



## **~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~**

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

### **DCTF MEETING UKIAH, CALIFORNIA March 12, 2012 FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this meeting summary is to:

- Inform all Members of the Dungeness crab task force (DCTF) and the wider public of ongoing work of the DCTF
- Provide a summary of discussions and outcomes from the March 12, 2012 DCTF meeting held in Ukiah, California

8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

#### **ATTENDEES**

Jim Anderson, F/V Alliane  
John Atkinson Jr, F/V New Rayann  
David Bennett, F/V Lee Ann  
Geoff Bettencourt, F/V Moriah Lee  
Bill Blue, F/V Morning Light  
Chuck Cappotto, F/V Rosella  
Bill Carvalho, Wild Planet Fisheries  
Lawrence Collins, F/V Autumn Gale  
David Crabbe, Environmental Defense Fund  
Vince Doyle, F/V Verna Jean  
Lt. Bob Farrell, CA Department of Fish and Game  
Marc Gorelnik, Sport Fishing  
Gerry Hemmingsen, F/V Pollux  
Christy Juhasz, CA Department of Fish and Game  
Chris Lawson, F/V Seaward  
Don Standley, F/V Terry S and F/V One and All  
Roger Thomas, F/V Salty Lady, Golden Gate Fishermen's Association  
Lee Wilson, F/V Gold Coast  
Jim Yarnall, Sport Fishing  
John Yearwood, F/V Abe  
Todd Whaley, F/V Dynamik  
Craig Goucher, Alternate for Mike Zamboni, F/V Luck  
Rich Shepherd, Alternate for Brett Fahning, F/V Rogue

#### **ABSENT**

Michael Cunningham, F/V Sally K  
Paul Johnson, Monterey Fish Market  
Carrie Pomeroy, CA Sea Grant  
Richard Young, California Association of Harbor Masters and Port Captains

#### **DCTF ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM PRESENT**

Rachelle Fisher, Strategic Earth Consulting  
Kelly Sayce, Strategic Earth Consulting  
Moira McEnespy, Ocean Protection Council



**Monday March 12, 2012- 8:30am to 5:00pm**

*1. Welcome, introductions, agenda review*

Rachelle Fisher welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the rest of the Dungeness crab task force (DCTF) Administrative Team (Admin Team)- Kelly Sayce and Moira McEnespy. Ms. Fisher explained the meeting would be recorded (via a hand held voice recorder). However, as allowed by the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act, all recordings will be deleted 10 days<sup>1</sup> after the meeting. In addition to the recording, a draft meeting summary will be made available to the DCTF and the public approximately one week after each meeting. The summary will be reviewed by the DCTF for accuracy, updated as needed, and a “final” version will be reposted to the [DCTF website](#).

Ms. Fisher informed the DCTF that there was a lot to be discussed during the meeting, and she requested the task force’s full cooperation to address all agenda items. Ms. Fisher reminded all attendees the meeting is a working meeting of the DCTF, and there would be opportunity for public involvement but the DCTF gets priority during discussions. DCTF Members (Members) are permitted to call on the public to resolve questions and there will also be designated times available for public comment.

Ms. Fisher asked all Members and public participants to introduce themselves. Upon completion of introduction, Ms. Fisher provided an overview of the meeting’s agenda.

*2. Discussion of DCTF process and approach including the requirements of SB 369*

Ms. Fisher provided a brief background on the history of the DCTF, Senate Bill (SB) 1690, and SB 369. She explained with the re-establishment of the DCTF through SB 369, the charge of the DCTF has changed. In addition to all items previously highlighted in SB 1690 (including commercial and sport regulations, the need for a permanent advisory committee, etc.), the DCTF is now charged with reviewing and providing feedback on the tiered trap limit program established in SB 369. The new changes to the DCTF’s purpose have been highlighted in the proposed amendments to the DCTF charter.

Ms. Fisher read the meeting ground rules from the DCTF charter and asked the task force if they had any additions. There were no additions. Ms. Fisher asked for all Members to agree to abide by these ground rules. All Members agreed. Ms. Fisher requested the public also abide by these ground rules.

Ms. Fisher briefly described the Bagley Keene Open Meetings Act and explained all DCTF procedures and work will be in accordance of the Act.

