



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

DCTF MEETING UKIAH, CALIFORNIA OCTOBER 29, 2014 MEETING SUMMARY

NOTE: This is a DRAFT summary of the Dungeness Crab Task Force's (DCTF) October 29, 2014 meeting. It is currently being reviewed by the DCTF for accuracy. This summary will be deemed final following the task force's approval and posted online at: <http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this meeting summary is to:

- Inform all DCTF Members and the wider public of ongoing work of the DCTF
- Provide a summary of discussions and outcomes from the October 29, 2014 DCTF meeting held in Ukiah, California

ATTENDEES

Jim Anderson, Half Moon Bay, Low Tier
John Atkinson, Jr., San Francisco, High Tier
Geoff Bettencourt, Half Moon Bay, High Tier
Ron Blodgett, Bodega Bay, Low Tier
Bill Blue, Half Moon Bay South
Joe Caito, Alternate for Bill Carvalho, Crab Processor
Larry Collins, San Francisco, Low Tier
Ricardo De Solenni, Crescent City, Low Tier
Vince Doyle, Fort Bragg, High Tier
Brett Fahning, Crescent City, High Tier
Lt. Bob Farrell, CA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Craig Goucher, Alternate for Mike Zamboni, Trinidad
David Helliwell, Eureka, Low Tier
Gerry Hemmingsen, Crescent City, High Tier
Christy Juhasz, CA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Chris Lawson, Bodega Bay, High Tier
Brian Nolte, Alternate for Todd Whaley, Nonresident
Carrie Pomeroy, CA Sea Grant
Rick Powers, Alternate for Roger Thomas, Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel
Dan Wolford, Alternate for Marc Gorelnik, Sport fishing
Jim Yarnall, Sport fishing
John Yearwood, Fort Bragg, Low Tier

ABSENT

David Crabbe, Nongovernmental Organization
David Bennett, Crescent City, Low Tier
Michael Cunningham, Eureka, High Tier
Paul Johnson, Crab Processor

DCTF ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM PRESENT

Rachelle Fisher, Strategic Earth Consulting
Kelly Sayce, Strategic Earth Consulting



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

Wednesday, October 29, 2014
8:00am-5:00pm

1. Welcome, introductions and agenda review

Rachelle Fisher, member of the DCTF Administrative Team (Admin Team), welcomed everyone to the meeting. She introduced Kelly Sayce, Admin Team, and the meeting note taker, Liz Perkins. Ms. Fisher mentioned that representatives from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Marine Region, Enforcement, and the License and Revenue Branch (LRB) and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) would be available to answer questions. There was no representative from the California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) present. She advised the meeting agenda was full and would be managed efficiently so everyone would have an opportunity to participate and be heard on all issues. She asked the DCTF to use a solutions-based approach to topics and to participate openly and with respect for all Members. Ms. Fisher reviewed the DCTF ground rules and respectfully requested the public adhere to the same ground rules.

Ms. Fisher reviewed the procedures for public comment and explained that public comment would be taken on every agenda item and there will be an opportunity for public comment on non-agenda items. DCTF Members and the Admin Team may call on the public for additional information and clarification as needed to support DCTF discussions. Ms. Fisher explained the meeting would be recorded (via hand-held voice recorder), and explained the recording would be erased after 30 days in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act.¹ DCTF Members, Alternates, and the public were asked to introduce themselves.

The Admin Team reviewed the meeting agenda and explained the purpose of the meeting was to determine content for a report, mandated by Senate Bill (SB) 369, due January 15, 2015.

2. Review of DCTF Charter and discussion related to the function and structure of the DCTF

The Admin Team reminded the group that the DCTF voted at the April 2014 meeting to add an appendix, Appendix A, to the [DCTF Charter](#). This appendix provides operating procedures for the DCTF Executive Committee (EC). In advance of the October meeting, the Charter was updated to reflect changes in DCTF membership due to Members stepping down. The Charter (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2) provided procedures for replacing DCTF Members: “In the event that an elected commercial fisherman Member must step down, or chooses to step down from DCTF, that Member’s service will be provided by an Alternate (see Section 3.2). The Alternate will fulfill all the elected Member’s responsibilities, as consistent with the Member’s perspective on any voting issues.” The Admin Team acknowledged there may be additional Members who step down over the course of the duration of the DCTF (i.e. through January 2017) and explained that those seats will be filled in the same fashion.

One Member asked to serve as an Alternate for an absent DCTF Member and vote in his place. The Admin Team explained Alternates must represent the same tier as the absent Member, which was not the case. They also explained that the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act prohibits voting by proxy.

¹ Note: Due to the delayed production of this meeting summary, the voice recording will be available 60 days following the meeting.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

Ms. Fisher revisited a request made at the April 2014 DCTF to discuss the restructuring of the DCTF. She reminded the group that [new data](#) showed the distribution of permits across ports to be different than when the DCTF was first established. This led some Members to feel the current structure of the DCTF did not appropriately reflect the current structure of the commercial fleet. Ms. Fisher reminded the group that changes to the DCTF's structure must be made through legislation, which can take up to two years. Additionally, the OPC has stated it will not allocate additional funds to the DCTF beyond what has been currently allocated through 2017. Ms. Fisher explained the Admin Team would like to support the DCTF in addressing this topic in a manner that does not invalidate past, present, and future work of the DCTF. The Admin Team proposed the DCTF include a statement in their 2015 report expressing interest in addressing the structure and make-up of the DCTF, and then provide details on how to accomplish this in their 2017 report to the Legislature.

