



C4 BSAI Pacific Cod Trawl CV Analysis

February 2019

Action Memo

- Staff: Jon McCracken
- Other Presenters: Darrell Brannan (Brannan & Associates), Mike Downs (Wislow Research Associates LLC)
- Action Required:
1. Initial Review Draft of RIR and SIA– review
 2. Determine which alternatives will move forward
 3. Select preliminary preferred alternatives – as appropriate
 4. Consider options for Alternative 5

BACKGROUND

At this meeting, the Council is scheduled to review the initial review draft to limit activity in the BSAI Pacific cod trawl fishery. During its June 2018 meeting the Council adopted a purpose and need statement and alternatives for the proposed limitation action. Limitations considered for the catcher-processors include licensing certain Amendment 80 catcher/processers and non-Amendment 80 catcher/processers to act as a mothership when receiving Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) non-community development quota (CDQ) Pacific cod deliveries from trawl catcher vessels, limit the amount of BS Pacific cod that could be delivered to the catcher-processors, and limit retired Amendment 80 catcher-processors from acting as a mothership in the BSAI and Gulf of Alaska (GOA). Catcher vessels would be limited by creating a BSAI trawl CV Pacific cod endorsement that would be required for any BSAI trawl LLP license to be used to harvest Pacific cod from the BSAI non-CDQ Pacific cod trawl catcher vessel sector allocation. The intent of this proposed action is to address the activity of vessels acting as motherships in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery and to improve the prosecution of the fishery by increasing the value of the fishery through limiting entry of vessels that have not participated or have not recently participated in the fishery.

The analysis is structured somewhat differently than other initial review documents presented to the Council. Five of the six action alternatives have been analyzed with the intent of meeting the requirements of a decision document. The remaining action alternative (Alternative 5) is included for discussion only, since specific options for analysis have not yet been provided by the Council. Therefore, the Council may either develop options for Alternative 5 and schedule another initial review for the entire package or bifurcate the alternative from the analysis. In the latter case, the Council would determine whether the remaining alternatives have been sufficiently analyzed (after requested modifications) and schedule all or a subset of those alternatives for public review, with any alternatives that are not ready for final action removed from this amendment package and pursued in a separate document. For example, Alternatives 2, 3, and 6 could be selected and moved forward, with changes requested by the Council incorporated in a public review draft, and Alternative 4 could either remain with those alternatives or be moved into a separate analysis and placed on its own time-line with Alternative 5. Depending on the options, if any, developed for Alternative 5, the new amendment package would likely require an Environmental Assessment (at a minimum) in addition to a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR).

Catcher-processor actions

Alternative 2 limits the number of catcher-processors that may take directed BSAI Pacific cod deliveries from catcher vessels in the future. Different options are considered for Amendment 80 catcher-processors and non-Amendment 80 catcher-processors. Depending on the option selected between one and seven Amendment 80 catcher-processors could qualify and one non-Amendment 80 catcher-processor would qualify.

Alternative 3 would limit the total amount of Bering Sea non-CDQ Pacific cod that could be delivered to catcher-processors acting as a mothership. The amount is determined by the percentage of BS non-CDQ Pacific cod delivered to those catcher-processors during defined qualifying years. The limit would be managed as a sideboard and the intent is that incidental catches of Pacific cod would not restrict catcher vessel deliveries to catcher-processors acting as a mothership in other target fisheries.

Alternative 6 prohibits replaced Amendment 80 vessels from participating in either the GOA or BSAI fisheries as a mothership. This Alternative could be selected in conjunction with Alternative 2 to ensure that any past Amendment 80 vessel could not be used as a processing platform in the North Pacific fisheries.

Catcher vessel actions

Alternative 4 would assign a Pacific cod trawl catcher vessel endorsement to BSAI groundfish LLP licenses with a trawl endorsement based on recent participation as a trawl catcher vessel in the Pacific cod fishery. That endorsement would be required to harvest directed Pacific cod from the Bering Sea or Aleutian Islands non-CDQ trawl catcher vessel sector allocation. The options considered require only targeted Pacific cod landing during the qualifying period, so more LLP licenses would qualify for the endorsement than have fished during any one year.

Alternative 5

Alternative 5 could be structured so that it has both catcher-processor and catcher vessel implications. The Council will need to provide further direction on elements and options to consider or provide a focused request for a discussion paper before additional progress can be made by staff on the alternative.