

## Long-Term Function of the DCTF, Considerations for Funding and Structure

*Drafted by the DCTF Administration Team, March 1, 2016*

In October 2015, the California Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF) held a robust discussion about the long-term function of the DCTF beyond January 2017. The DCTF requested its Executive Committee continue discussing this topic, and potentially generate proposals/options for moving forward, in advance of its next meeting in October 2016.

To help inform the DCTF Executive Committee's [March 3, 2016 conference call](#), the DCTF Administrative Team has drafted: a summary of approximate costs associated with DCTF operations beyond January 2017; and questions and considerations to support reevaluating the current operating structure of the DCTF. Ideas that emerge from the DCTF Executive Committee will be shared with the full DCTF and their constituents for further consideration and review<sup>1</sup>.

### I. Long-Term Funding, Estimated Costs

The California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) has committed funding to the DCTF through January 2017. The current OPC funding cycle began January 2012, and provides administrative and meeting support to assist the DCTF in fulfilling its legislatively mandated reporting requirements. If there is interest by the Dungeness crab industry to continue informing the management of the Dungeness crab fishery through an organizational body like the DCTF beyond January 2017, new funding streams will need to be identified and steps to appropriate funds determined.

To help inform DCTF and Executive Committee discussions, the following cost breakdown has been developed based on expenditures incurred from 2012-2015.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1. Estimated costs to support the long-term operation of the DCTF.**

| Task/Budget Item   | Cost Estimate                             |
|--|---|
| <b>Meeting Costs</b>   |   |
| DCTF and Admin Team travel   | \$4,500-\$5,850/meeting <sup>3</sup>      |
| Materials printing   | \$600/meeting                             |
| Meeting room   | \$600/day                                 |
| Note-taking services (i.e. attending meeting and developing summary)   | \$2,000/meeting                           |
| <b>Administrative Support<sup>4</sup></b>  |   |
| Daily operations, internal and external communications, meeting planning and facilitation, report writing, elections, polls, policy navigation, operating structuring review, etc. |   |
| Option 1- 20 hours/week  | \$70,000/year                             |
| Option 2- 30 hours/week  | \$165,000/year                            |
| Option 3- 40 hours/week  | \$220,000/year                            |
| <b>Additional Costs</b>  |   |
| Website design and maintenance   | Design: \$6,000-\$10,000; \$300/month     |
| Conference Line  | \$25/month                                |
| Elections (assumes all ports included in the election)   | \$9,000/election                          |
| Polls  | \$4,000 - \$10,000/poll <sup>5</sup>      |
| Port Tour (includes time and travel for Admin Team)  | \$11,000/week                             |
| Analysis of DCTF Operating Structure (external)  | TBD                                       |
| Sponsoring Agency <sup>6</sup> overhead  | TBD                                       |
| California Department of Fish and Wildlife staff support   | TBD                                       |
| <b>Gross Total</b>   | <b>\$111,600 – \$272,950+<sup>7</sup></b> |

<sup>1</sup> Any updates to the appropriation of funding and/or organizational structure of the DCTF will require legislative changes.

<sup>2</sup> A breakdown of the DCTF related costs was shared at the October 2014 and 2015 meetings, and is available on the DCTF webpage: [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/media\\_library/2009/04/DCTF\\_Long-termDCTF\\_10272014.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/media_library/2009/04/DCTF_Long-termDCTF_10272014.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Range considers 1-day (\$4,500) and 2-day (\$5,850) meeting scenarios.

<sup>4</sup> Estimates are based on a two-person team (similar to the current DCTF). Rates do not account for cost of living increases.

<sup>5</sup> Range considers web-based (\$4,000) and mail-based (\$10,000) polling scenarios. Assumes entire fleet is polled.

<sup>6</sup> Sponsoring agency is the agency identified to support DCTF operations and administration (e.g. Ocean Protection Council, California Department of Food and Agriculture, etc.)

**Prioritization of Effort**

As of March 2016, the DCTF has identified and engaged in a number of priority topics including domoic acid, whale entanglements, lost fishing gear recovery, evaluation of the commercial Dungeness crab trap limit program, and the long-term functioning of the DCTF. The above costs were developed with the understanding that the DCTF will continue to address these topics over the coming year(s). To ensure budgets are sufficient and funding is used efficiently, reprioritization of these priority topics may be needed in the future as additional fisheries issues are identified.

