



Meeting 2 Workgroup Outputs San Francisco, CA September 8 - 10, 2009

From September 8 to 10, 2009, the Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF) resumed its work and held a three day meeting at the Hyatt Hotel in San Francisco. As noted in the meeting summary, the DCTF Facilitation Team developed a “Road Map” (See Appendix 2) for the meeting that would allow DCTF Members to:

- Review proposed straw problem statements and objectives for the fishery;
- Engage in collaborative Workgroups to revise straw objectives and develop new objectives—understanding priorities and gaining shared meaning about objectives for the fishery; and
- Brainstorm and discuss approaches and tools to achieve objectives.

This document presents the outcomes of these Workgroup exercises. The presentation format mirrors the steps that DCTF Members took in the small Workgroups to draft and find shared agreement on PRELIMINARY objectives. Similarly, it presents the potential solutions that Members brainstormed for the Dungeness crab fishery. A brief introduction to each section describes specific Workgroup outputs or results, and is supported by data displayed (where appropriate) in tables.

DCTF Members will use this material to get feedback from constituents in their respective ports and organizations. It is critical that DCTF Members stress to their constituents that the materials contained are preliminary, and no decisions have been made to finalize any of the objectives or solutions described in this document.

1. Summary of PRELIMINARY draft objectives prepared by the Workgroups

Following a brief review of proposed problem statements and objectives derived from the DCTF Situational Analysis¹ during day 1 of the meeting, three Workgroups were established, each comprised of a balanced set of Members representing different sectors of the fishery. The Workgroups were coordinated on the following categories: 1) *Capacity*; 2) *Profitability and Equitability*; and, 3) *Sustainability of Communities: Transitioning Away From the Derby Dynamic*. Each Workgroup was assigned a category with associated proposed problem statements and objectives (See Appendix 3). Guided by a facilitator, the Workgroups began a collaborative process to review and revise the objectives and develop new objectives. Table 1 below is a summary listing of preliminary objectives drafted by each respective Workgroup during day two of the meeting.

¹ In April 2009, the Facilitation Team conducted a Situational Analysis with all DCTF Members in order to identify issues of concern, opportunities for collaboration, and the most effective methods to manage the legislatively mandated DCTF. A power point of the results of the Situational Analysis can be viewed at <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>



2. Assessing PRELIMINARY draft objectives

The Workgroups on *Capacity and Sustainability of Communities* had time to prioritize objectives through a simple, non-binding dot voting exercise, and agreed in principle on all the drafted objectives. Once each Workgroup completed and prioritized a list of preliminary drafted objectives (Table 1), the facilitator led the Workgroup through a review and discussion to ensure all Workgroup Members had shared understanding of the intention of each refined objective. The facilitator then asked for each preliminary objective, whether or not anyone was opposed. Following that question, if any participant said they were opposed to a particular objective, the facilitator then asked the Member to recommend a change to the objective to be sure it meets his needs as well as the needs of other Members of the Workgroup.

For the *Capacity and Sustainability of Communities* Workgroups, no Members were opposed to the objectives they had prepared by end of day two and thus achieved consensus that their list of preliminary objectives was acceptable and ready to be discussed by the full DCTF. For the *Profitability and Equitability* Workgroup, consensus was achieved on one of three objectives, but concerns about unintended consequences on different markets in the state (regional, north and central differences) prevented full consensus on two other objectives. While each Workgroup shared its results at regular intervals, time constraints limited the amount of critical review and feedback that could be provided by the full DCTF for the draft preliminary objectives listed in Table 1.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Table 1. Workgroup Preliminary Draft Objectives