Ms. Fisher explained a draft meeting summary will be made available to the DCTF after the meeting. The DCTF will have one week to review it for accuracy before it is deemed “final.” The same procedure will be used for all DCTF meetings and final reports, including the upcoming May 1 report to the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) on the commercial Dungeness crab fishery statewide trap limit program.

---

<sup>1</sup> Correction: audio recordings will be deleted 30 days after each meeting as per the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act.



## ~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

Ms. Sayce discussed the public's involvement in the DCTF meeting. The meetings are working meetings of the DCTF that are open to the public. Public comment will be allowed to provide comment during each agenda item, including when there is action that will be taken. Public comment provided for an agenda item is to be directly related to the agenda item actively being discussed. There is also a general public comment period on the agenda. Any member of the public wishing to speak on an agenda item or during general comment was asked to fill out a public comment card. Throughout the meeting, the DCTF may call on members of the public to help with clarifications and answer questions.

### 3. *Review revisions to [DCTF charter](#) and [associated materials](#)*

Ms. Fisher explained the Charter was created to establish DCTF operating procedures. It was amended to be in compliance with SB 369. She walked through the proposed amendments and briefly discussed the proposed changes.

Ms. Fisher highlighted the DCTF is required to produce two (2) reports: an initial report in 2015 and a final report in 2017. The reports will contain recommendations for the California State Legislature (Legislature), California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), and California Department of Fish and Game's (DFG) consideration. The DCTF solely produces recommendations and is not a decision-making body.

Ms. Fisher described the DCTF voting procedures. She explained Members can only vote in person at official DCTF meetings. If a Member cannot be present then an Alternate may vote in his or her place. Each Member is encouraged to select an Alternate. There are two (2) types of votes: Administrative votes or votes pertaining to the requirements of SB 369. Administrative votes are votes on issues pertaining to logistics. They require a simple majority. Votes pertaining to issues in SB 369 require 15 affirmative votes to pass. Straw polls are non-binding and are only used as tools. Voting procedures are available in the charter.

One Member requested clarification on what constituted a quorum and how many affirmative votes were needed to approve an action. Ms. Fisher explained 15 votes were required to pass a vote as explained in SB 369.

Ms. Fisher opened the floor for discussion. Larry Collins moved to accept the amendments to the Charter. Gerry Hemmingsen seconded. The Administrative Team asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

**ACTION:** *Consideration and possible adoption of amendments to the DCTF Charter (previously approved September 2009).* **APPROVED**

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Carvalho, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None



## ~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

4. *Presentation and discussion of [proposed regulations](#) for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery statewide trap limit program. DCTF port and organizational caucuses and/or workgroups may be convened to refine and discuss proposed management measures.*

The Administrative Team opened the floor for **public comment**:

- Larry Thevik, WA Dungeness crab fisherman- Requested the DCTF to reconsider their recommendation to exclude out of state landings from the California trap tier program. He expressed concern the DCTF actions would undermine cooperation and cooperative agreements between Washington, Oregon, and California including the 1980 MOU and HR 3498. He explained the Magnuson-Stevens Act provides interim authority to the states that may be taken away if the three states do not cooperate. He believes the DCTF's recommended pot limit program is in violation of federal authority law and appears to not be cooperative. [Click here for Mr. Thevik's written statement](#)
- Ray Toste, WA Dungeness Crab Fisherman's Association- Explained he worked on LE 200 which was intended to improve some of the issues surrounding the fishery. He believes LE 200 and Interim Authority has had a positive effect on the fishery. He expressed concern that unilateral action by one state can cause LE 200 and Interim Authority to be overturned such that the federal government will begin running the commercial Dungeness crab fishery which would be "a disaster". [Click here for Mr. Toste's written statement](#)
- Thane Tienson, Attorney, WA Dungeness Crab Fisherman's Association- Expressed concern about the fairness, propriety, and legality of the Dungeness crab trap limit established in SB 369. He explained California is giving preference to in-state citizens, which has federal and constitutional implications. Landings from all three states should be considered in the program. He suggested the pot limit program be revised so tri-state landings are considered and said nobody wants the matter to proceed to a lawsuit regarding discrimination against out of state permit holders. [Click here for Mr. Tienson's written statement](#)
- Danny Murray, California Dungeness Crab Fisherman- Questioned why landings from 2009 to the present aren't considered and asked what process would be in place for him to be able to increase his assigned trap limit, such as stacking permits. He inquires as to whether he could lease traps from another permit holder and hoped those questions would be addressed.

