

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council and AP Members
FROM: Chris Oliver *D-O for*
Executive Director
DATE: September 26, 2011
SUBJECT: Halibut/Sablefish IFQ Program

ESTIMATED TIME 4 HOURS (all C-5 items)
--

ACTION REQUIRED

(a) Initial Review/Final action on CQE vessel use caps (GOA Am. 94)

BACKGROUND

The Council approved the Community Quota Entity (CQE) Program as an amendment to the halibut and sablefish IFQ Program in 2002 (GOA Amendment 66), and the program was implemented in 2004. Under the original IFQ Program, only persons who were originally issued catcher vessel quota share (B, C, and D category QS) or who qualify as IFQ crew members¹ were allowed to hold or purchase catcher vessel quota share. Thus, only individuals² and initial recipients could hold catcher vessel quota share. The CQE Program was developed to allow a distinct set of 42 small, remote coastal communities located in the Gulf of Alaska to purchase halibut and sablefish catcher vessel quota share, in order to maintain access to these fisheries.

In order to participate, eligible communities must form non-profit corporations called Community Quota Entities (CQEs) to purchase catcher vessel QS, and the IFQ resulting from the QS is leased to community residents annually. In effect, the CQE remains the holder of the QS, creating a permanent asset for the community to use to benefit the community and its residents. Twenty-six of the eligible communities have formed CQEs to-date; however, only two CQEs have purchased quota share thus far.

The existing CQE Program limits the annual amount of halibut QS that can be fished on a vessel to 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut, if that vessel is used to harvest any amount of IFQ halibut derived from QS held by a CQE. Similarly, it limits the annual amount of sablefish QS that can be fished on a vessel to 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish, if that vessel is used to harvest any amount of IFQ sablefish derived from QS held by a CQE. The vessel use caps for IFQ derived from CQE-held QS are inclusive of any individually-held IFQ being used on the vessel, on an annual basis, and are not based on a percentage of the IFQ TAC. This limitation was established in the regulations of the original CQE Program, in tandem with a limit on the annual amount of IFQ that an individual could lease from a CQE, in order to ensure a broad distribution of QS, and thus benefits, among qualified residents of the CQE community.

¹IFQ crew member means any individual who has at least 150 days experience working as part of the harvesting crew in any U.S. commercial fishery, or any individual who receives an initial allocation of QS (50 CFR 679.2).

²Per 50 CFR 679.2: Individual means a natural person who is not a corporation, partnership, association, or other such entity.

This analysis was initiated by the Council in December 2010, in response to public testimony in December 2010 and a previous IFQ proposal, stating that the current vessel use caps are unnecessarily restrictive and may reduce the flexibility that small communities need to develop long-term plans for using the potential opportunities afforded by the CQE Program. CQEs have stated they wish to purchase QS and lease it to individuals who may not own vessels, so that they may find employment as crew members and fish the IFQ derived from CQE-held QS. Under the status quo, once any amount of IFQ derived from CQE-held QS is used onboard, the vessel is limited by the 50,000 pound vessel use cap. This limitation may discourage vessels from using IFQ derived from CQE-held QS onboard, as the vessel would otherwise be subject to the higher individual vessel use caps for the IFQ Program in general. The proposed action would amend the GOA FMP and Federal regulations to make the vessel use caps applicable to vessels using IFQ derived from CQE-held quota similar to those applicable to vessels using IFQ derived quota held by individuals.

The Council has not yet approved a problem statement for this action and may choose to do so at this meeting. The analysis for the proposed action considers three alternatives:

Alternative 1. Status quo:

- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut from any halibut QS source if that vessel is used to harvest IFQ halibut derived from halibut QS held by a CQE.
- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish from any sablefish QS source if that vessel is used to harvest IFQ sablefish derived from sablefish QS held by a CQE.

Alternative 2. Revise current regulations such that:

- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut derived from quota share held by a CQE; and no vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish derived from quota share held by a CQE.
- The vessel would also be subject to the same vessel use caps applicable in the overall IFQ Program.³

Alternative 3. Revise current regulations such that:

- Vessels harvesting halibut or sablefish IFQ derived from quota share held by a CQE are subject to the same vessel use caps applicable in the overall IFQ Program.

Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. Alternative 2 would maintain the 50,000 lb vessel use cap for each species of CQE quota, but they would not be inclusive of any halibut or sablefish IFQ that is individually-owned and used on the vessel. Alternative 3 would eliminate the 50,000 lb vessel use caps for CQEs. CQEs would be subject to the same vessel use caps for halibut and sablefish that are applicable in the general IFQ Program.

Upon initiation of this amendment package, the Council determined it may be sufficiently straightforward to warrant initial review and final action at one meeting. Thus, upon review at the October meeting, the Council could determine that additional data and/or analysis are necessary prior to final action, or the Council could select a preferred alternative for recommendation to the Secretary of Commerce.

The analysis was mailed to you on August 22, and the executive summary is attached as **Item C-5(a)**.

³The existing vessel use caps for the IFQ Program that would be applicable under Alternatives 2 and 3 are: 1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) was prepared to evaluate the economic and socioeconomic effects of Gulf of Alaska (GOA) Amendment 94 and associated regulatory amendments to change the vessel use caps applicable to halibut and sablefish quota share when it is held by Community Quota Entities (CQEs), as required under Presidential Executive Order 12866. The proposed amendment would be a revision to the Gulf of Alaska CQE Program, which was approved by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) in 2002 and implemented by NMFS in 2004, under Amendment 66 to the GOA Fishery Management Plan. The program was developed in order to allow a distinct set of 42 small, remote coastal communities located in the Gulf of Alaska to purchase catcher vessel quota share (QS) under the existing halibut and sablefish Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) Program.

The existing CQE Program limits the annual amount of halibut QS that can be fished on a vessel to 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut, if that vessel is used to harvest any amount of IFQ halibut derived from QS held by a CQE. Similarly, it limits the annual amount of sablefish QS that can be fished on a vessel to 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish, if that vessel is used to harvest any amount of IFQ sablefish derived from QS held by a CQE. This limitation was established in the regulations of the original CQE Program, in tandem with a limit on the annual amount of IFQ that an individual could lease from a CQE, in order to ensure a broad distribution of QS, and thus benefits, among qualified residents of the CQE community.

The proposed action would amend the GOA FMP and Federal regulations at 50 CFR 679.42(h)(1)(ii) and (h)(2)(ii) to make the vessel use caps applicable to CQEs similar to those applicable to individuals. This analysis was initiated by the Council in December 2010, in response to public testimony in December 2010 and a previous IFQ proposal, stating the current vessel use caps are unnecessarily restrictive.

In effect, individual QS holders are subject to a less restrictive vessel use cap than CQEs. The current vessel use caps applicable to individuals are 1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC (23,300 lbs in 2011) and 0.5% of all halibut IFQ TAC combined (151,910 lbs in 2011). For sablefish, the vessel use caps are 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC (64,815 lbs in 2011) and 1% of all sablefish IFQ TAC (267,947 lbs in 2011). The vessel use caps for IFQ derived from CQE-held QS are fixed at 50,000 lbs of each species, inclusive of any individually-held IFQ being used on the vessel, on an annual basis, and are not based on a percentage of the IFQ TAC. Representatives of CQEs have testified that the more restrictive vessel use caps reduce the flexibility that small communities need to develop long-term plans for using the potential opportunities afforded by the CQE Program. By definition, the eligible CQE communities are very small and not connected to the road system; many have few vessels owned by residents and are trying to attract people back to the community by providing economic opportunities. Thus, CQEs have stated they wish to purchase QS and lease it to individuals who may not own vessels, so that they may find employment as crew members and fish the IFQ derived from CQE-held QS on other vessels. However, once any amount of IFQ derived from CQE-held QS is used onboard, the vessel is limited by the 50,000 pound vessel use cap. This limitation may discourage vessels from using IFQ derived from CQE-held QS onboard, as the vessel would otherwise be subject to the higher individual vessel use caps for the IFQ Program in general.