Capacity	Profitability and Equitability	Sustainability of Communities: Transitioning Away from the Derby Dynamic
<p>1. To avoid increased effort, increased gear, the transfer of permits to processors, and the “sun setting” of SB 1690, by July 31, 2010, make permanent and explicit the definition of latent permit as those permits with a catch history of less than or equal to 5,000 lbs between November 15, 2003 and July 15, 2008 inclusive. This includes permits purchased after July 15, 2008 with that catch history.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Highest priority</p>	<p>1. By the start of the 2010/2011 season, the Dungeness crab fleet agrees to a management action(s) to measurably reduce early season landings in district 10. The management action(s) will stabilize the market and price of crab, optimize opportunity for all harvest groups (e.g. commercial, sport, and CPFV), reduce impacts (wildlife, navigation, derelict gear), and reduce gear costs for fishermen operating in district 10.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No dot voting completed on objectives by this group</p>	<p>1. By 2010, lengthen effective commercial and recreational harvest over a longer time period based on science and adaptive management.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Highest priority</p>
<p>2. By the 2010 fishing season, spread the volume of catch over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Highest priority</p>	<p>2. During the 2009/2010 season, data will be collected, including the total number of pots in district 10 (fished and owned), and a historical price and landings analysis for the commercial fishery. In addition, data collection methods will be improved for all user groups.</p>	<p>2. Increase early pre-season collaboration to optimize value of first-of-the-season crabs with target of 5% base increase ex-vessel.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: High priority</p>
<p>3. By _____, exempt crab fishing from MPAs as a means to avoid the loss of crabbing grounds and maintain the sustainability of the crab fishery.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: High priority</p>	<p>3. By January 1st, 2011, legislative changes will eliminate double dipping (i.e. double permitted boats) getting two openings (e.g. Oregon and Washington fishermen harvesting in California first, then migrating back north to harvest).</p> <p>Note: Double dipping is a term that was used by several DCTF Members, but appears to have different meanings to different people. In general, it refers to a fishermen being legally able to exploit season openers in different regions of the fishery, and is perceived as unfair by some. Members noted that further discussion and clarity on the term is needed.</p>	<p>3. By 2011, establish a marketing commission to serve as an advisory body for both decision-makers and the public, and improve education. The commission could also provide PR and improve community awareness of the Dungeness crab. The crab commission could grow new markets by 20% and existing markets by 5% through targeted marketing.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Same as objective 2 above</p>



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Capacity	Profitability and Equitability	Sustainability of Communities: Transitioning Away from the Derby Dynamic
<p>4. As soon as feasible, improve the quality of the product by moving start date to December 15 north of District 10.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: High priority</p>	<p>4. By November 2011, the effort shift to district 10 has been reduced, therefore the value of crab from November 15th – December 1st increases. The DCTF will prioritize common ground solutions prior to addressing more contentious issues.</p>	<p>4. Increase profitability to all fishermen through 10% reduction of overhead.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Same as objective 2 above</p>
<p>5. By the 2010 fishing season, establish and certify current quantity of pots in California by fishery and by region. By the 2011 fishing season, establish a maximum amount of pots to be allowed in the fishery.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Mid-level priority</p>		<p>5. Study the impact of sport catch on female crab population; eliminate effort depending on study results.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Same as objective 2 above</p>
<p>6. By January 2011, cap the fishing potential of the fleet by getting better clarity on the “limited entry” fishing potential of each boat (i.e., length or width increases/hull capacity).</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>		<p>6. Collect, analyze, and disseminate long-term biological and historic catch data to monitor the status of the Dungeness crab population and inform management/policy.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: Mid-level priority</p>
<p>7. By the 2010 season, improve the image of the fishery and improve fishery safety and take by eliminating derelict gear in California waters.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>		<p>7. By 2010, increase availability for total live and fresh market by 20% (reduce daily catch to spread out the market).</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>
<p>8. By the 2010 fishing season, limit or eliminate the competition between Rock Crab fishing (no current season limits exist) and the Dungeness Crab fishing season.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>		<p>8. By 2011, establish mechanisms to eliminate or slow down derby dynamic to improve safety (reduce loss of life and injury by 50% in “Report”) and to increase profitability, and ecological sustainability.</p> <p>Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>
		<p>9. Streamline governance and rulemaking. Workgroup prioritization: No ranking</p>



3. Emerging themes across the Workgroups

An analysis of the Workgroup outputs suggests common themes that demonstrate overlap among several draft preliminary objectives. For example, both within and across Workgroups, Members seek to slow down the derby aspects of the fishery. A parallel interest is to lengthen the harvest and reduce the perceived negative impacts of effort shift. In addition, key sub-themes—such as finding solutions to minimize the impacts of fleet migration from Oregon and Washington, as well as from northern California, south to district 10—highlight strong interest in a particular issue that still may be merged into a broader, more overarching theme. The common themes where strong interest has been expressed to address particular issues include:

- Slow the derby, lengthen harvest, reduce effort shift
 - Sub-theme: Eliminate “double-dipping” (see note in table 1 above on terminology)
 - Sub-theme: Improve safety
- Increase profits and the value of crab
- Re-define limited entry and clarify the definition of latent permits
- Acquire, analyze and integrate science and data to inform policy and management

The information included in Table 2 below highlights these themes and suggests potential for consolidation of the draft preliminary objectives that may take place during meeting three of the DCTF.