A DCTF Member read additional comments from [Zach Rotwein, California Dungeness crab fisherman](#), and [Mike Zamboni, DCTF Member](#).

Ms. Fisher reminded meeting participants the DCTF makes recommendations to DFG, the Legislature, and the Commission.

Lt. Bob Farrell, DFG, presented [DFG's proposed Title 14 regulations for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery statewide trap limit program](#) and discussed each slide with the DCTF. He explained the draft regulations mirror SB 369. DFG also considered Oregon and Washington laws when developing the draft Title 14 regulations.



## **Section 1. Dungeness Crab Trap Tags, Department Issued Buoy Tags, and Trap and Buoy Tag Allocations.**

Lt. Farrell explained the difference between a trap tag and buoy tag. The task force discussed the information that should be required to be on each trap tag. Two Members suggested changing “operator contact” to general contact information since some people have vessel name, corporation name, or nickname on their trap tags.

One Member requested there be a specification in the regulations about when buoy tags would be sent out (i.e. date) so fishermen have ample time to get their gear ready for the season. One Member explained that adding a deadline was moot because if there were a deadline for the tags to be distributed in the regulations, there would be no penalties to hold DFG accountable. Another Member explained adding a date like this would be complicated considering not everyone pays license fees on time. Members explained they would like to receive tags no later than August 30. A representative from DFG explained tags will be ordered from a vendor and that it is currently unclear when the tags will be available each year to be distributed. DFG will investigate this issue further and may be able to revisit this discussion at the next DCTF meeting.

Lt. Farrell discussed the buoy tags. He explained that permit holders are required to buy all of their allocated buoy tags every year or their permit will be void. Similar to Oregon and Washington, each tier will have a different color buoy tag and that replacement tags will also be a different color. Buoy tags would all be sequentially numbered. One Member expressed concern about the buoy tags being sequentially numbered especially when applying for replacement tags. Further discussion on replacement tags was tabled until later in the day.

Lt. Farrell explained that in Sections 1(b), numbers 3 and 4 would be replaced with new language that says that a commercial trap with a buoy tag cannot be used to fish recreationally. Commercial fishing vessels will not be able to carry recreational traps or fish recreationally. Members of the public requested clarification for why these regulations were in place. The DCTF generally agreed that they felt it would be unfair for commercial fishermen to also be able to fish recreationally.

Lt. Farrell discussed the trap tier allocation and explained that it came directly from SB 369. He further explained that permits cannot be stacked and vessels may not fish more traps than they have been allocated. One Member asked for clarification about what the landings cut offs would be for each tier and explained that having that information made available as soon as possible would potentially reduce the number of appeals. A representative from DFG explained that each permit holder was sent a letter asking them to verify the landings DFG had on file so that DFG has the most accurate information on file. Permit holders were given an April 30, 2012<sup>th</sup> deadline to report back to DFG. Therefore, this question cannot be answered until after that process is completed. It was further explained that these numbers may not be released until after the regulations are implemented. The appeal process was explained and it was clarified that the appeals process will not impact the initial trap limit allocations.

## **Section 2. Waiver for a Permitted Dungeness Crab Vessel to Retrieve Another Vessel’s Dungeness Crab Traps**



## **~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~**

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

The task force discussed the process to handle another person's gear and obtain a waiver to retrieve another person's gear. The draft regulations specify no traps will be allowed on a commercial vessel without a commercial trap tag. Members discussed adding provisions to allow someone to pick up derelict gear and suggested allowing six (6) untagged traps (or tagged with someone else's information) would be acceptable.

One Member suggested there be a provision that allows everyone to pick up anyone else's gear at the end of the season to help with issues with lost gear. The Department agreed that lost gear is an issue, however it is not something that can be handled in the trap limit program. Instead, the DCTF should review this in future discussions.

Lt. Farrell explained that a written waiver may be granted to allow retrieval and transport to shore of traps and associated gear provided that: 1) a permitted vessel is either destroyed due to fire, capsizing, or sinking, or non-operational due to major mechanical failure; or 2) circumstances beyond the control of the permit holder created undue hardship. Requests for a waiver, including proof of vessel and/or personal hardship would be required to be submitted to DFC. Each permit holder is limited to one waiver request per fishing season. Any permit holder that is granted a waiver cannot retain any Dungeness crab when retrieving another permit holders' traps.

