

## California Dungeness Crab Task Force

### UPDATED Options for the Composition of a Dungeness Crab Industry-Representative Body

*Drafted by the DCTF Admin Team; updated March 21, 2017*

In the January [2016](#) and [2017](#) reports, the California Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF) indicated there was value in continuing the DCTF or another industry-representative body beyond 2019 when the DCTF is set to sunset per Fish and Game Code 8276.4. Various DCTF Members expressed interest in revisiting the structure and procedures of the DCTF to inform a recommendation for what a future industry-representative body should look like. A number of options were discussed during the October 2016 DCTF meeting and at prior DCTF meetings and Executive Committee conference calls, but DCTF Members requested additional time to discuss options with their constituents.

**This document has been developed as a tool to capture options currently under consideration by the DCTF Executive Committee as of March 14, 2017. The options in this document (or other options developed prior to the DCTF's final vote) will be discussed during an upcoming DCTF Executive Committee call in April 2017 and are expected to be voted on during the next DCTF meeting.** DCTF Members are expected to share these options with their constituents and be ready to make a final recommendation at the next DCTF meeting.

#### Overview

In the January 2017 report, the DCTF identified a number of components that will be important to clarify for any future industry-representative body including the purpose of the body, frequency of elections, and voting.

- **Purpose:** The DCTF identified the priorities of an industry-representative organization should be to inform fisheries management, be responsive to high profile and policy issues, serve as a conduit of information to/from the fleet to the Legislature, CDFW, and the Fish and Game Commission, identify industry research priorities, and serve as a source for public relations efforts related to industry issues. At this time, the DCTF is not interested in a future industry-representative organization addressing commodity marketing or pricing as part of its charge.
- **Elections:** The DCTF supports new elections of commercial fishing representatives as soon as feasible (i.e., funding dependent). The DCTF recommends an election every 3 years among permit holders to ensure fresh perspectives are added to the body, while also maintaining institutional knowledge. Alternates would be requested to attend all meetings. The details of how elections will be carried out will be determined at a later date.
- **DCTF Voting Structure:** The DCTF supports maintaining the 2/3 voting structure (where  $\frac{2}{3}$  of Members must agree for a recommendation to move forward) to ensure DCTF recommendations represent the majority of the body and not the views of a single management area.

A number of considerations still need to be addressed should the DCTF continue beyond 2019 including the composition of the body (including commercial fishing seats, along with sport/recreational fishing, commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV), processing, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), science advisor(s), and other seats), the need for term limits, how elections will be carried out, etc. Below are suggestions that have been developed to-date regarding the composition of the DCTF. Suggestions for other components of the body or other options for the composition of the body are welcome and should be emailed to [info@dungenesscrabtaskforce.com](mailto:info@dungenesscrabtaskforce.com) so they may be made available to the full DCTF for consideration.

**Options of Composition of an Industry-Representative Body**

*Commercial Fishing Seats*

The options below reflect the discussion from the March 14, 2017 DCTF Executive Committee conference call. During the call the Executive committee agreed to remove various options from the DCTF’s consideration as they were “non-starters” for various ports and were not an efficient use of the DCTF’s time for continued discussion. In addition to these options, one Executive Committee member supported tying commercial fishing seats to production/landings. The mechanisms of that option should be further fleshed out if the DCTF wishes to explore it further.

| Port Area                             | Number of Commercial Fishing Seats |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                       | Option A<br>Current DCTF Structure | Option F<br>Even seating north and south of<br>Sonoma- Mendocino County line,<br>one Nonresident seat | Option G<br>Even seating north and south of Sonoma-<br>Mendocino County line, two additional<br>Nonresident seats |
| Nonresident                           | 1                                  | 1   | 2   |
| Crescent City                         | 4                                  | 3   | 3   |
| Trinidad                              | 1                                  | 1   | 1   |
| Eureka                                | 2                                  | 2   | 2   |
| Fort Bragg                            | 2                                  | 2   | 2   |
| Bodega Bay                            | 2                                  | 2   | 2   |
| San Francisco                         | 2                                  | 2   | 2   |
| Half Moon Bay                         | 2                                  | 2   | 2   |
| South of Half Moon Bay                | 1                                  | 2   | 2   |
| <b>TOTAL Commercial Fishing Seats</b> | <b>17</b>                          | <b>17</b>   | <b>18</b>   |

### *Non-Commercial Fishing Seats*

DCTF Members have expressed support for continuing to include non-commercial fishermen on an industry-representative body to ensure various perspectives are included and inform the body's discussions. However, there will be a need to ensure that representation and the roles (i.e., voting versus non-voting) of those representatives are clarified to ensure the focus of the body is upheld.

- Should **sport/recreational fishermen, CPFVs, and/or processors** be included on the industry-representative body?
  - If yes, should they be voting or non-voting seats? How many of each should be on the body? How should they be appointed or elected?
  - If no, why?
- Should advisors from **California Sea Grant/scientists, CDFW, the Legislature, and/or nongovernmental organizations** (e.g., port and harbor associations, environmental groups, etc.) be included as non-voting representatives?
  - If yes, how should they be appointed or elected? How many of each should be on the body?
  - If no, why?

### **Key Considerations**

As DCTF Members and the public review these options (and potentially develop alternative options), a number of key ideas and questions should be considered.

- *Composition*
  - The larger the DCTF gets, the more difficult it is for the group to be responsive to issues as they arise since it will be difficult to convene the group.
  - What is the incentive for sport, CPFV, and processing representatives to participate and attend meetings if they are non-voting seats?
- *Elections*
  - How should representatives be replaced between elections (i.e., if someone is to retire, sell their boat, etc.)?
  - Who should be responsible for coordinating and carrying out elections?
- *Alternates*
  - Should alternates be permitted?
  - How are alternates selected/appointed/elected?
- *Procedures*
  - Should there be term limits to elected representatives? Non-voting representatives?
  - How frequently should the body meet (both in-person and via conference call)?
  - How can Members be more effective in reaching their constituents?

### **Sunsetting Fish and Game Code Provisions**

In 2019, various Dungeness crab regulations in the California Fish and Game code will be sunseting. The legislature would appreciate guidance from the DCTF about these provisions including sections:

- 8276.2- Crab quality testing, sale of crab meat to fund quality testing, CDFW Director authority to delay districts 6, 7, 8, and 9

- 8276.3- Crab may not be taken from districts 6, 7, 8, and 9 in the event of a delay, 64 hour presoak
- 8276.4- Dungeness Crab Task Force
- 8276.5- Commercial Dungeness Crab Trap Limit Program
- 8279.1- Fair start
- 8280.1- Limited entry, qualifications to own a commercial Dungeness crab vessel permit
- 8280.2- Issuing and renewing commercial Dungeness crab vessel permits
- 8280.3- Transferability of commercial Dungeness crab vessel permits
- 8280.4- State's ability to revoke permits
- 8280.5- Dungeness crab review panel to review permits for limited entry program
- 8280.6- Permit fees

DCTF Members are encouraged to prioritize section codes for discussion. The DCTF Executive Committee may discuss these sections and develop initial proposal(s) for full DCTF consideration.