Finally, it is important to note that few of the listed objectives are stand alone, and as such success in meeting any particular objective may have re-directed effects on others. For example, some Members commented that slowing down the derby aspects of the fishery can contribute to a reduction in accidents and fatalities among fishermen. Protecting California fishermen from the effects of fleet migration from Washington and Oregon may minimize effort shift, and thus contribute to a longer fishing season. Addressing the potential threat of latent permit activation, or implementing some form of a staggered start, may need to be considered in designing a pot limit program. (A staggered or “fair” start may have different applications but in general refers to different start dates that require fishermen to commit to a particular region for a fixed period of time before being able to fish another location). Consideration of such re-directed effects will be a critical aspect of discussions by DCTF Members in meeting three and beyond.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Table 2. Themes Across Workgroups

Emerging theme: Slow down derby, lengthen harvest, reduce effort shift
1. By 2010, lengthen effective commercial and recreational harvest over a longer time period based on science and adaptive management.
2. By the 2010 fishing season, spread the volume of catch over a longer period of time.
3. By the start of the 2010/2011 season, the Dungeness crab fleet agrees to a management action(s) to measurably reduce early season landings in district 10. The management action(s) will stabilize the market and price of crab, optimize opportunity for all harvest groups (e.g. commercial, sport, and CPFV), reduce impacts (wildlife, navigation, derelict gear), and reduce gear costs for fishermen operating in district 10.
4. By November 2011, the effort shift to district 10 has been reduced, therefore the value of crab from November 15 th – December 1 st increases. The DCTF will prioritize common ground solutions prior to addressing more contentious issues.
Sub-theme: Eliminate “double-dipping” (potential for merging with reduce effort shift)
1. By January 1 st , 2011, legislative changes will eliminate double dipping (i.e. double permitted boats) getting two openings (e.g. Oregon and Washington fishermen harvesting in California first, then migrating back north to harvest.(See note on double dipping terminology in table 1 above)
Sub-theme: Improve safety (potential for merging with slow the derby)
1. By 2011, establish mechanisms to eliminate or slow down derby dynamic to improve safety (reduce loss of life and injury by 50% in “Report”) and to increase profitability, and ecological sustainability.
2. By the 2010 season, improve the image of the fishery and improve fishery safety and take by eliminating derelict gear in California waters.
Emerging theme: Increase profits and the value of crab
1. By 2011, establish a marketing commission to serve as an advisory body for both decision-makers and the public, and improve education. The commission could also provide PR and improve community awareness of the Dungeness crab. The crab commission could grow new markets by 20% and existing markets by 5% through targeted marketing.
2. Increase early pre-season collaboration to optimize value of first-of-the-season crabs with target of 5% base increase ex-vessel.
3. Increase profitability to all fishermen through 10% reduction of overhead.
4. As soon as feasible, improve the quality of the product by moving start date to December 15 north of District 10.
5. By 2010, increase availability for total live and fresh market by 20% (reduce daily catch to spread out the market).
Emerging theme: Define latent permits and limited entry
1. To avoid increased effort, increased gear, the transfer of permits to processors, and the “sun setting” of SB 1690, by July 31, 2010, make permanent and explicit the definition of latent permit as those permits with a catch history of less than or equal to 5,000 lbs between November 15, 2003 and July 15, 2008 inclusive. This includes permits purchased after July 15, 2008 with that catch history.
2. By January 2011, cap the fishing potential of the fleet by getting better clarity on the “limited entry” fishing potential of each boat (i.e., length or width increases/hull capacity).
Emerging theme: Acquire, analyze and integrate science and data to inform policy and management
1. Collect, analyze, and disseminate long-term biological and historic catch data to monitor the status of the Dungeness crab population and to inform management and policy.
2. During the 2009/2010 season, data will be collected, including the total number of pots in district 10 (fished and owned), and a historical price and landings analysis for the commercial fishery. In addition, data collection methods will be improved for all user groups.
3. Study the impact of sport catch on female crab population; or just eliminate the take of females.