The task force continued to discuss waivers and provisions to allow fishermen to retrieve or move someone else's gear, specifically in the cases of personal hardship. A representative from DFG expressed concern that if the correct regulations are not in place, people will be able to fish outside their trap allocation by fishing someone else's gear. One Member stated that when he fell ill, it was helpful to have a fellow fisherman bring in his gear and sell his crab for him. Another Member stated that unless the ability to retain the crabs from another person's gear is in place, it would be impossible to assist someone in retrieving their gear since they will need to recoup the cost of the trip to get the traps.

Members expressed concern about needing a waiver from DFG before moving another person's gear. Several Members stated it would be impossible to get a waiver from DFG in times when there is a small weather window available to move the gear. DFG suggested fisherman call a designated DFG warden or staff member directly when there is an emergency. Members believed someone from DFG may not always be available. DFG explained the agency has latitude to try to get immediate action for when emergencies happen. DFG further explained different protocols may be needed for moving gear in a personal hardship versus other types of emergencies (i.e. inclement weather). An individual hardship (i.e. a health emergency) should require a written request while weather-related emergency could be handled by phone. DFG requested the DCTF to consider a number of options.

The task force discussed additional options for retrieving gear:

- A one-time waiver could be issued to a permit holder that would allow someone to retrieve his/her gear and keep the crab. However, the traps could not be fished for the remainder of the season.



- A warden would do a hold inspection on the vessel retrieving the gear, the crab may not be retained, and the traps may be fished again during the season. This waiver could be issued multiple times in a season OR issued once in a season.
- The permit holder with the hardship can hire someone else to operate his/her vessel. In this case, no waiver would be necessary since the traps being retrieved are associated with the vessel retrieving them.

The DCTF decided to table decisions and further discussion on this issue until the next meeting.

A Member of the public suggested removing the term “licensed” from all mentions of marine surveyors throughout the regulations since a person does not need a license to be a surveyor. DCTF Members unanimously agreed.

### **Section 3. Biennial Dungeness Crab Trap Limit Permit.**

Lt. Farrell explained this section requires permit holders to purchase a biennial Dungeness crab trap limit permit. He explained DFG is unable to remove the biennial fee from the trap limit program since it was established by SB 369. One Member explained the original intent was the Dungeness crab trap limit permit fee would disappear after two years and was only intended to assist DFG in start-up costs of the program. DFG explained all fees from this program will be placed into a dedicated account. DFG can provide an accounting of the balance in the Dungeness Crab Account and apply any surplus towards the trap limit fee structure. One member of the public point out according to SB 369, the Director may consider a recommendation by the DCTF to reconsider the fee structure. DFG explained the DCTF would have an opportunity to revisit this issue and make further recommendations on the fee structure in 2015 and 2017. Two Members of the DCTF requested there be a vote so the record shows the DCTF does not approve of a permanent trap limit permit fee.

### **Section 4. Replacement Procedures for Lost Dungeness Crab Department Issued Buoy Tags.**

Lt. Farrell discussed the process for obtaining replacement tags and explained permit holders could not replace more tags than were initially allocated. Members discussed alternatives to DFG’s proposed procedures for replacement tags. Alternatives for consideration included:

- Allow permit holders to replace 10-25% of tags each season with “generic,” non-numbered tags
- Send permit holders a complete set of buoy tags each year
- Use a sticker system on the buoy tags
- Use a hybrid system where permit holders could purchase 10% of their allocation in “generic” replacement tags at the beginning of the season; at the end of the season, each permit holder will send DFG a list of all of the numbered tags that are missing. “Generic” replacement tags from the previous year will be void and permit holders will be allowed to replace as many tags within their tier allocation.

One Member stated Oregon allows permit holders to purchase up to 10% of their allocation in replacement tags 30 days into each season. A member of the public stated the last option was similar to the system used in Washington. A representative from DFG explained provisions can be added so every permit holder would be made whole between seasons. However, once a buoy



tag is reported lost, that tag will be void even if later found. The DFG representative further explained a full accounting of tags at the end of the season will facilitate getting gear out of the water at the season's conclusion.

