 and 39 of E.9.a Attachment 2) will be considered for management of the bycatch caps under the IFQ alternative. Bycatch species would be pooled and managed with bycatch caps. The pools may be for all whiting sectors combined or for each whiting sector (option to be chosen). The options for management of the caps include the possibility of midseason rollover of unused bycatch from one sector to another (or not having a rollover), and the possibility of mid-season releases of portions of the bycatch cap (or not providing for such releases).

Section A-2.1.2 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Eliminate the recent participation requirement with respect to allocation of QS to owners of limited entry permits. Specify for motherships a recent participation requirement of 1,000 mt in each of any two years from 1998 through 2004.

Section A-2.1.3

- For permits with catcher vessel history, add an allocation formula option that would allocate QS to permits based entirely on permit delivery history (the option for equal sharing of the QS pool associated with buyback permits will also be maintained, i.e. keep Options 1 and 2 listed in Section A-2.1.3 of E.9.a, Attachment 2).
- Modify overfished species Option 2 to specify that 2003-2006 fleet average effort distributions and bycatch rates will be applied to permit specific allocations of target species QS to determine the amount of overfished species QS that would be allocated to each recipient (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2).
- For permits with catcher processor history, eliminate the option that would be based on unanimous consent of the sector (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2).
- For shoreside processors apply the same overfished species allocation options developed for the permits with catch history. If bycatch in the whiting fishery is not managed with IFQ then whiting deliveries will not count toward a processor's history of bycatch species (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2).

Section A-2.1.6 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Direct staff to develop for consideration options for the reallocation of QS when a species moves to or from overfished status.

Section A-2.2.1.

- Direct the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) to continue working on some options that would specify minimum amounts of quota pounds that a vessel would need to have in its account prior to departure from port (as per page 1 of E.9.c, Supplemental GMT Report 2).
- Change the alternative to allow vessels more than 30 days to cover an overage without incurring a violation so long as the overage is within the carryover allowance (as per page 3 in E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report).

Section A-2.2.3.

- Eliminate the section on liens (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). This is a matter of private contract and options for special provisions to facilitate the placement of liens are specified in Section A-2.3.1 (creation of a central lien registry).
- Include the new language specifying how the own-or-control accumulation limits will be applied (the individual and collective rule) (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Also, make the following adjustments to footnote t: increase the shoreside whiting control limit options to 10%, 15%, and 25%; and eliminate the reference to the 50% rule for ownership affiliation (as per page 4 in E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report).

Section A-2.3.1. Pursue a process that will consider creation of an electronic logbook system and allowing vessels to split loads between different delivery locations (as per page 3 in E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report).

Section A-2.4

- Add options pertaining to QS allocated for processing history
 - Option: Specify that such shares will expire after a certain number of years (as indicated in Item 1 in Section A-2.4 of E.9.a, Attachment 2).
 - Option: Specify that such shares will not be allocated to entities if the result would be that the recipient would receive shares in excess of the accumulation limits (as indicated in Item 2 in Section A-2.4 of E.9.a, Attachment 2).
- The Council rejected Item 3 in Section A-2.4. Item 4 of that section was accepted and is covered here in the following description of the Adaptive Management provision.

Section A-3 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2 except eliminate the 10-year sunset). Add an adaptive management option that would allow up to 10% of the trawl allocation to be used to create incentives to adjust for program impacts and unanticipated consequences. Such quota pounds could also be auctioned off to generate funds to compensate processing companies that demonstrate they have been harmed by the IFQ program (as indicated in Section A-2.4 Item 4).

Section A-4 (as indicated in E.9.a, Attachment 2). Add Individual Halibut Bycatch Quota (IBQ) as an option. Retention will not be allowed. (Section A-4)

Co-op Alternative

The Council adopted for analysis the co-op alternative as presented in E.9.a, Attachment 2 with the following adjustments.

Mothership Co-op Program

Add an option to allow whiting endorsements and the associated catch history to be transferred as a whole from one limited entry trawl permit to another (as per page 5 in E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report).

In the section on “Movement Between Mothership,” eliminate Option B. Option B would have allowed vessels to move between motherships without spending any time the non-co-op fishery.

Shoreside Co-op Program

Allow whiting endorsements and the associated catch history to be transferred as a whole from one limited entry trawl permit to another (as per page 5 in E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report).

In the section on “Co-op Formation and Structure,” where “Date range to be determined” is indicated, specify the following options: Years Option 1, 2001; Years Option 2, 2000; Years Option 3, 2000 to 2003. In the same section, replace the last sentence of the first paragraph with Options 1 and 2, as listed on page 5 of E.9.c, Supplemental TIQC Report. Option 1 specifies that in the early years of the program, in order to move between processors, vessels are required to participate for a period of time in the non-co-op fishery. Option 2 applies this requirement for the entire duration of the program.

Over the summer, NMFS will be developing a set of alternatives for tracking and monitoring IFQs and address issues related to program implementation costs and fee structures. NOAA General Council will address legal questions pertaining to the alternatives.

F:\PFMC\MEETING\2007\June\Groundfish\0706_NL_TRat_DecisionList.doc