4. Brainstormed solutions and potential management tools

On day three, each Workgroup began to brainstorm potential management tools and approaches that could be applied to meet an objective. Workgroup Members were tasked to consider all potential management tools, and then discuss pros and cons, to understand tradeoffs and potentially to eliminate the least desirable options. **For almost all of the objectives, Workgroups did NOT attempt to agree on any solution or tool.** However, some Workgroups were able to prioritize some objectives and the brainstormed list of approaches and tools to achieve the objective. In addition, each Workgroup considered:

- What additional information was needed to inform decision making about objectives and/or brainstormed tools and approaches?
- What are the foreseen costs, resources, and funding mechanisms needed to pay for management associated with the possible tools and approaches used to achieve the objective?

The solutions and potential management tools brainstormed by each Workgroup are listed in Table 3 below. Importantly, there is significant overlap on potential management approaches and tools discussed to meet various objectives. Where that is the case, the most commonly identified tools are listed directly under the theme heading. The table is structured in the following order:

1. Emerging themes (as displayed in table 2 above)
2. Overlap of potential management tools discussed across theme (if any)
3. Preliminary objectives contained within the theme
4. Solutions/potential management tools and discussion points (by objective)

During meeting three, DCTF Members will be tasked to further explore and refine potential solutions including consideration of which tools may be stand alone and which may be applied together as a package within an adaptive framework.



Table 3. Themes, Preliminary Draft Objectives, Brainstormed Solutions and Potential Management Approaches and Tools

Emerging theme: Slow down derby, lengthen harvest, reduce effort shift	
Overlap of brainstormed solutions and tools	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pot limits ➤ Staggered or “fair” start ➤ Regional management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Individual Fishing Quotas ➤ Uniform statewide start
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Latent permits ➤ Delivery limits 	
<p>Preliminary objective:</p> <p><i>1. By 2010, lengthen effective commercial and recreational harvest over a longer time period based on science and adaptive management.</i></p> <p>Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup</p>	
Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Set capacity goals for the entire season, vessel numbers, and district 10 (D10) fishing (long-term management solution):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Pot limits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Define and implement capacity caps where needed, e.g. pot and vessel limits ○ For northern districts, establish caps on effort achieved with tiered pot limits (similar to Oregon’s tiered system, e.g. 200, 300, and 500 pots per vessel and 100 pots for latent permits) ○ Start with a pilot with 300-pot limit for everyone, then DCTF can adaptively manage ○ Establish pot buybacks ○ Sport fishing pot limit and elimination of female catches ○ Transferability limit/pot stacking to be further discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Methods on determining caps/tiers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine historic trends on catches, length of time, number of landings, etc. - Integrate current and historic data 	<p><u>Other issues related to pot limits:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Could align with Oregon and Washington systems ➤ Northern fishermen currently deploy more pots in D10 than fishermen in D10 <p><u>Other issues related to permits:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potential loss of boat and/or permit value <p><u>Shortened presoak:</u> After discussion Workgroup decided solution unviable and eliminated the option</p> <p><u>Delivery limits:</u> This is a historic solution that has been implemented before</p>



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set up point system (5 points for x pounds, 10 points for xx pounds, 1 point for x landings) • <u>Individual Transfer Quotas/Transferrable Permits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need caps on pots or be able to stack permits (purchasing other available permits to increase a certain percentage of pots to purchaser's permit limit) • <u>Permits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consideration of latent permits in defining pot limits ○ Require statewide permit and an optional D10 permit (special permit, based on historic fishing efforts-need to define historic) ○ Define and convert latent permits to use non-transferrable permits. Results: state could dwindle to 329 from 600 through attrition ➤ <u>Shortened pre-soak</u> (to three days) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to enforce and reduces safety ➤ <u>Staggered or "fair" start</u> (30 day restriction) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 15th/December 1st north • Border fishermen can go between both, or set new district in Cape Mendocino • Set 300-pot limit in D10 (tiered) ➤ <u>Implement willing buyer/seller enter cooperative agreements</u> to smooth out season (short-term management solution) ➤ <u>Delivery limits</u> (e.g. can only land a ton at a time) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishermen would have a delivery limit imposed upon them and could not deliver more to the processor ➤ <u>Individual fishing quotas</u> (IFQs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linked with delivery limits ➤ <u>Ban night fishing</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to regulate • Can lose gear at night and sand bar problems are hard to predict ➤ <u>Processor shares</u> ➤ <u>Regional zonal management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rotation of fishing area/boundary-setting • Area-based permits; transferability ➤ <u>Uniform statewide start date</u> (e.g. December 1st) 	<p><u>Individual Fishing Quotas (IFQs)</u>: May not stop derby fishing, and may institutionalize buyers, create loss for smaller fishermen, etc. Too much uncertainty with quota and fishery. Further discussion needed</p> <p><u>Banning night fishing</u>: After discussion Workgroup decided solution unviable and eliminated the option</p> <p><u>Processor shares</u>: After discussion group decided solution unviable and eliminated the option</p> <p><u>Uniform start date of December 1st</u>: Not ideal for Thanksgiving market. Workgroup had a brief discussion on pushing northern start date back to December 15th</p> <p>Other issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Long-Term Payment for a Dungeness crab fishery management plan (FMP)</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need landing tax and another fund to support costs • Half a cent/pound tax could go into a fund could work out to about \$152/person (\$50-\$300)
--	---