The analysis examines three alternatives, one of which is the no action alternative. The alternatives under consideration are as follows:

Alternative 1. Status quo:

- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut from any halibut QS source if that vessel is used to harvest IFQ halibut derived from halibut QS held by a CQE.
- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish from any sablefish QS source if that vessel is used to harvest IFQ sablefish derived from sablefish QS held by a CQE.

Alternative 2. Revise current regulations such that:

- No vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ halibut derived from quota share held by a CQE; and no vessel may be used, during any fishing year, to harvest more than 50,000 lbs of IFQ sablefish derived from quota share held by a CQE.
- The vessel would also be subject to the same vessel use caps applicable in the overall IFQ Program.¹

Alternative 3. Revise current regulations such that:

- Vessels harvesting halibut or sablefish IFQ derived from quota share held by a CQE are subject to the same vessel use caps applicable in the overall IFQ Program.

Alternative 1 would retain the current annual vessel use caps applicable to IFQ derived from CQE-held QS as 50,000 lbs of halibut IFQ, inclusive of any individually-owned halibut IFQ; and 50,000 lbs of sablefish IFQ, inclusive of any individually-owned sablefish IFQ. Note that because no vessels are exempt from the overall vessel use caps in the IFQ Program, these caps are applicable under all alternatives. Thus, in the case that the 50,000 lb caps applicable to vessels with CQE quota onboard are less restrictive than the overall vessel use caps in a given year due to fluctuating TACs, all vessels would still be subject to the overall vessel use caps.

Alternative 2 would revise current regulations such that the 50,000 lb vessel use cap would still apply for each species, but it would not be inclusive of any halibut or sablefish IFQ that is individually-owned. In effect, a vessel could not use more than 50,000 lbs of halibut IFQ derived from QS held by a CQE during the fishing year, but it could also use individually-owned IFQ over and above the 50,000 lbs, up to the vessel use cap applicable in the overall program (e.g., 151,910 lbs of halibut IFQ in 2011). Thus, overall, the vessel would be subject to the vessel use caps applicable in the general program, regardless of whether CQE quota is being used on the vessel.

Table E- 1 Comparison of annual vessel use caps under Alternatives 1 - 3

Alternatives	Limit on amount of CQE quota that can be used on a single vessel	Limit on amount of total IFQ that can be used on a single vessel, if ANY CQE quota is used onboard
Alternative 1	50,000 lbs halibut; 50,000 lbs sablefish	50,000 lbs halibut; 50,000 lbs sablefish ¹
Alternative 2	50,000 lbs halibut; 50,000 lbs sablefish	1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC
Alternative 3	1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC	1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC

¹If the vessel use caps in the IFQ Program (1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC) are lower than 50,000 lbs in a given year, then the lower cap applies.

Alternative 3 would eliminate the 50,000 lb vessel use caps for CQEs. CQEs would be subject to the same vessel use caps for halibut and sablefish that are applicable in the general IFQ Program. Table E- 1 compares the annual vessel use caps that would be applicable to CQE quota and the total amount of IFQ onboard a single vessel under Alternatives 1 – 3.

¹The existing vessel use caps for the IFQ Program that would be applicable under Alternatives 2 and 3 are: 1% of Area 2C halibut IFQ TAC and 0.5% of the entire halibut IFQ TAC; 1% of Southeast sablefish IFQ TAC and 1% of the entire sablefish IFQ TAC.

None of the alternatives proposed would change the use restriction pertaining to how much IFQ can be annually leased from a CQE to an individual community resident. Leasing of CQE-held IFQ would continue to be limited to 50,000 lbs of halibut and 50,000 lbs of sablefish IFQ, inclusive of any IFQ owned, per lessee.

Effects on CQEs

The proposed action implies that the rules addressing CQE purchases in the original CQE Program have, to-date, failed to achieve some of the Council's objectives with respect to preserving fishing opportunity in small communities. The purpose of the action is therefore to have distributional effects, to provide a regulatory environment that is more conducive to the CQE purchase of QS, such that more IFQ derived from that quota would be allowed to be fished from a single vessel. CQEs have testified that without such flexibility, they have less incentive to purchase QS, as the rules governing the use of QS by CQEs prohibit a potentially realistic opportunity for use of the IFQ by community residents.