One Member asked if there is any indication the OPC would continue to provide funding after 2017. Ms. Fisher explained that OPC stated it will not allocate any additional funds to the DCTF. One Member questioned the timing of the proposed recommendation since the Legislature would take two years to respond. Ms. Fisher responded that in addition to the legislatively mandated 2015 and 2017 reports, the DCTF may send additional reports to the Legislature to help move things forward. A Member clarified that agreeing to a statement is simply opening the door to future discussions. Members discussed what would happen if the DCTF did not recommend changes to its structure. Members discussed the original scoping process for developing the structure of the DCTF and acknowledged that both the number of permits and the production from each port were taken into account when deciding the DCTF's structure. They also agreed that production in the fleet has changed over the last 10 years and it could change again in the next 10 years. Members agreed it is important to define what determines the number of representatives in each port (e.g. landings or permits or both). The DCTF agreed the EC would work on proposed solutions regarding this topic for full DCTF consideration at the next meeting. This topic will not be addressed with a recommendation in the 2015 report.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Bill DeBacker, Commercial Fisherman- Asked to be informed of when/where EC meetings would take place, and requested EC Members meet with their constituents prior to EC meetings.
 - Ms. Fisher explained that EC meeting announcement are made via an email listserve announcement. Since Mr. DeBacker does not have email, he may share his phone number with the Admin Team and they will reach out to him prior to the meetings.

A Member asked how to get in touch with his constituents and gain access to a list of permitholders' contact information so that he may properly notify his constituents of DCTF related activities. He suggested each permitholder sign a statement saying they are willing to be on a publicly available list. Another Member stated that all DCTF information and proceedings are publicly available on the DCTF website. Ms. Fisher explained that, in the past, the DCTF Admin Team sent a letter to every permitholder sharing information about their respective DCTF representative and how to contact them. At that time, there was not any apparent response to this effort. However, cost permitting, the Admin Team could circulate a mailing to this effect in the coming months. The Admin Team has also looked into posting flyers on harbor bulletin boards to inform constituents of EC and DCTF meetings. Ms. Fisher explained that anyone can email info@dungenesscrabtaskforce.com to request the contact information of DCTF Members, or any other information. The Admin Team will look into CDFW's confidentiality agreement of making a public list of permitholder's contact information.

3. *Presentation of [data related to the California Dungeness crab fishery](#) and DCTF discussion related to the Dungeness crab commercial trap limit program. DCTF discussions may include, but will not*



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

be limited to, review of commercial trap limit program to-date, changes in the fishery over the last 10 years, and implications for management, latent permits, and derelict gear retrieval options.

Ms. Fisher reviewed the topics discussed at the April 2014 DCTF meeting related to the commercial Dungeness crab trap limit program and shared a [document outlining these options and their rationale](#). Other options not contained in the document may also be considered by the DCTF. Additional options were developed during an EC conference call on [October 15, 2014](#).

Christy Juhasz, CDFW Marine Region, presented [information on the commercial Dungeness crab fishery](#). Lt. Bob Farrell, CDFW Enforcement, did not have any new updates and was available if questions arose.

Commercial Trap Limit Program- Buoy Trap Tag Fee Waiver

Ms. Fisher reviewed the straw poll from the April 2014 meeting:

Straw Poll- Allow buoy tag fee waiver for permitholders based on any issue (e.g. sick or just not fishing) upon renewal of permit. There is no limit on how many times a permitholder can do this. An individual cannot purchase tags mid-season and start fishing (13 up; 5 sideways; 0 down; 3 abstain)

Straw Poll- If an individual decides to not fish 1 year and wants to fish the next year, they will still need to pay for 2 full years. No discounting or prorating fees. (18 up; 1 sideways; down; 2 abstain)

One Member explained he received mixed reviews from his constituents on the topic of tag fee waivers for all permitholders. There was concern out-of-state boats and others could waive tag fees for an indeterminate period of time and gain full support of the system. Ms. Fisher clarified that people would still be required to purchase permits but would get a waiver on the buoy tag fees. One Member stated his constituents support waivers on tag fees when permitholders are too ill to fish. Some Members agreed that tag fee waivers should be allowed if a permitholder is sick, but questioned how CDFW would decide if someone is legitimately sick and unable to fish. Some Members suggested requiring more than one doctors' note; while others thought doctors' note requirements would not discourage individuals from taking advantage of the system. A Member suggested that permitholders faced with mandatory military service should be allowed fee waivers. Many Members agreed.

Members questioned if the revenue lost by allowing tag fee waivers would need to be made up by raising fees for those participants that are fishing. Ms. Fisher clarified that increasing the \$1,000 biennial permit fee and \$5/tag fee would require a change in statute. Some Members stated they thought tag fees went to pay for the tags themselves. The Admin Team and CDFW clarified some of the fees go to CDFW to cover other costs associated with the trap limit program. CDFW referenced the [trap limit program accounting information](#) presented at the April 2014 DCTF meeting and stated that updated accounting information will be made available yearly. The availability of excess funds is unclear at this point, however, since the cost of lawsuits as a result of the program has not been included in the accounting document. CDFW explained that SB 369 indicates that a surplus of funds may be used to offset the costs of the program, fund the DCTF, etc.

One Member suggested an opt-out fee be considered, so if a permitholder were not planning to use their tags, the fee would be reduced to a specified amount that would be sufficient to support the trap limit program. Other Members suggested the current process of "use it or lose it" (i.e. pay all of your tag fees or lose your Dungeness crab commercial fishing permit) should continue to be the requirement.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

The DCTF looked at data from CDFW to understand if a waiver is needed to prevent the activation of latent permits. Data showed that latent permit holders were not more inclined to fish/activate their permits to offset the new fees associated with the trap limit program. The data also showed that fewer vessels made landings in the 2013-2014 season than in the previous two years. A couple of Members expressed a hope that tags fees would discourage those holding permits for speculative purposes to not renew their permit since it would cost too much to hang onto without fishing. Another Member stated the intent of the program was not to reduce number of traps, but instead to cap the number of traps fished.

Members asked CDFW for guidance on how to establish a definition for sick, incapacitated, or disabled. CDFW explained there are few instances where waivers are given on commercial fishing fees. In the drift gill net fishery, a permit holder can have a substitute fish their vessel if they provide a medical reason, but no fees are waived in these instances. CDFW also acknowledged the outcome of waivers for the Dungeness crab fishery may influence whether tag waivers are allowed in other fisheries like California spiny lobster. CDFW explained there are options in place to help permit holders who are sick with an operational boat, or if a permit holder is well but the boat is not functional (e.g. someone else fishes the boat, emergency transfers, etc.). In circumstances where the former alternative has been used in other fisheries (e.g. sea urchin), a doctor's note is needed to confirm the permit holder is unable to fish.

CDFW explained LRB contracts with a private vendor to print tags (i.e., it is not done in-house), so if a person recovers from their illness there is not a quick turn around for tag printing. The DCTF agreed that the recommendation should include a qualifier that fishermen may not purchase buoy tags mid-season. One Member suggested setting an early opt-out period so CDFW does not print every tag available in the fishery, thereby adding cost savings.

One Member suggested allowing a small window when fishermen can file an appeal to get a waiver and CDFW could consider waivers on a case-by-case basis. A Member stated the tag fee waiver issue was brought to the DCTF's attention by a fisherman that was sick, but hired someone to run his boat to recover his costs. Members concluded only a small percentage of the fleet would need a waiver for fees due to illness and allowing waivers may lead to unnecessary abuse of the program. Most Members agreed buoy tag waivers should be allowed for permit holders serving mandatory military service.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Tommy Ancona, Commercial Fisherman and Permit Broker- Stated the trap limit program was developed to reduce the amount of gear in the ocean. Requiring permit holders to purchase all of their tags forces them to put their gear in the water even if they haven't historically fished. If a boat doesn't want to fish for whatever reason he will not put gear in the water. That is a win for everyone who is fishing. If a permit holder wants to come back in during the 2nd year, they can pay the entire tag fee, which would recover the lost revenue to CDFW.
- Jim Roberts, Commercial Fisherman- Stated that Oregon permit holders pay substantially less money for their tags than California and wondered how it could be possible that the trap tags have not generated sufficient revenue.
 - Another member of the public reminded Mr. Roberts that Oregon has a substantially higher landing taxes than California.

Replacement of Buoy Tags or Purchase of a Portion of Tags



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

Ms. Fisher explained that during the October EC conference call, one Member suggested eliminating the temporary in-season replacement tags. Another Member suggested that permit holders be allowed to purchase only a portion of their trap tags rather than their total allocation.

Various Members stated they preferred to retain in-season replacement tags, including the requirement for a permit holder to purchase all tags at the start of the season. Some Members expect that more people will utilize in-season replacement tags in upcoming seasons. One Member pointed out the importance of replacement tags depends on a permit holder's tier/trap allocation. For example, losing 10% of a Tier 7 permit holder's traps is going to have more impact than someone who is fishing at a higher tier. One Member voiced the majority of replacement tags are used for stuck traps rather than lost traps and questioned the legality of this procedure. Members acknowledged the abuses and loopholes associated with replacement tags, but questioned whether it constituted a serious enough problem to make changes since only 11% of the fleet requested in-season replacement tags comprising less than 1% of all of the traps in the fishery. Meeting participants discussed that since an affidavit must be signed to receive in-season replacement tags, anyone using replacement tags outside of their intended use is committing fraud. Rather than make a recommendation for regulatory changes, the DCTF agreed to make a statement in the 2015 report that they recognize this is a potential problem, but feel current abuse is low enough (and the amount of in-season replacement tags purchased is currently insignificant) to continue to allow in-season buoy tag replacements.

Transferability of Tier 7 Permits

Beginning March 31, 2015, trap tags associated with Tier 7 permits will be transferable, as per Fish and Game Code section 8276.5. At the April 2014 DCTF meeting, some Members suggested prohibiting these transfers from taking place in perpetuity. The Admin Team explained that even if the DCTF made a recommendation to that effect at the current meeting, it would take a few years to change the regulation through legislation and the Tier 7 permits would still be able to make transfers beginning March 31, 2015. CDFW further clarified that these permits have been allowed to be transferred, but once the moratorium is lifted, the traps may be fished. A couple Members stated the DCTF's original intent was to prevent transferability of "latent" permits to limit the number of traps in the water.

One Member questioned whether Tier 7 permits that were transferred before the moratorium should be treated any differently than other Tier 7 permits. Members discussed that 4-6 permits were transferred during the moratorium and have not been able to fish. Several Members suggested not taking any action on this issue and allowing Tier 7 permits to be transferred after March 2015. Some Members stated that transferability of Tier 7 permits allows fishermen to build their business. Various Members explained that all permit holders should have the same ability to fish and should be able to transfer their permits when they sell a boat/business. One Member stated that extending the moratorium on Tier 7 transfers could invite lawsuits. CDFW added it would also likely increase cost of the trap limit program, due to the litigations that would likely result.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Nick Kidd, Commercial Fisherman- Purchased a Tier 7 permit during the moratorium on transfers, and thus, has no landings associated with his permit. Before receiving a bank loan to purchase his permit, his loan officer questioned CDFW to confirm the permit was a good investment. CDFW said it was a good investment. Kidd explained he is a fisherman and not a speculative buyer. If the moratorium continues, the business investment he made is gone, he will be paying for a loan on a worthless permit, and it would be impossible for him to move up and purchase a higher tier permit. He questioned how people would be able to enter the fishery if



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

these permits are not transferable. He stated if this moratorium continued, the future of small business owners like him will be erased.

- Megan Yarnall, Attorney- Explained that even if there was an intent to change the law regarding Tier 7 transfers, people, like Mr. Kidd, have made business decisions based on the current law. They simply looked at the law on the books and the intent of that law at the time. Prohibiting transfers beyond March 2015 would have large ramifications for those who did not read all of the DCTF minutes and legislative history. She asked the DCTF to consider where people may have landed based on this law and what was currently in place when making their business decisions.

Permit Stacking to Increase Trap Allocation

The DCTF discussed potentially recommending permit stacking. Members discussed stacking only Tier 7 permits, all permits, and allowing stacking with a limit (e.g., could not stack beyond 500 traps). Various Members were opposed to stacking for fear it would negatively impact the structure of the fleet and lead to the elimination of smaller boats and smaller tier permits. One Member stated that the 7-tier system was developed so individuals had the ability to move up in the fishery without stacking. One Member expressed concern that fishermen who fish in California, but land in Oregon, have been adversely affected by the trap limit program and received lower trap allocations. Allowing these individuals to stack permits would still maintain the structure of the fleet while allowing these individuals to fish as they have historically. One Member explained it was costly to purchase a high tier permit and suggested stacking was a more cost effective way to move up in the fishery. Another Member opposed the argument by explaining that the larger tier permits will have to decrease in price or no one will be able to purchase them. Another Member agreed and stated he plans on selling his larger permit in a few years and downsizing to a smaller permit because he does not want to stop fishing, but must slow down due to his age. He explained he would like smaller permits to remain available for him to purchase in the future.

Members questioned how many permits were being held for speculative purposes and not actually attached to a vessel. CDFW explained that when permits are renewed, they are required to show proof of vessel ownership.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Tommy Ancona, Commercial Fisherman and Permit Broker- Stated the goal of the 7-tier trap limit program was to preserve fleet demographics. He explained that the 175-trap tier is an opportunity for new people to enter the fishery. Stacking should not be considered until the trap limit program is more developed.
- John Corbin, Oregon Dungeness Crab Commission- Asked if boat size is attached to the permit and whether most of the low-tier permits were from out-of-state? He explained that eliminating a low-tier permit is not necessarily eliminating a small boat. He asked if there was a correlation between the permit tier and the size of the vessel?
 - CDFW did not have the data on hand to answer this question. However, the data they presented earlier showed that of the 119 Tier 7 permits, 25 were from out-of-state vessels. Other ports such as south of Half Moon Bay and San Francisco have similar numbers.

Commercial Trap Limit Monitoring and Evaluation

Ms. Fisher explained that the legislature mandates the DCTF monitor and evaluate the commercial Dungeness crab trap limit program. She explained the Admin Team has been working with Carrie Pomeroy, California Sea Grant, and Christy Juhasz, CDFW, to put together an evaluation and monitoring strategy. Ms. Sayce explained that in anticipation of 2017, this sort of information could inform the work, decisions, and conversations of the DCTF. Dr. Pomeroy added that several ideas have been generated



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

with regard to the design of the strategy, but wanted to ensure these ideas resonate with the DCTF prior to implementing a monitoring and evaluation strategy. Dr. Pomeroy provided examples of what information could be included in a evaluation and monitoring report: illustrating changing patterns in fleet dynamics (e.g., changes in fleet mobility when a season is delayed compared to a season without a delay). Dr. Pomeroy pointed out there are many different, valuable perspectives within the fishery, and a monitoring and evaluation plan could capture big picture results and generate useful information for the DCTF. She further stated that the fishery is a vibrant industry that has many communities dependent on its long-term success, so having sound information to support the industry can be really beneficial.

Some Members asked Dr. Pomeroy about her position on the DCTF and her role as a scientist. Ms. Pomeroy responded that she is a non-voting DCTF Member with no vested interest in a particular outcome on DCTF related activities. She is a social scientist affiliated with California Sea Grant, whose work focuses on social, culture and economic aspects of fisheries and fishing communities including the human dimensions of fisheries or the people side of fisheries. Dr. Pomeroy helps to ensure management is aligned with how people in fisheries operate. She offered to share her publications with anyone interested.

Various Members recommended that the EC work on developing the monitoring and evaluation plan in cooperation with Dr. Pomeroy and Ms. Juhasz. The Admin Team agreed and stated they would work with Dr. Pomeroy and Ms. Juhasz to develop an evaluation and review it with the EC before presenting it to the full DCTF for consideration.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Tommy Ancona, Commercial Fisherman and Permit Broker- Expressed support for evaluation of the trap limit program to identify what information the program has revealed, and whether it is achieving its goals.

Regulatory Fixes for Transiting Vessels

At the April 2014 DCTF meeting, Members discussed the issue that vessels transiting California to drop out-of-state tagged gear in those states are in violation if traps onboard do not also have California tags. Members agreed this issue should be addressed so that transiting vessels are not required to have California tags on their out-of-state traps. CDFW recommended the following amendment to the current Title 14 regulations: “The DCTF recommends amending 132.1 CCR T-14 and adding #3-Vessels may transit waters south of 42.00 with traps buoy tagged with either a valid Oregon or Washington buoy tag, provided no crab species are aboard the vessel and no traps shall be deployed in waters South of 42.00 without a valid CA buoy tag.”

Members questioned whether “Oregon and Washington” should be changed to “any state” to account for Alaska vessels. The DCTF generally agreed rare instances of vessels travelling to Alaska or British Columbia from California waters could be handled on a case-by-case basis. Some Members suggested keeping the Title 14 regulations as-is and letting CDFW handle things on a case-by-case basis. CDFW explained they would like to close all loopholes in the code and suggested that if the DCTF did not want to recommend changes, gear could be barged only on unpermitted boats to resolve this issue. CDFW also suggested the DCTF could hold off on making a recommendation until the issue becomes a problem. Some Members thought it best to make CDFW’s job easier by recommending changes to the law.

Members discussed removing “provided no crab species are aboard the vessel” to allow boats that fish in Oregon to land in Crescent City. One Member questioned whether vessels could call CDFW to let them know they were delivering Oregon caught crab in California and they had only Oregon tagged pots on board. Another Member stated that as long as people are permitted in both Oregon and California and



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

fishing legally, they should be able to deliver crab wherever they want. Another fisherman explained that if someone was violating the law, CDFW would find out quickly from other fishermen. One Member said there is no easy way to cover all possible scenarios and that the suggested change to the Title 14 regulations would be an improvement. Fishermen will have to offload their crab in Oregon when fishing in Oregon. CDFW explained the DCTF could make any recommendation they wished, but CDFW will request regulators retain the no-crab onboard provision.

DCTF Members asked for clarification from a member of the public to understand how Oregon addresses this issue.

- John Corbin, Oregon Dungeness Crab Commission- Explained all vessels fishing in multiple states are dually permitted, but he was not clear if fishing in one state and landing in another state was illegal. He clarified that as long as people fish the traps tagged for the respective state, in that state's waters, there is no need to address it.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Jim Roberts, Commercial Fisherman- Explained the suggested regulatory change would be an issue for him. Loading Oregon tagged gear and offloading his crab in Oregon would be troublesome in bad weather. He prefers to land the crab in California, since he would need to remove all of the traps from his deck in order to unload the crab. If this gear isn't fished in California, it shouldn't be a problem to transit California waters with Oregon tagged traps and crab onboard.
 - CDFW explained that if weather made it difficult to offload crab in Oregon, exceptions could be made by calling CDFW.
- Jennifer Renzullo, California Lost Fishing Gear Recovery Project- Suggested removing "traps shall not be deployed in waters South of 42.00 without a valid CA buoy tag" since it would be a repetition in the statute.
 - CDFW explained that it is fine to reiterate what is already in statute.

Lost Trap Retrieval Program

During the October EC call, DCTF Members expressed interest in exploring an industry supported [lost trap retrieval program](#). Jennifer Renzullo and Kirsten Gilardi, [California Lost Fishing Gear Recovery Project](#), gave a brief project overview explaining the project has been operating out of Eureka, Trinidad, and Crescent City and is in need of long-term funding and support. The project recovered 665 traps last season (2013-14). Once traps are retrieved, fishermen are invited to voluntarily pay the program to get their recovered traps back, which helps fund the program. Ms. Renzullo explained most people were happy to pay although no one can be forced to pay to have their gear returned. Ms. Renzullo asked the DCTF to use [the proposal discussed during the EC call](#) to inform discussions surrounding a proposed design, funding, and implementation of a long-term program. She also described the lost gear retrieval programs in Oregon and Washington and how they coordinate with their respective Departments of Fish and Wildlife. She explained that while a positive step, these programs create incentives for gear collectors to high-grade gear they collect and leave the rest behind.

Multiple Members expressed support for a gear retrieval program and suggested fishermen be required to pay an impoundment fee (similar to one for cars) for recovered traps rather than voluntary payment. They stressed the program should be self supported through a flat fee for each trap. One Member suggested a poundage fee or tag fees if revenue from lost gear was insufficient to support the program. Another Member recommended a higher flat fee per trap at the beginning of the program, which would then be reduced when overhead and administrative fees are lower. Ms. Fisher noted that with less gear left in the



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

water in subsequent years, the cost per trap may have to stay the same or be adjusted to continue covering the overhead costs of the program to encourage a steady revenue stream.

One Member suggested CDFW require permit holders to sign a document stating they will participate in the program and purchase their traps back before they will be issued a license. CDFW clarified such a requirement would have to be added in regulation as a condition of the permit. Ms. Fisher suggested looking into the legality of such an option especially if an outside organization was running the program.

The DCTF asked Ms. Renzullo and Ms. Gilardi if \$75 per trap would be sufficient to cover program costs. Ms. Renzullo estimated \$89,000 statewide to fund the program assuming the same amount of traps were retrieved as last season. She concluded that fees for recovered traps and potentially a tax on replacement tags would cover program costs. Most program fees will decrease proportionally when less gear is left to be recovered. If the program required the use of an observer, the costs would be higher. She explained that an observer is valuable in verifying the exact location of trap retrieval and how many traps were pumped versus pulled. However, a flat rate for all traps (pumped or pulled) will reduce the need for an observer. CDFW clarified that an observer is important when gear recovery efforts occur during the season, to ensure the gear was legitimately lost. Ms. Gilardi stated that any port association could support and implement this kind of program with the proper coordination, and that letters of support from port associations can help obtain grants to extend the program to new ports.

One Member suggested the DCTF agree to support this issue and revisit it after understanding what funds are available from the trap limit program and the costs to continue supporting the DCTF. Several Members agreed that a gear retrieval program run by the industry and DCTF would be more efficient than one run by CDFW. Another Member explained the program should not be in competition with CDFW's efforts for retrieving illegal traps.

Members asked CDFW if enforcement would no longer issue citations for lost or stuck traps if this program was in place long-term. Lt. Farrell stated the trap retrieval program should focus on lost and derelict gear and CDFW will focus on illegal gear. CDFW explained that replacement tags are available in-season and following the season to replace those lost traps. To receive tags, an affidavit must be signed confirming the loss of traps. Enforcement should be cross-referencing the numbers on the buoy tags with those in the affidavit and citations should not be issued for lost traps. Enforcement is using their discretion when they find one or two lost traps and may not issue a citation in those cases. However, enforcement will issue citations when gear is willfully left behind or there is negligence (e.g., a string of multiple traps).

One Member stated that fishermen who have stuck gear can make arrangements to hire someone to remove the stuck gear before the season ends after acquiring a waiver. Another Member suggested those involved in retrieving lost gear could report illegal fishing gear or large strings of gear to CDFW. CDFW agreed and suggested CDFW would benefit from working in partnership with a gear recovery program.

One Member representing sport interests expressed appreciation from the north coast recreational fishing community for the gear retrieval program and highlighted that approach routes to harbor entrances are easier to navigate and fish for salmon with the derelict traps removed.

Public comment was taken on the topic at hand.

- Bill DeBaker, Commercial Fisherman- Explained that after a few years of the program, there may not be enough lost gear in the ocean to fund the program. He requested clarification about how repeat offenders may be stopped from abandoning gear.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

- CDFW explained that those individuals abandoning gear are written a citation. Depending on the situation, repeat offenders can have their permits suspended or revoked.
- John Corbin, Oregon Fish and Game Commission- Disagreed with Ms. Renzullo’s statement that the Oregon program supports high-grading gear, and that it was not a behavior he had experienced. He explained that the long-running Washington program has changed fishermen’s behavior and has encouraged fishermen to keep better track of their gear because those programs do not require the program administrators to return gear to the original owners.
- Jennifer Renzullo, California Lost Fishing Gear Recovery Project- Mentioned that a vessel out of Crescent City continues to abandon large strings of traps year after year. Since the people recovering this gear did not have the power to require payment or retain it, the fishermen continued getting gear pumped and returned free of charge. She believes that if fishermen are required to pay \$5,000 or \$6,000 to receive their gear back, there may be changes in behavior experienced in California similar to that seen in Oregon and Washington.

CDFW explained the program should not result in CDFW’s loss in the ability to enforce gear abandonment laws. Therefore, the process of collaboration between the program and CDFW should be further fleshed out. CDFW also suggested any recommendations from the DCTF around this issue should specify lost gear (not derelict or abandoned gear). Ms. Fisher recommended the EC work on the details of this program and present a proposal at the next DCTF meeting.

Actions taken by the DCTF during agenda item 3:

ACTION: *Consideration and possible adoption of recommendations related to the Dungeness crab commercial trap limit program including, but not limited to, waivers for trap tag fees, derelict gear retrieval options, changes to the transferability of tier 7 permits, future data needs and monitoring and evaluation of the commercial Dungeness crab trap limit program.*

APPROVED The DCTF agrees that the Dungeness crab commercial trap limit program is an important step in managing the amount of gear in the water. The DCTF looks forward to monitoring the development of the program and providing additional recommendations to its efficiency and effectiveness in the DCTF’s legislatively mandated 2017 report. Future recommendations may include:

- Looking at the need for in-season replacement tags to address concerns about potential loopholes associated with replacement tags.
- Recommendations related to preserving the structure of the commercial fleet.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
19	0	0	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (19): Anderson, Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Collins, de Solenni, Doyle, Fahning, Goucher, Helliwell, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Nolte, Powers, Wolford, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

APPROVED Allow buoy tag fee waiver for permitholders upon renewal of permit if you are faced with mandatory military service. There is no limit on how many times a permitholder can do this. An individual cannot purchase tags mid-season and start fishing. If a permitholder decides to not fish one year and wants to fish the next year, the permitholder will need to pay tag fees for two full years. No discounting or prorating fees.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
17	1	1	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (17): Anderson, Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Collins, de Solenni, Goucher, Helliwell, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Nolte, Powers, Wolford, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (1): Fahning

Thumbs down (1): Doyle

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

APPROVED The DCTF believes no action should be taken on Tier 7 permits with regards to allowing transferability of trap tags after March 31, 2015.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
14	5	0	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (14): Anderson, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, de Solenni, Fahning, Goucher, Helliwell, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Nolte, Powers, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (5): Atkinson, Bettencourt, Collins, Doyle, Wolford

Thumbs down (0): None

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

APPROVED The DCTF continues to oppose the stacking of commercial Dungeness crab permits.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
16	1	2	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (16): Anderson, Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Collins, Fahning, Goucher, Helliwell, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Powers, Wolford, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (1): Doyle

Thumbs down (2): de Solenni, Nolte

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

APPROVED The DCTF recommends amending 132.1 CCR T-14 and adding #3- Vessels may transit waters South of 42.00 with traps buoy tagged with either a valid Oregon or Washington buoy



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

tag, provided no crab species are aboard the vessel and no traps shall be deployed in waters South of 42.00 without a valid CA buoy tag.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
13	3	0	3	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (13): Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Collins, de Solenni, Doyle, Fahning, Goucher, Helliwell, Lawson, Nolte, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (3): Anderson, Atkinson, Hemmingsen

Thumbs down (0): None

Abstain (3): Powers, Wolford, Yarnall

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

APPROVED The DCTF agrees that an industry designed, funded, and implemented lost gear retrieval program that works in cooperation with CDFW is a priority. The DCTF will work with CDFW, the Northern CA Crab Gear Retrieval Program, and the industry to investigate the best way to design and implement this program, including the specifics of how to fund this program.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
18	0	0	1	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (18): Anderson, Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Collins, de Solenni, Doyle, Fahning, Goucher, Helliwell, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Nolte, Wolford, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs sideways (0): None

Thumbs down (0): None

Abstain (1): Powers

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

4. *Discussion of Dungeness crab tri-state issues including, but not limited to, crab quality testing protocols, modifications to the season opener, revising the presoak, the role of district 10 in the tri-state agreement, and addition of a fair-start agreement.*

At the April 2014 DCTF meeting, the DCTF voted on a number of [recommendations to send to the Tri-State Dungeness Crab Committee](#) (Tri-State Committee). The Tri-State Committee met in May 2014 and [responded to the DCTF's recommendations in a summary](#) and provided a new suite of proposals for California's consideration. The Admin Team and CDFW explained the DCTF has an opportunity to provide a unified voice on behalf of the Dungeness crab industry/DCTF for California fishery managers to respond to the Tri-State Committee's proposal. CDFW further explained the DCTF speaks with a consensus-type voice that the Legislature and CDFW is listening to, which has and may continue to be instrumental in changing California Dungeness crab fishery laws and regulations. DCTF recommendations are valuable tools at Tri-State meetings because they can support California in their ability to better coordinate with the other states.

Tri-State Response: District 10 Testing, Opening Dates, & Fair-Start Clauses



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

The DCTF discussed the Tri-State Committee's recommendation for District 10 to join the Tri-State agreement, which could include testing into their opener and opening on the same day as the rest of the coast. CDFW explained that if District 10 were to be included in the Tri-State Agreement, testing into the opener would be a requirement. However, all other options including the management area's start date are up for negotiation. Ms. Fisher directed the DCTF's attention towards the [management options document](#), which outlined options discussed at the April 2014 DCTF meeting to address the DCTF's concerns about the effort shift to District 10 prior to the opening in the north.

A Member from District 10 stated their constituents would like to test into their opener using the same crab quality testing rules and procedures agreed upon at the tri-state level. Various Members from District 10 expressed support for a single-statewide opener and felt that the dual openers created a disadvantage for fishermen in District 10. Some Members from other ports expressed support for two openers in California. One Member acknowledged the DCTF was split on this issue and that it would be difficult to achieve 15 votes to approve a recommendation. After a great deal of discussion, the following proposals were developed:

- 1) *A single state-wide opener. District 10 joins Tri-State and tests into the opener (the opener date would be decided upon later. It could be Nov 15, Dec 1, Dec 15, Jan 1, etc)*
- 2) *Two openers-November 15th and December 1st, District 10 joins Tri-State and tests into the opener*
- 3) *Status quo-District 10 still does not test, District 10 can't be delayed, opens November 15th, fair start when there is a delay*

Various Members representing the northern ports expressed concern that a single statewide opener would flood the market. A Member representing processing interests agreed explaining that processors could not handle the entire volume of crab at one time. Another Member disagreed stating that a large bulk of the crabs would be shipped to China. One Member stated Proposal 2 was the most economical and provided California with the best marketing opportunities.