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Preliminary objective:

2. *By the 2010 fishing season spread the volume of catch over a longer period of time.*

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Stop/shorten presoak</u> ➤ <u>Buyback program</u> ➤ <u>Uniform statewide start</u> ➤ <u>Boat/Dist ID</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisherman picks spot and it includes a pot limit (i.e. 500, 300, 200 limit) ➤ <u>Pot limits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tag system to enforce (like Oregon); Remove gear in water • Fixed period pot limit/not whole season ➤ <u>Daily landing limits</u> ➤ <u>Seasonal limits/market-based Total Allowable Catch (TAC)</u> ➤ <u>District 10 Restricted Entry (Regional Management)</u> ➤ <u>30 day clause (two options)</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Staggered start:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District 10 keeps November start • Oregon – Dec 1 • North of District 10 – December 15 • 30 day clause 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Stop/shorten presoak:</u> Addresses Rock crab issue; might address sport gear issue. Workgroup conclusions: Viable but not preferred; creates safety issues; other options seem like better priority ➤ <u>Buyback program</u> Unclear how and if it really works to reduce impacts. There are several examples from other fisheries where fishermen have re-entered the target fishery or a different fishery with newer/better gear. Workgroup conclusion: There are always loopholes to allow fishermen to re-enter. It is an inconsistent tool and not preferred at this time ➤ <u>Uniform statewide start date</u> Compresses/does not spread volume; messes up buyers/market. Workgroup conclusion: Not viable ➤ <u>Pot limits</u> Regarding use of a tag system with pot limits: Who supplies? Who pays? Lost tags/replacement? ➤ <u>Daily landing limits</u> How is it handled if fishermen exceed limit?



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pot Limits with fixed window – not season long 2) <u>Not a staggered start</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above for all the rest <p>➤ <u>Latent permits</u></p>	<p>➤ <u>District 10 Restricted Entry (Regional Management)</u> Doesn't work without Pot limits. Workgroup conclusion: Not an ideal solution</p> <p>➤ <u>Latent permits</u> Tools addressed in the latent permit objective are high priority</p>
--	---

Preliminary objective:

3. By the start of the 2010/2011 season, the Dungeness crab fleet agrees to a management action(s) to measurably reduce early season landings in district 10. The management action(s) will stabilize the market and price of crab, optimize opportunity for all harvest groups (e.g. commercial, sport, and CPFV), reduce impacts (wildlife, navigation, derelict gear), and reduce gear costs for fishermen operating in district 10.

Drafted by: Profitability and Equitability Workgroup

(Note: Within the full Workgroup, consensus was not achieved on this objective. Some fishermen expressed concern that reducing landings in district 10 could negatively affect other markets. The specific question was posed “Can it be done without destabilizing markets in other parts of the state outside district 10?” to which no one in the group had an answer.)