### **Section 5. Appeal of Dungeness Crab Trap and Buoy Tag Allocations and Deadlines.**

Lt. Farrell explained the appeals process for permit holders who wish to change their trap allocation (i.e. increase or decrease). Permit holders may decrease their trap allocation but such a decrease will have permanent consequences. Permit holders wishing to increase their allocation must either 1) appeal and show evidence of a hardship; or 2) purchase a new permit with higher landings associated. A notarized letter postmarked by March 31, 2014 for all appeals. One Member asked why an individual would give up the number of traps allowed on a permit in perpetuity. DFG explained some individuals may not wish to, or be able to, purchase their entire allocation. One Member explained there should be a mechanism that allows people to reduce the number of tags they purchase for a time without losing their allocation permanently.

A Member wanted to know if reduction had to be a full tier or if someone could reduce his or her allocation by a specific number (e.g. 27 traps). DFG explained individuals may only reduce their allocation by one of the 7 tiers as indicated in SB 369 (i.e. must purchase all tags allocated for a given tier), but operators may choose to fish fewer traps.

The task force discussed the appeal process. Lt. Farrell explained an administrative law judge will hear appeals within 12 months of the appeal filing through the Office of Administrative Hearing. One Member suggested requiring an advisory panel composed of peers to assist the judge in reviewing the appeals similar to the panel that was established for the limited entry program. Other Members felt such a panel was impractical and would create an unlevelled playing field.

One Member of the public asked if there would be a way to track the progress of an appeal (e.g., online tool). The Department indicated at this time it would be impossible to develop an online tracking system for appeals but DFG staff will be monitoring all appeals.

### **Section 705 Commercial Fishing Applications, Permits, Tags and Fees.**

Lt. Farrell explained DFG's License and Revenue Branch is in the process of finalizing fees but the buoy tag fee will not exceed \$5.00 and the biennial permit fee will not exceed \$1,000.00. The cost of replacement tags has yet to be determined. One Member expressed disappointment these fees are not yet determined.

Before closing out the discussion on the trap limit program, the DCTF discussed additional topics including:

- Implementation of trap limit program in early 2013- Some Members requested the trap limit program begin in the 2012/2013 season, or in early 2013 to include half of the season. After roundtable discussions and input from DFG, the DCTF determined early implementation of the program is likely infeasible.
- Legality of the tiered trap limit program not considering out-of-state landings- Some Members expressed concerns about the legal implications of excluding Oregon and





## ~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

Washington landings in the trap allocations. The DCTF discussed the idea that some dual permit holders, especially those fishing out of Brookings, will be negatively impacted by this element of the program. DFG explained due to the way SB 369 is written, the DCTF could not include out-of-state landings unless the Legislature designated it to do so. The DCTF requested the Admin Team gather information about the legality of excluding out-of-state landings and information on how the trap limit program would change if those landings were included.

While public questions and comments were taken throughout this agenda item, formal public comment was also taken prior to closing out the discussion on the trap limit program.

### **Public comment:**

No public comment cards were submitted, however, those who requested the opportunity to speak provided public comment. Public comments include:

- Multiple members of the public raised concern about the fact that out-of-state landings were not included in SB 369.
- One member of the public explained that he understood that the DCTF's role is to provide recommendations, however the DCTF's recommendations carry a lot of weight. A passage from Magnuson-Stevens Act was read aloud and the DCTF was urged to reconsider the exclusion of out-of-state landings and recognize out of state vessels.
- Two members of the public explained in Brookings, when crab is landed in Oregon, fishermen specify where which state the crab was caught in. Therefore, including landings from Oregon fish tickets in the California trap limit program should not be difficult. Excluding out-of-state landings would be unfair especially since non-resident permit holders pay double the amount in permit fees.

### **Actions taken during Agenda Item 4:**

**ACTION:** *Consideration and possible adoption of recommendations to the Department of Fish and Game on it's proposed statewide trap limit program regulations.*

**APPROVED: Recommendation 1.** Section 1(a): Replace language from "vessel name and phone number of the operator of the vessel" to "at least contact phone number."

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Carvalho, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

**APPROVED: Recommendation 2.** Section 2: Waiver would allow for six (6) traps belonging to someone else or six (6) untagged traps to be aboard vessel at any time. These traps may only be transported and may not be fished.



## **~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~**

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Carvalho, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

**APPROVED: Recommendation 3.** Section 4: DCTF approved the following process for replacement/lost tags:

- All tags will be sequentially numbered;
- Temporary replacement tags (30 days after beginning of season) may be purchased, however cannot exceed 10% of the permit holder's total trap allocation;
- At the end of the season permit holders will report missing tag numbers to the Department, at which time permit holders will apply for replacement of all lost tags.