Alternative 2 would likely create additional opportunities for vessels to use CQE quota, regardless of whether they are owned by residents of the CQE community. Thus, under Alternative 2, CQEs and residents leasing IFQ from the CQE may benefit due to the availability of vessels that may not otherwise be willing and able to use additional CQE quota onboard if they were subject to the lower overall vessel use cap under status quo. This would likely also result in additional opportunities to lease CQE quota, as the pool of potential resident applicants would increase if there is more flexibility (i.e., a larger pool of potential vessels) for residents who do not own vessels to fish the IFQ.

Because the limit on the amount of IFQ derived from CQE-held quota that can be fished on a single vessel is maintained under Alternative 2, this alternative would continue to compel a distribution of the potential benefits that one vessel or vessel owner could derive from the CQE Program. In effect, the same amount of benefit could be derived under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, as the 50,000 lb cap does not change. The difference under Alternative 2 is that the likely availability and opportunity associated with bringing CQE quota onboard a vessel increases when the vessel is not subject to a total vessel use cap that is more stringent when any amount of CQE quota is used.

Under Alternative 3, vessels using CQE quota would be subject to the same overall vessel use caps for halibut and sablefish that are in place for vessels using only individually-held IFQ. Because all IFQ would be treated the same in terms of applying the same vessel use caps, Alternative 3 would create additional flexibility within the CQE Program compared to Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would remove the 50,000 lb vessel use cap in entirety, and thus remove one of the limits the Council established in 2004 to ensure the distribution of benefits among vessels. However, the limit on the amount of IFQ that each individual resident could lease from the CQE on an annual basis (50,000 lbs per species) would remain.

Table E- 2 below shows the number of vessels that landed at least 50,000 lbs, at least some of which was Gulf IFQ, and thus would not be available to use additional IFQ onboard under the status quo: 222 halibut vessels and 130 sablefish vessels. Most vessels landed <50,000 lbs of IFQ in 2010. The table also provides the total number of vessels that landed halibut and sablefish IFQ that met the existing vessel use caps in 2010, which are the overall caps that would apply under Alternatives 2 and 3. Very few vessels met the vessel use caps in the IFQ Program: 10 vessels met the use cap of 0.5% of all halibut IFQ and 8 vessels met the cap of 1% of all sablefish IFQ. The remainder of the fleet did not meet or exceed the vessel use caps, and thus could theoretically use additional IFQ onboard, including IFQ leased from a CQE. In effect, using 2010 data, hundreds more vessels ($222 - 10 = 212$ halibut vessels and $130 - 1 = 129$ sablefish vessels) would be eligible to use additional IFQ derived from CQE quota under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 compared to Alternative 1, without exceeding the applicable vessel use cap.

Table E-2 Number of vessels that met vessel use caps and IFQ landed, 2010

Vessel use cap 2010	Vessel use cap level	Cap under Alternative 2 & 3		Cap under Alternative 1		Total # of vessels that fished	Total IFQ lbs landed
		# of IFQ vessels that met vessel use caps in 2010	Total IFQ lbs used by vessels that met cap	# of vessels that landed $\geq 50,000$ lbs of IFQ ¹	Total IFQ lbs used by vessels that landed $\geq 50,000$ lbs ¹		
Halibut Area 2C	1% of 2C halibut IFQ TAC	1	44,050	n/a	n/a	574	4,349,771
Halibut All Areas	0.5% of all halibut IFQ TAC	10	2,421,648	222	28,697,472	1,074	39,878,502
Sablefish SE	1% of SE sablefish IFQ TAC	8	608,520	n/a	n/a	215	5,657,418
Sablefish All Areas	1% of all sablefish IFQ TAC	1	248,845	130	16,697,498	388	21,952,388

Source: NMFS RAM Program, 5/4/11.

¹Data are from Table 24. Columns include vessels that landed $\geq 50,000$ IFQ lbs, with some portion from Gulf IFQ, in order to estimate more closely the number of vessels that may be available to use IFQ derived from quota held by Gulf CQEs under the status quo. Thus, the total number of vessels that landed $\geq 50,000$ IFQ lbs would be slightly higher if BSAI IFQ were included.