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Uniform statewide start date of November 15th</u> ➤ <u>Regional limited entry, including greater restrictions in district 10</u> ➤ <u>Regional pot limit for district 10, potentially including pot stacking and/or a total pot cap</u> ➤ <u>Staggered or “fair” start clause</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Uniform statewide start date of November 15th</u> Several Workgroup Members felt this was not achievable through legislation due to the political influence of large buyers / processors, but was nonetheless worth exploring further ➤ <u>Regional limited entry, including greater restrictions in district 10</u> The entire Workgroup agreed that more data would be needed to inform such a management decision. The group was not clear on what that data would be ➤ <u>Regional pot limit for district 10, potentially including pot stacking and/or a total pot cap.</u> Some Workgroup Members stressed the need to look at what the unintended consequences of the application of either type of pot limit may have on the rest of the fishery ➤ <u>Staggered or “fair” start clause</u> The entire Workgroup expressed interest in this tool, or at minimum did not oppose the idea in principle. The group was in agreement that the issue of “fair start” needs more discussion



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Preliminary objective:

4. By November 2011, the effort shift to district 10 has been reduced, therefore the value of crab from November 15th – December 1st increases. The DCTF will prioritize common ground solutions prior to addressing more contentious issues.

Drafted by: Profitability and Equitability Workgroup

(Note: The full Workgroup was not opposed to this objective in principle, however some expressed concern – similar to objective #1 above – that a reduction in effort and/or migration in district 10 in the early season could have unintended consequences and possibly negative effects on other markets. The full Workgroup agreed the objective was worth further exploration.)

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>30 day fair start for every season opener in California</u> ➤ <u>Limited entry</u> ➤ <u>Buyback programs</u> ➤ <u>Quota shares</u> ➤ <u>Gear restrictions (pot limits)</u> ➤ <u>Regional management</u> ➤ <u>Marketing programs</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>30 day fair start for every season opener in California</u> ➤ Must be reciprocal with the Tri-State Commission; considered the best available tool by some Workgroup Members ➤ <u>Buyback programs</u> Considered not workable by some Workgroup Members ➤ <u>Quota shares</u> Would need a Total Allowable Catch which some feel is not possible for Dungeness crab ➤ <u>Gear restrictions (pot limits)</u> Some Workgroup Members felt that success in implementing a fair start could reduce the need for pot limits ➤ <u>Regional management</u> Some Workgroup Members felt the state is already split (two distinct fisheries) and thus regional management could be a good option ➤ <u>Marketing programs</u> Some Workgroup Members felt that formation of a Dungeness crab council or marketing commission could be a good tool)



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Sub-theme: Eliminate “double dipping” (potential for merging with reduce effort shift)

Preliminary objective:

1. *By January 1st, 2011, legislative changes will eliminate double dipping (i.e. double permitted boats) getting two openings (e.g. Oregon and Washington fishermen harvesting in California first, then migrating back north to harvest).*

Drafted by: Profitability and Equitability Workgroup
(See note on double dipping terminology in table 1 above)

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>30 day fair start clause for out-of-state boats</u> ➤ <u>Application of Oregon and Washington pot limits for out of state fishermen operating in California</u> ➤ <u>Pot limits for non-resident boats</u> ➤ <u>Individual fishing quotas (IFQs)</u> ➤ <u>Coordination with the Tri-State Dungeness Crab Commission</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>30 day fair start clause for out-of-state boats</u> Many stressed that this rule would need to be clearly defined. By example, some commercial fishermen have a different definition for “double dipping”, and thus a different vision of how a fair start would be applied ➤ <u>Application of Oregon and Washington pot limits for out of state fishermen operating in California</u> Many felt this may not be politically feasible or even legal ➤ <u>Pot limits for non-resident boats</u> Some Workgroup Members considered Washington and Oregon pot limits being applied in California for non-resident fishermen. Following initial discussion, most felt this would not work without California pot limits in place first

Sub-theme: Improve safety (potential for merging with slow down derby)

Preliminary objective:

1. *By 2011, establish mechanisms to eliminate or slow down derby dynamic to improve safety (reduce loss of life and injury by 50% in “Report”) and to increase profitability, and ecological sustainability.*

Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
Same as tools listed for objective 1 under the theme slow down derby, lengthen harvest, reduce effort shift	Same as notes listed for objective 1 under the theme slow down derby, lengthen harvest, reduce effort shift



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Preliminary objective:

2. By the 2010 season, improve the image of the fishery and improve fishery safety and take by eliminating derelict gear in California waters.

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Revise state code that prohibits gear retrieval by parties other than the gear's owner ➤ Establish funding incentives to remove gear ➤ Establish disincentive policies to eliminate future gear loss 	

Emerging theme: Increase profits and the value of crab

Overlap of brainstormed solutions and tools

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| ➤ Marketing commission | ➤ Pre-season collaboration |
|------------------------|----------------------------|

Preliminary objective:

1. By 2011, establish a marketing commission to serve as an advisory body for both decision-makers and the public, and improve education. The commission could also provide PR and improve community awareness of the Dungeness crab. The crab commission could grow new markets by 20% and existing markets by 5% through targeted marketing.

Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>Establish representative(s) for each port</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Processors • Sport fishermen • Retail and distribution sectors • Fish and Game (DFG) liaison 	Look at established models such as the Sea Urchin Commission; California Salmon Council; Oregon Dungeness Crab Commission; Referendum Tax



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Preliminary objective:

2. Increase early pre-season collaboration to optimize value of first-of-the-season crabs with target of 5% base increase ex-vessel.

Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Propose Oct 15-25th meeting of an informal crab commission to get price commitment three weeks in advance to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help assess current value against historic value • Start season on time • Benefit live/fresh market • Set legal market order prior to pot deployment (key) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Price factors include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory in freezer • Puget Sound fishery gets cheaper price in October and depresses market • British Columbia competition • Oregon price-setting in October

Preliminary objective:

3. Increase profitability to all fishermen through 10% reduction of overhead.

Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Less fuel, time, bait, crew, less cost buying, maintaining, storing-overhead in general 	<p>Details on pot transferability need to be considered</p>

Preliminary objective:

4. As soon as feasible, improve the quality of the product by moving start date to December 15 north of District 10.

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Use methods to assess fishery recovery as a way to define improved quality 	
<p>Preliminary objective:</p> <p><i>5. By 2010, increase availability for total live and fresh market by 20% (reduce daily catch to spread out the market).</i></p> <p>Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup</p>	
Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
None defined yet	
<p>Emerging theme: Define latent permits and limited entry</p>	
<p>Preliminary objective:</p> <p><i>1. To avoid increased effort, increased gear, the transfer of permits to processors, and the “sun setting” of SB 1690, by July 31, 2010, make permanent and explicit the definition of latent permit as those permits with a catch history of less than or equal to 5,000 lbs between November 15, 2003 and July 15, 2008 inclusive. This includes permits purchased after July 15, 2008 with that catch history.</i></p> <p>Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup</p>	
Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Create new legislation as soon as feasible to mandate that the latent permit text from SB 1690 is codified in the Fish & Game code ➤ Recognize potential impacts to latent permit holders that are attempting to enter the fishery: 	<p>Current text in SB1690 is the best approach available to achieve limit of 200 permits (need better data); several Workgroup Members understood that this may continue to limit ability of entry-level fisherman</p>



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

- Create a “Hardship Review” process to be administered by Fish & Game Commission
- A Hardship Review process will have a time limit of XX years within which applicants must apply
- Criteria for the Hardship Review process will be administered by the Fish & Game Commission and will be advised on/created by some group of Dungeness crab fishermen (i.e. a to-be-developed Dungeness Crab Advisory Committee)

Preliminary objective:

2. By January 2011, cap the fishing potential of the fleet by getting better clarity on the “limited entry” fishing potential of each boat (i.e. length or width increases/hull capacity).

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions and tools to achieve objective

Discussion points and additional notes

- Redefine permits to be more directly related to a boat and its potential (Limit increases when not being sold – transfer limits are already defined)

Emerging theme: Acquire, analyze and integrate science and data to inform policy and management

Preliminary objective:

1. Collect, analyze, and disseminate long-term biological and historic catch data to monitor the status of the Dungeness crab population and to inform management and policy.

Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Juvenile life history ➤ Real-time catch ➤ Spatial-temporal applications ➤ Collaborate research protocols ➤ Studies that quantify sport take ➤ Long-term impact on resources, such as climate change, water quality degradation (from land-based pollution), etc. ➤ Area/ecosystem-based management (e.g. predator/prey relationships) 	
<p>Preliminary objective:</p> <p><i>2. During the 2009/2010 season, data will be collected, including the total number of pots in district 10 (fished and owned), and a historical price and landings analysis for the commercial fishery. In addition, data collection methods will be improved for all user groups.</i></p> <p>Drafted by: Profitability and Equitability Workgroup</p>	
Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improve and create methods of data collection for all user groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pot count (total # in water and owned) • Historic landings analysis • CPFV log book improvements and compliance • Sport landing data • Assessment on landings with dedicated funds going back to fishery management and potentially used for marketing the commercial fishery 	
<p>Preliminary objective:</p> <p><i>3. Study the impact of sport catch on female crab population; or just eliminate the take of females.</i></p> <p>Drafted by: Sustainability of Communities Workgroup</p>	
Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
None defined yet	



Additional preliminary objectives

Preliminary objective:

1. By _____, exempt crab fishing from MPAs as a means to avoid the loss of crabbing grounds and maintain the sustainability of the crab fishery.

