


MEMORANDUM

TO: Council, AP, and SSC Members

FROM: Clarence G. Pautzke   
Executive Director

DATE: June 16, 1989

SUBJECT: Coastal communities under limited access

**ACTION REQUIRED**

Decide how to treat coastal communities for purposes of analyzing limited access systems.

**BACKGROUND**

The sablefish and halibut license and individual fishing quota limited access systems in items C-6(c) and (d) contain decision points relating to coastal communities (Section VIII). The choices center on allocating access rights directly to coastal communities, allowing special provisions for certain communities, or treating coastal communities the same as all other entities. Under the definition of "person" [in II(C) in the decision documents], local as well as state governments would be considered eligible to be allocated or control harvest rights.

We will be completing the final analysis on sablefish this summer and on halibut this fall. So the Council needs to determine if and how coastal community preference should be treated in the context of limited access. Until our April meeting when the inshore-offshore issue (see agenda item C-7) came to the forefront, the design and analysis of limited access systems was the only vehicle being used for consideration of community preference.

The Fishery Planning Committee discussed new or continued access by communities to the resource in general terms, not restricted to sablefish and halibut. Committee members recognized that community dependence on the resource was not restricted to local communities and that several communities in Washington and Oregon also are heavily dependent on the fishery resources in the EEZ off Alaska. Two approaches were discussed: structuring management measures to advantage local communities, and setting aside TAC. A concept paper on the latter, as requested by the chair of the Committee, is in item C-6(e)(1).

Under agenda item C-7, the Council will be dealing with a range of measures that could be used to establish inshore-offshore preference. Traditional measures, such as vessel size limits, registration areas, trip limits, and hold inspections could be used to give local fishermen advantages for certain species in certain areas. Hold inspections and trip limits are now used to advantage western Alaskan communities in local halibut fisheries. Fishermen not landing their fish locally are required to obtain a hold inspection and vessel clearance in specific non-local ports within five days prior to and following each opening (the openings are either one or two days long). Trip limits also are used, being the same for all vessel sizes and reducing the profit potential for larger vessels. Such regulations need not directly discriminate against residents of any region but they would dictate the structure of the fleet in certain fisheries.

How does the Council want to treat the coastal community issue for purposes of the sablefish and halibut analyses?

MEMO

May 26, 1989

To: Dick Tremaine, NPFMC Staff  
From: Larry Cotter *LC*  
Re: Open Access/Community Quota Concept

At the May 17 Fishery Planning Committee meeting, Chairman Blum requested that I provide you with a written version of the open access/community quota concept I articulated. The following complies with his request. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

There are two aspects to the concept: at-sea/community maintenance quotas and community development quotas. The at-sea/community maintenance concept can stand on its own with or without the community development portion.

AT-SEA/COMMUNITY MAINTENANCE QUOTAS

The TAC would be separated into two components: an at-sea component and a community maintenance component. Each component would be allocated a percentage of the TAC.

The at-sea component would include, at the very least, all factory trawlers. Other types of at-sea operations, such as factory longliners, might fit into this category but not necessarily. Very large mother ships designed to operate at-sea might fit into this category as well.

The community maintenance component would include all harvesting-only vessels, shore plants, and most floating processors. Factory longliners might also be included in this category.

The purpose of separating the TAC into two distinct components is to provide stability for those groups. Therefore, to ensure the at-sea component is not able to harvest its portion of the TAC in the same area relied upon by the community maintenance component, it is necessary to establish harvest areas for each component. The easiest way to accomplish this is to define the area within which the at-sea component can operate. The community maintenance component can operate in the remaining areas. Neither component can operate in the other's area.

The TAC is now divided into two groups and fishing areas for the two groups have been defined.

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTAS

In order to address the development needs of specific communities, the following approach might be used:

- 1.) Define the types of communities which might qualify -- not all do. Kodiak, Unalaska, Akutan, Sitka, etc., are communities which have developed and whose needs are addressed through the community maintenance approach outlined above. The Pribilofs are an example of a community which has not developed an industry and should qualify.
- 2.) Identify an amount of the TAC available adjacent to the community which could be used as a development quota. This could come from the community maintenance percentage or from a combination of the community maintenance and the at-sea percentages.
- 3.) The development quota could be used by the community for a defined period of time, not to exceed \_\_\_\_ years. The length of time should be sufficient to accomplish the program, but not unreasonably long; for instance, two to four years.
- 4.) A community seeking a development quota would apply for the quota. The application would include business and other plans to support the request and justify the quota. The length of time requested for the quota does not need to be the maximum length of time a quota could be granted. The quota, if granted, could be leased or otherwise used by the community in accordance with its application. Procedures for auditing the performance of the development plan and use of the quota would be developed.
- 5.) When the program is complete (which will coincide with the end of the allocated development quota), the percentage allocated to the quota will revert back to the component(s) from which it came. The community shall thereafter participate in the community maintenance component outlined above.