In sum, it is policy choice of the Council whether to remove the 50,000 lb vessel use cap under Alternative 3 and forego the certainty associated with the distribution of benefits among vessels, but increase the flexibility of the CQE and potentially its ability to maximize benefits for community residents. The regulatory provision that requires that each resident is limited to leasing 50,000 lbs of halibut IFQ and 50,000 lbs of sablefish IFQ would remain, which is likely more effective in ensuring that benefits are equitably distributed throughout the community. Alternative 3 would serve to increase the flexibility of the CQE and CQE community residents compared to Alternatives 1 and 2, with little effect on the goal of distributing benefits fairly and broadly among community members.

The issue is theoretical at this point, as very little QS has been purchased by CQEs (less than 50,000 IFQ lbs) to-date, but it has been cited as a barrier to participation in the program. Given the financially prohibitive factors for CQEs and any new entrant to finance a QS purchase, analysts cannot speculate as to whether the proposed action would have the intended effect. While not part of this action, in the future, actions effective in 2011 (i.e., fixed gear permits for Pacific cod in the Central and Western Gulf and community charter halibut permits in Area 2C and 3A, both issued to CQEs at no cost and non-transferable) could potentially provide seed money for CQEs to purchase halibut and sablefish QS, as CQEs lease licenses to individual residents. At least in the short-term, CQEs will likely continue to have difficulty in funding the purchase of QS and participating in the CQE Program; this action is intended to provide a better opportunity for communities to use IFQ once QS is purchased.

Effects on IFQ fishery participants

No significant effect on individual participants in the IFQ fisheries, or residents of non-CQE communities, is anticipated under Alternative 2 or 3 compared to the status quo. One possible effect is the potential for individual participants to use IFQ derived from CQE-held QS on their vessels, with the community resident leasing the IFQ from the CQE working as a crewmember, without being subject to a more restrictive vessel use cap than the overall IFQ program affords. This may provide additional fishing opportunity for both community residents and individual vessel owners, if they desire to pursue this business relationship. This action does not directly regulate IFQ participants and would not affect IFQ participants' vessel use caps.

Based on the analysis and criteria under Presidential Executive Order 12866, the proposed action does not appear to constitute a significant regulatory action, recognizing that there may be distributional impacts among the various participants affected.

**Koniag/KANA Region Roundtable
194 Alimaq Drive
Kodiak, Alaska 99615**

September 13, 2011

**Eric Olson, Chairman
NPFMC
605 W. 4th Ave., Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501**

Re: CQE Issues and General Concerns

Dear Chairman Olson:

The Kodiak Roundtable is an all inclusive regional entity encompassing ANCSA corporations, the Kodiak region health care organization, federally-recognized tribes and rural community representatives. We address a range of issues impacting the economic and social well being of our members and communities. Fishery participation has long been the economic backbone of the Koniag people. Nevertheless, we have experienced continuous and cumulative regulation and management changes that have inhibited and reduced fishery participation opportunities. Economic barriers to entry in various fisheries now foreclose participation by most of our young people. The status quo is not acceptable.

The attached Kodiak Roundtable resolution reflects the concerns and desired outcomes of our region --- both specific near term decisions and large picture, long term, solutions. We stress the Council's need to immediately improve the CQE program with the inclusion of Adak and the elimination of the CQE vessel poundage limit. More long term, we believe the Council must address active participation and crew issues arising from the Bering Sea Crab rationalization program. Finally, we anticipate working with the Council and the Department of Commerce through the tribal consultation process to explore Gulf of Alaska Community Development Quotas and/or parallel solutions to the current fishery participation crisis.

If you have any additional questions regarding our resolution and our specific recommendations, I would welcome a call.

