



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

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

Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF) Conditional Management Measures October 14, 2009

The following management measures were developed during meeting 3 of the Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF). They were developed first through port-specific (and organization-specific [e.g. DFG, ex-officios, etc]) discussions. Following port / organization specific discussions, all members were pooled together into multi-participant workgroups. The workgroup members were instructed to deliver the specific brainstormed solutions from their ports and to then merge and blend ideas in an attempt to identify a consensus in each workgroup. The tables below present the following information:

- A management measure that has general support*, followed by,
- A set of yes/no, and either/or, survey questions.

The purpose of this document is to allow DCTF members and their constituents an opportunity to assess areas of general support that came out of meeting 3, and to provide an opinion on related specific decisions that are unresolved. The goal is to have a more specific sense from the members on how their ports feel about specific decisions related to a management measure.

** For the purpose of this document "General Support" means that at least two of the three workgroups in Meeting 3 suggested this management measure.*

Management measures that achieved general support are listed with survey questions in the following tables below:

Table 1: Define latent permits, redefine limited entry, and manage potential latent permit activation

Table 2: Consider Statewide pot limits

Table 3: Implement a trial pot limit program in District 10

Table 4: Create an advisory body that addresses fishery management and marketing

Table 5: Coordinate with Washington and Oregon through the Tri-State Committee to reduce impact on the California fishery from effort shift

Table 6: Protect the California Dungeness crab fishery from future MPA designations

Table 1. Latent Permits

DCTF General Support			
Define latent permits, redefine limited entry, and manage potential latent permit activation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language in SB 1690 defines latent permit; build this language into permanent statute and code prior to SB 1690 sun setting 			
Latent Permits – Question 1: Should latent permits be eliminated?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 2: Should latent permits be transferable or non-transferable?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Transferable	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-transferable	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 3: Should latent permits allow permit stacking?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 4: Should an individual latent permit have a minimum required landing limit? What should that limit be?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Ideas on limit:
Latent Permits – Question 5: Should there be a voluntary industry funded buy-out of latent permits (funding method to be determined)?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 6: If a pot limit is implemented in District 10 or Statewide, should latent permits have a lower limit than the lowest limit for active permits?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Latent Permits – Question 7: Should there be a “hardship review” process for latent permit holders?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 8: Should latent permits only be privately owned? (e.g. single ownership versus partnerships or corporations)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Latent Permits – Question 9: Should latent permits be fished only by the permit holder?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Vessel specifications – Question 1: Should vessel specifications be redefined regarding length (LOA), width and capacity?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Table 2. Statewide Pot Limits

<u>DCTF General Support</u>			
Consideration of a California statewide pot limit			
Statewide Pot Limit – Question 1: Should a statewide pot limit be created now or should it be staged after a regional pot limit trial is conducted?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Create now	<input type="checkbox"/> Create after a regional trial	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Statewide Pot Limit – Question 2: Should a potential statewide pot limit be tiered or not-tiered?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Tiered	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Tiered	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Statewide Pot Limit – Question 3: Should a potential statewide pot limit be based on a fishery pot threshold (e.g. a total pot allocation for the entire state)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Statewide Pot Limit – Question 4: If a statewide pot limit is implemented, should there a staged deployment during the beginning of the season (i.e., only allowed to fish a certain percentage of your pots)?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Statewide Pot Limit – Question 5: If yes to question 4, what should be the timeline of a staged deployment? If yes, what percentage of a permit holders pots should be fished in each stage?			
Notes:			
Statewide Pot Limit – Question 6: If yes to question 4, what percentage of a permit holders pots should be fished in each stage?			
Notes:			
Pot limits – Question 7: Are you willing to report data about your fishing practices as a means to support the effectiveness of any future changes to a pot limit system?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Table 3. District 10 Pot limits

<p><u>DCTF General Support</u></p> <p>Implement a trial pot limit program in District 10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a sunset date for the program • Program will be financed exclusively by fishermen operating in District 10 (“Pay to Play” tag system) • Further discussion is needed on structure and costs (e.g. Tiered or not tiered, time period of trial program, associated costs, etc.) • Data will be collected, analyzed and disseminated to evaluate program effectiveness and inform adaptive management • Pot limits to be considered for the entire state after District 10 trial program is assessed
--

Pot limits – Question 1: Should there be a fixed time period for a District 10 pot limit program? (e.g. two to three weeks following the November 15th opener)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 2: Should there be a single pot limit program for the fixed time period? (e.g. current District 10 proposal is 250 pots)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 3: Should there be a tiered pot limit program in District 10 based on catch history? (e.g. 500, 300, 100)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 4: Should there be fines established and enforced in District 10 for violators of a trial pot limit program?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 5: Should funds generated from violations of the District 10 trial pot limits directly support the costs associated with implementation and monitoring of the program?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 6: Should a District 10 pot limit program be funded by a “pay to play” tag system or a statewide fee/landings tax?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Tag system	<input type="checkbox"/> Statewide fee	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 7: Should there be specifications on the size of pots that can be used in the commercial fishery?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Pot limits – Question 8: Should there be a cap set on the total number of pots fished in California?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Pot limits – Question 9: Are you willing to report data about your fishing practices as a means to support the effectiveness of any future changes to a pot limit system?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Table 4. Crab Advisory Body

DCTF General Support Create an advisory body that addresses fishery management and marketing *Several Members noted that support for creation of an advisory body is pending success of the DCTF as a collaborative process **Per the mandate of SB 1690, the DCTF can continue until January 15 th , 2011			
Crab Advisory Body – Question 1: Should the DCTF continue work as an advisory body beyond January 15 th , 2011?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 2: Should there be a marketing body to advocate for California Dungeness crab?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 3: Should any marketing body be merged into an overall crab advisory body (e.g. subcommittee) or created separately?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Merged	<input type="checkbox"/> Separate	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 4: Should California landings taxes be used to fund a crab advisory body?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Crab Advisory Body – Question 5: If yes to question 4, should landings taxes be increased to fund an advisory body?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 6: Is there an alternative funding source for a future crab advisory body, and if so what is it? (Use notes section to describe)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 7: In the context of the DCTF currently serving as an advisory body, should the commercial fishery continue to be managed by the State Legislature?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Crab Advisory Body – Question 8: In the context of the DCTF currently serving as an advisory body, should the sport fishery continue to be managed by the Fish and Game Commission?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Table 5. Tri-State Committee

<u>DCTF General Support</u> Coordinate with Washington and Oregon through the Tri-State Committee to reduce impact on the California fishery from effort shift <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that neighboring states move the fair start line south to include the entire state of California • Ensure the Washington buy-out program does not allow re-entry into the California Dungeness crab fishery 			
Tri-State Committee – Question 1: Should boats/permits removed through a Washington buy-out program be prohibited from re-entering the Dungeness crab fishery in all three states?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Tri-State Committee – Question 2: In the context of table 3 - If established, should an advisory body be directly involved with the Tri-State Committee regarding management of the Dungeness crab fishery?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:
Tri-State Committee – Question 3: Should the management role of the Tri-State Committee be re-defined as it relates to Dungeness crab?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes:

Table 5. MPAs

DCTF General Support			
Protect the California Dungeness crab fishery from future MPA designations			
MPAs – Question 1: Should commercial and sport harvest of Dungeness crab be allowed within designated MPAs?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> I would like more information in the future	Notes: