

October 20, 2009

Dear DCTF,

We sincerely regret our inability to attend this important meeting, but hope to communicate our input to you with this brief memo. We have asked that David Crabbe sit in for us on plenary and workgroup discussions – as many of you know, he is extremely familiar with the issues facing the fishery, and we believe he can make very helpful contributions to the discussion and process.

Below are points we would ask the Task Force to keep in mind during its hard work through the next two days:

- We see the singular importance of continuing the hard work and progress of the Task Force, especially considering the shortened timeframe due to the state budget situation beyond anyone's control; not to mention the approaching fishing season! We note and emphasize that per existing statute, the DCTF *can* continue through Jan 15, 2011 following the report due this approaching Jan 2010. We recommend that the OPC and/or the DCTF officially clarify to the State its progress so far and if necessary, explain that an expanded report or further recommendations will be submitted by March 31.

- 1 We encourage inclusion of clearly stated fishery goals in a report to the Legislature – based on discussion in the Task Force meetings to date, we understand those goals generally as:

- Cap and Reduce Capacity

- 1 Minimize Effort Shift Within California and between States
- 2 Increase Profitability and Community Benefits; Allow for New Entrants
- 3 End the Derby and Stabilize Product Flow
- 4 Improve Enforceability
- 5 Improve Safety
- 6 Increase Transparency and Stakeholder Involvement in Management
- 7 Clarify Regulations
- 8 Base Management on Data

- We support the stated interest by many members in establishment of a more permanent crab advisory body tasked with collecting and analyzing data and developing management recommendations in California; and who would advise improve coordination with the Tri-State Crab Committee. Such an advisory body could, for one, take proactive action to prevent negative impacts if there is to be WA buyback of crab permits

- 1 We support the stated interest by many members to finalize a control date and establish such language in code past the expiration of SB 1690. We see the importance of the so-called 'latent permit issues,' and note that defining latency is different than deciding exactly how latent permits would fit into any other management changes. It

seems to us this is a discussion that needs more time – a discussion that could take place if the DCTF timeframe is expanded and the process continued.

2 We strongly encourage discussion about the importance of structuring any management changes to incorporate flexibility and adaptability for the diverse fleet. There are a variety of ways to incorporate this principle into the design of various management tools. A continuance of the DCTF and/or establishment of a crab advisory body would provide a forum to have these discussions.

3 We note the clear interest by some members in learning more about the variety of management approaches available to this fishery. We strongly encourage such a discussion over the longer term.

4 We strongly support and encourage a recommendation(s) for more data (fishery and scientific research) to be collected and used to inform management of the fishery.

In summary, we see the above points describing significant progress and a feasible package of outcomes focusing on the 1) continuation of this stakeholder process; 2) more information and discussion of management approaches over the longer-term; and 3) improved data and science used for management of the fishery. We look forward to the outcomes of this meeting, and to future work with you for the good of the Dungeness crab fishery.

Best regards,
Johanna Thomas (and Maggie Ostdahl), EDF