Very truly yours,



William Anderson, Jr., Chair

- cc **Honorable Governor Parnell**
- Honorable Senator Murkowski**
- Honorable Senator Begich**
- Rebecca Blank, Acting Secretary of Commerce**
- Dr. Jane Lubchenco, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans & Atmosphere**
- Jim Balsiger, Regional Administrator NOAA Fisheries, Alaska**
- Senator Gary Stevens**
- Representative Alan Austerman**

**Koniag-KANA Region Roundtable
September 8, 2011**

Resolution 11-01

WHEREAS, Kodiak Area Native Association and Koniag Inc. coordinate a biannual Roundtable meeting between all federally-recognized Tribes, ANCSA Native Corporations, and non-profit Alaska Native organizations in the Kodiak Area, including representatives from the communities of Kodiak, Ouzinkie, Port Lions\Afognak, Larsen Bay, Akhiok, Karluk, and Old Harbor;

WHEREAS, All representatives in attendance unanimously agreed that many State and National fisheries regulation decisions over the past 40 years have consistently and cumulatively had negative impact in the Kodiak Region to our subsistence, sport, sport charter and commercial fisheries;

WHEREAS, Kodiak Area fisheries opportunities have significantly declined over time and the Kodiak region has experienced some of the greatest declines in rural resident fisheries participation and Alaska Native community involvement in fisheries, with perhaps the largest participation reduction of any area in the State of Alaska;

WHEREAS, many Federal and State fishery management decisions have adversely impacted and reduced availability of marine subsistence foods;

WHEREAS, the tribal governments in the Kodiak Region are entitled to government to government consultation with the Secretary of Commerce regarding significant and ongoing exclusion of tribal members from Gulf of Alaska fisheries;

WHEREAS, the Community Development Quota program is not currently available to Gulf of Alaska communities and therefore Kodiak's fishery dependant rural communities and Kodiak Area Alaska Natives continue to have economic, geographic and regulatory barriers to fisheries participation;

WHEREAS, the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council established an opportunity for Gulf of Alaska communities to purchase halibut and sablefish fishing quotas by creation of a Community Quota Entity (CQE) Program in 2004;

WHEREAS, no funding was provided to the CQE program and Kodiak area fishery dependant rural communities have only been able to purchase, over the past 7 years, a minimal amount of Quota while, at the same time, prices have more than doubled;

WHEREAS, the CQE program was structured to limit individual and community participation in the program by placing limits on how much quota could be fished on any one vessel;

WHEREAS, rationalization of the Bering Sea crab fisheries has eliminated more than 1,000 crew jobs and thereby substantially reduced participation by Kodiak area rural residents in fisheries;

WHEREAS, the Bering Sea Crab Rationalization Program has provided co-operative fishing structures and does not require active participation by those that own crab quota and consequently the crew shares of Kodiak area rural residents and Alaska Native fishermen participating in the fishery have been substantially reduced;

WHEREAS, reductions in the amount of useable halibut in the Gulf of Alaska (exploitable biomass) have resulted in regulations that limit sport charter halibut fishing with the potential to reduce the daily bag limit in the Kodiak area;

WHEREAS, reductions in the amount of useable halibut in the Gulf of Alaska (exploitable biomass) may increase pressure on regulators to further reduce subsistence harvest opportunities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the KANA/Koniag Roundtable of ANCSA Corporations and Tribal Governments in the Kodiak Archipelago and Koniag region, that the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council act at the September 2011 Council meeting to improve the Community Quota Entity Program by including the community of Adak in the program and by eliminating the 50,000# harvest cap per CQE vessel and by applying the programmatic cap to CQE vessels;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, as it reviews the Bering Sea crab rationalization plan, implement plan amendments that increase active quota share holder participation in the fishery and equitable crew shares;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council immediately act to replace the halibut charter "Catch Share Plan" with a new management plan that will allow the Halibut Charter Fishery in Kodiak area communities to develop and prosper.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council continue to prioritize subsistence use of halibut and not act to limit subsistence access by gear or harvest reductions and review the impacts of near shore commercial fishing on halibut subsistence opportunities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary of Commerce initiate tribal consultation with the Kodiak area tribes regarding disenfranchisement from Gulf of Alaska fisheries; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that Kodiak's rural fishery dependent communities and Koniag Region Alaska Natives request State and Federal action, including consideration of a Gulf of Alaska Community Development Program, to increase access to and participation in both State and Federal Fisheries.

Submitted by: William Anderson, Jr., President
Koniag, Inc.
For the Koniag Region Roundtable Group

Date: September 8, 2011

Contact Name: Cheryl Christofferson

Phone: (907) 486-2530

Email: cchristofferson@koniag.com