**II. Operating Structure Considerations, Lessons Learned from the DCTF**

During the October 2015 meeting, the DCTF identified a need to revisit its current operating structure. This reevaluation could include updating the DCTF’s composition, updating the process for replacing members and appointing alternates, etc.

**Current DCTF Organizational Structure**

The DCTF is comprised of 17 elected members and 10 appointed members. Of the 27-member body, 22 are voting members and five are nonvoting members as mandated by [Fish and Game Code 8276.4](#).

**Table 2. Current DCTF membership (as defined by Fish and Game Code 8276.4).**

| <i>Elected Members (17)</i>   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Representatives</b>        | <b>Interest group</b>                      |
| 1                             | Non-resident- Commercial Fishing           |
| 4 (high & low tier)           | Crescent City- Commercial Fishing          |
| 1                             | Trinidad- Commercial Fishing               |
| 2 (high & low tier)           | Eureka- Commercial Fishing                 |
| 2 (high & low tier)           | Fort Bragg- Commercial Fishing             |
| 2 (high & low tier)           | Bodega Bay- Commercial Fishing             |
| 2 (high & low tier)           | San Francisco- Commercial Fishing          |
| 2 (high & low tier)           | Half Moon Bay- Commercial Fishing          |
| 1                             | South of Half Moon Bay- Commercial Fishing |
| <i>Appointed Members (10)</i> |  |
| <b>Representatives</b>        | <b>Interest group</b>                      |
| 2                             | Sport Fishing                              |
| 2                             | Crab Processing                            |
| 1                             | Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel        |
| 2                             | Non-voting - Non-governmental organization |
| 1                             | Non-voting - Sea Grant                     |
| 2                             | Non-voting - Department of Fish and Game   |
| <b>27</b>                     | <b>Total Members</b>                       |

**Current Voting Procedure**

As mandated by SB 369, “*Except as otherwise provided in Section 8276.5, a recommendation shall be forwarded to the Joint Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Fish and Game Commission upon an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the task force Members*”. **This means the DCTF must forward a recommendation if 2/3 or more of the Members support it, or if 15 Members support it (excluding non-voting members).** Therefore, any vote of 15 or more DCTF Members constitutes a mandatory recommendation.

**Questions for Consideration**

---

<sup>7</sup> Gross total does not include items marked as TBD and assumes one, single-day meeting/year. Estimates include Executive Committee conference call meetings.

- What is working with the current DCTF structure?
  - Are there aspects to the current structure that should be retained?
- Elected Members
  - Is the composition of elected members (i.e. commercial fishing representatives) reflective of the make-up of the fleet? Are there users/ports/etc. not reflected in the current composition?
    - Is this a priority? If so, what can be adjusted so the composition is more reflective (e.g., port distribution, geographic distribution, tier allocation distribution, etc.)?
    - Does composition need to be tied to the number of permit holders within a port? Are there other selection criteria to consider?
    - Additional options to consider:
      - Two representatives per port (could consider port groupings)
      - Equal number of representatives above/below Northern and Southern Management Area (Mendocino/Sonoma County line)
      - Other
  - Is there value in having high and low tier representatives within a port?
  - Should permit tiers be reflected in the composition of elected members?
  - Is there a need for additional out-of-state representation? Or representation south of Half Moon Bay?
  - Should there be flexibility built into a new structure to allow for membership to be updated to reflect changes in the make-up of the fleet?
- Appointed Members
  - Is the composition of the appointed members appropriate? Are there any perspectives/groups not represented that should be?
  - Should any of the appointed members be elected members?
  - Who should appoint these members.
- Voting
  - Should any voting appointed members become nonvoting? Any nonvoting members become voting?
  - Is the current 2/3 needed for a recommendation to be forwarded appropriate?
    - Other options to consider:
      - Consensus
      - Simple majority
      - Other
- Other Considerations
  - Are there any adjustments needed to reflect the trap tiers in the representation?
  - If a “DCTF 2.0” is industry-funded, should there be any additional compensation provided by non-commercial representative groups (i.e., appointed members)?

## Reference Materials

- [Summary of permit holders in each port area](#) (developed by CDFW in 2014)
- [October 2015 DCTF meeting summary](#)