

PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP SHEET

Agenda Item: C7 Obs. fee Analysis

Check the boxes below if you will have a PowerPoint or Handout

	NAME <i>(Please Print)</i>	TESTIFYING ON BEHALF OF:	Handout	PPT
1	Abby Turner - Franke	NPFA		
2	Robert Alverson	FVOA - Seattle	X	
3	ALEXUS KWACHKA	SELF		
4	DAN FALVEY	A&FA		
5	Molly Zaleski	Oceanic		
6	Brian Burkholder	FV Northern Endurance		
7	Nicole Kimball	PSPA		
8	Rhonda Hubbard	Kruzof Fisheries LLC		
9	Natasha Hayden	Native Village of Afognak		
10	Julia Penny	A&DB		
11	Kurt Cochran	FV MADRID		
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

6
3
6
6
3
6
3
6
6
3

NOTE to persons providing oral or written testimony to the Council: Section 307(1)(I) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act prohibits any person "to knowingly and willfully submit to a Council, the Secretary, or the Governor of a State false information (including, but not limited to, false information regarding the capacity and extent to which a United State fish processor, on an annual basis, will process a portion of the optimum yield of a fishery that will be harvested by fishing vessels of the United States) regarding any matter that the Council, Secretary, or Governor is considering in the course of carrying out this Act.

Observer concerns that the AP might want to make known to the NPFMC.

Going forward for the next 5 yrs. With a contract that is scheduled to begin in June 2019 have the following problems for the long term;

- a. The cost per day will run from 1100 dollars a day to 1900 dollars a day. The sole source contract has little market completion. Outside rates prices for the 100 percent fleet is about 600 dollars a day and the cost for short coverage in the Pacific Council area is about 585 dollars a day.**
- b. It was reported by Council economist that the value of the fishery resources would likely not be able to cover the cost of government contract inflation over the next 5 yrs. Or beyond the next 5 yr. contract. Fish values do not necessarily move similarly as inflation factors that affect the partial coverage contract.**
- c. The analysis for the fee increase says that coverage rates falling below 15% of trips begins to produce information that is difficult to meaningfully be extrapolate. At the projected cost of the new contract, the cost per day of 1100 to 1900 dollars a day barely brings the program above that 15% benchmark, for the next 5 yrs.**
- d. The Council should step back from taking final action on the increase in fee in June and determine what their vision is of future actions over the next 3 to 4 yrs. If the Council is going to move for Gulf Rationalization and remove the trawl fleet from the current partial coverage program this will have long term cost implications. It removes over 2000 observed trips. The fewer days available for coverage the cost goes up a lot per day for the entire program. Taking action in June without some additional thought on long term designs for the partial coverage fleet would be premature.**
- e. The council may want to change the focus of the partial coverage fleet should the trawl component be removed from it, perhaps to mostly a EM fleet with some observer coverage to proof the EM information and to collect biological information. The council should look at what this cost structure might be.**

- f. If the Council is going to keep the current structure of the partial coverage fleet with only the fixed gear as the fleet to be monitored without extended EM coverage the Council needs to restructure the program so the fleet can take advantage of the market rates of 600 dollars a day.

The above concerns need to have some decision taken by the Council prior to the next 5 yr. renewal or they will likely find that the partial coverage program cannot meet the basic goals and objectives of the Council.