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Revise legislation and policy to specifically exempt Dungeness crab fishing activities from marine protected areas (MPAs) ➤ Define and characterize limited impacts to MPAs from crab fishing activities 	

Preliminary objective:

2. By the 2010 fishing season, limit or eliminate the competition between Rock Crab fishing (no current season limits exist) and the Dungeness Crab fishing season.

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Set a temporary close of Rock Crab season to 3 weeks before Dungeness crab season ➤ Don't require the close under the southern Rock Crab permit area 	



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/?p=444>

Preliminary objective:

2. *By January 2011, cap the fishing potential of the fleet by getting better clarity on the "limited entry" fishing potential of each boat (i.e. length or width increases/hull capacity).*

Drafted by: Capacity Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
None defined yet	This is an alternative to setting a pot limit. It instead focuses on setting a pot "cap"

Preliminary objective:

3. *Streamline governance and rulemaking.*

Drafted by: Profitability and Equitability Workgroup

Brainstormed solutions	Discussion points and additional notes
<p>➤ Establish and implement a Dungeness crab FMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DCTF could become crab commission, collaborate with FGC on recreational and legislature on commercial catch• Landing tax could pay for DGF and solve harbor district• Could charge fishermen higher prices, which could go into Dungeness crab fund	



5. Desired information and data needs for further discussion of management tools

Following the solutions brainstorming exercise, each Workgroup considered what additional information was needed to inform discussion on potential solutions and management options. Table 4 below highlights information requests from each Workgroup relative to the proposed draft objectives and potential solutions listed in Tables 1 and 3 above.

Table 4. Workgroup Identification of Data and Information Needs

Capacity	Profitability and equitability	Sustainability of Communities: Transitioning Away from the Derby Dynamic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pot limits: how is it working and where? How are numbers set? How are large-scale (i.e. coastal) versus regionalized / district-size efforts working and how do they compare? ➤ Derelict gear retrieval: physical methods, methods to adjust current restrictions (i.e. legal constraints to remove someone else's gear) ➤ Ecological impact (or lack thereof) of crabbing on marine protected areas (MPAs) ➤ Current levels of gear in the fishery: how much? Where? (to be potentially used as a means to put a cap on gear, rather than a reduction of it) ➤ Buyback programs: success rates in achieving intended goals of reducing fishery / fleet size, versus rates or re-entry back into the target fishery or some other fishery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Statistics on how many non-residents fish district 10; how many fish districts 6, 7, 8, and 9 ➤ How many non-residents boats "double dip"?(i.e. fish an opener in California, then head north to fish an opener in Oregon or Washington) ➤ How many non-resident boats have latent permits for the California fishery? ➤ How many non-resident boats fish California all season? ➤ Case study examples of how fair start provisions have been used in Washington, Oregon and other locations ➤ Landings price analysis of the fishery (DFG or an outside consultant / specialist?) ➤ Sport landing data (DFG California Recreational Fisheries Survey) ➤ Total pot count for California waters; total pot count for district 10 (not attainable right now) <p>Ideas on improvements for data collection in the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CPFV log book improvements and compliance ➤ Assessment on landings with dedicated funds going back to fishery management and potentially used for marketing the commercial fishery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Investigate the cost of producing and implementing a Dungeness crab fishery management plan (FMP) ➤ Determine legality of market orders to establish pot deployment ➤ Determine legality of dispensing latent permits ➤ Collect data on pots/landing and identify landing differences (between districts) in order to set capacity goals for vessels and pots ➤ Analysis to understand socioeconomic impact of implementation of tools like IFQs versus gear restrictions ➤ Sport landing data ➤ Information on management tools in Oregon and Washington being implemented and under consideration ➤ Find case studies on referendum tax ➤ Find out status of landing tax bill in California