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Carvalho, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

**APPROVED: Recommendation 4.** Section 1: DCTF original intent of \$1,000 permit fee was to sunset after 2 years.

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): Carvalho, Yarnall

Thumbs down (0): None

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

**APPROVED: Recommendation 5.** General: Remove "licensed" from "marine surveyor."

*Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):*

Thumbs up (20): Anderson, Atkinson, Bennett, Bettencourt, Blue, Cappotto, Carvalho, Collins, Doyle, Gorelnik, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Shepherd, Standley, Thomas, Whaley, Wilson,



Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Absent (2): Cunningham, Johnson

#### 5. *General Public Comment*

Public comment was heard on non-agenda items. There was no general public comment.

6. *Discussion of DCTF interests and priorities over the course DCTF. Discussion may include, but will not be limited to, review of commercial trap limit program, fair-start provisions, refining sport and commercial fishery management measures, season modifications, latent permits, additional management measures, essential fishery information needs, and short- and long-term objectives for improved management. DCTF port and organizational caucuses and/or workgroups may be convened to refine and discuss proposed management measures.*

Ms. Fisher and Ms. Sayce explained the DCTF is required to furnish two reports, one by January 2015, and the other by January 2017. In addition to making recommendations on the trap limit program in SB 369, the DCTF is also charged with making recommendations on other commercial and sport issues including, but not limited to, review of commercial trap limit program, fair-start provisions, refining sport and commercial fishery management measures, season modifications, latent permits, additional management measures, essential fishery information needs, and short- and long-term objectives for improved management. The DCTF brainstormed topics members were interested to discuss over the course of the DCTF's tenure. Topics included:

- Commercial
  - Crab testing program: discussions included adding a mechanism in the Fish and Game code to compensate observers and others involved in the crab quality testing process.
  - Ensure crab caught in California is landed in California; discussions included considering related taxes and revenue, how to track/log.
  - Emergency transfers: discussions included tighter restrictions on emergency transfers so permits cannot be transferred to larger vessel.
  - Enforcement: discussions included registering specific buoy colors with each permit holder.
  - Lost and derelict gear retrieval: discussions included allowing fishermen to have any type of trap on board their vessel two weeks after completion of the season or within the last two weeks of the season.
  - Dual permit holders: discussions included requiring out-of-state permit holders to put both OR and CA tags on a traps in CA waters.
  - Provide a mechanism to return to original trap allocation if reduced due to financial hardship.
- Sport
  - Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel (CPFV): discussions included removing inconsistencies between CPFV and sport fishing regulations, limiting commercial fishers from participating in the recreational opener.



## **~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~**

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

---

- Quality control: discussion included poor crab quality tests preventing commercial season from opening however remains open to sport fishery.
- Other: discussions included dissolvable cottons, retention of female crabs, minimum size requirements, marking sport buoys and traps.

During the discussion the sport representatives expressed concern about exploring sport issues in a task force composed primarily of commercial interests. The DCTF Admin Team explained SB 369 requires the DCTF to discuss many things including sport issues, and one of the audiences of the DCTF reports is the Fish and Game Commission.

### *7. Next steps and discussion of next meeting*

The DCTF Admin Team discussed the next meeting and proposed a meeting on Monday, April 2, 2012. Members expressed concern about holding a meeting at that time since the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) meeting is scheduled for that week. The Admin Team explained the date could be moved by a day or two, however in order to meet the May 1, 2012 deadline to submit DCTF recommendations on the trap limit program, the next DCTF meeting must occur during the week of April 2. Members generally agreed they could attend a meeting that day. Ms. Fisher and Ms. Sayce said they would call all DCTF Members to confirm there will be a quorum for the April 2 meeting.

The Admin Team asked Members to discuss the draft trap limit regulations with their constituents and come to the next meeting ready to vote on final recommendations with regard to the program.

The Admin Team will collate the brainstormed list of interests and priorities in preparation for the April 2 meeting. The DCTF will prioritize this list at the next meeting.

A draft meeting summary will be distributed to the DCTF within a week or so for review. The summary will be deemed final after it receives the DCTF's approval.

### *8. Adjourn*

The DCTF Admin Team adjourned the meeting at approximately 5pm.