A Member suggested retaining two openers, but requiring both management areas to test into their openers. One Member expressed support for this option and stated that in years when crabs were poor quality in District 10, a fair-start clause would take effect similar to the fair-start that is in place during years of poor crab quality. Another Member agreed and felt that a fair-start would offer some level of "protection" from effort shift. One Member stated that due to the value of the Thanksgivings market, even in years when crabs were light, fishermen and processors would say the crabs were ready to open the season. CDFW cautioned the group stating that a recommendation from the DCTF that creates delays and fair-start provisions more frequently may not be palatable to Oregon and Washington. A Member from District 10 felt it was inappropriate for the northern ports, Oregon, and Washington to decide what is best for District 10. Various Members suggested District 10 join Tri-State and retain the same season openers to help maintain the high price for crab in recent years. Another Member added that testing and delayed starts in District 10 would lead to lower prices and production problems. CDFW provided clarification in the instance that California maintained two openers and District 10 tested into their season. In this case, if District 10 was delayed until the northern opener and someone chooses to fish in District 10, they will have to wait 30 days before they can fish in the northern management area even though both management areas opened at the same time.

The Admin Team acknowledged the discussion is not about the health of the resource, but rather differing priorities related to business decisions. Ms. Fisher suggested the group try to determine the best course of action for business in California, something all Members can relate to. They discussed a new option:



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

- 4) *District 10 joins tri-state/test into opener. Single statewide opener on Nov 15. CDFW Director will place a line where the crabs are ready based on crab quality testing and the area where the crabs are ready will open (similar to what is done in Oregon). Both areas may be delayed.*

Members asked for further clarification on Oregon's process.

- John Corbin, Oregon Fish and Game Commission- Explained Oregon's process for setting a line for season openers. Although Oregon could wait for a single opener, there is also a sentiment that someone would be denied the ability to harvest crabs that are ready. He added that the coastline of California is much longer than Oregon's and that crab will not always be ready at the same time throughout California's coastline.

One Member expressed support for a November 15th statewide opener since in most years it would elicit a delay, which would provide protection from Oregon and Washington regardless of whether the two zones open simultaneously. Another Member disagreed for the same reasons and stated that fishermen from Oregon would also be opposed. Various Members agreed this scenario would distribute effort from out-of-state boats throughout the state more evenly. Members acknowledged that crabs are rarely ready in the north by November 15th meaning there would be a delay most years. A Member from the north stated that a November 15th opener was the best option because since most years would be delayed and would elicit a 30-day protection from out-of-state vessels and southern boats.

One Member questioned whether Tri-State would support a November 15th start date in California since it is an unrealistic start time for the northern ports and would restrict out-of-state boats. CDFW commented that Oregon and Washington might not be open to having more delays than are currently in place. Another Member added the effort shift is not only a result of nonresidents, but, also within the state due to effort shift from northern boats fishing District 10.

A Member asked if it was possible for California to modify District 10's opener to be concurrent with the northern ports without District 10 joining Tri-State. Ms. Fisher explained that it would be possible, but explained that joining Tri-State is about building relationships with the other states. CDFW agreed stating that the purpose of Tri-State is to coordinate the fishery for everyone's benefit as best as we can.

Members from District 10 stated they are willing to join Tri-State and implement crab quality testing as long as there is a single, coast wide opener. CDFW agreed that a single statewide opener is best for enforcement. Members continued discussing the effort shift, fair-start provisions, and the effect each potential start date would have on each management area. The DCTF briefly discussed a 15-day fair-start option as opposed to 30-days and a fair-start for District 10 regardless of a delay.

Public comment was taken on the topics at hand.

- Tommy Ancona, Commercial Fisherman and Permit Broker- Expressed support for a single opener stating it was the only way to alleviate the pressure on District 10.
- Bill DeBacker, Commercial Fisherman- Ask for clarification. If the north is delayed, are fishermen from District 10 subject to a fair-start?
 - A Member explained that if a fisherman made landings in District 10 prior to the northern opener, he would also be subject to a fair-start.
 - Jim Roberts, Commercial Fisherman- Explained that he gets the best price for crab when the Chinese Market comes online in January. He suggested changing the northern opener to January 1 to benefit the market.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

- A Member expressed opposition and concern that Mr. Roberts's suggestion would create more effort shift to District 10.

A straw poll was used to assess the level of agreement regarding season openers and fair-start clauses. Support shown through a straw poll does not reflect adoption of an idea.

Straw poll: Two openers: December 1st opener in the North, November 15th opener in the South. District 10 tests into the opener and joins Tri-State. A 30-day fair-start would be imposed for those fishing in District 10 during the early opener regardless of whether or not there is a delay in that area. (9 up; 1 sideways; 7 down; 3 abstain)

Straw poll: Single statewide opener on December 1st. District 10 joins tri-state and tests into the opener. (8 up; 3 sideways; 6 down; 2 abstain)

Straw poll: Single statewide opener Nov 15th. District 10 joins Tri-State and tests into opener (7 up; 2 sideways; 6 down; 4 abstain)

Straw poll: Maintain status quo. (5 up; 5 sideways; 6 down; 3 abstain)

One Member suggested polling the entire California commercial fleet to decide what should happen. Ms. Fisher explained that a fleet-wide poll would require additional funds that are currently unavailable. One Member suggested that the Crab Boat Owners Association may be able to help fund a poll. Other Members opposed a fleet-wide poll stating that DCTF Members were elected to represent their constituents. The Admin Team stated they would investigate the costs of a fleet-wide poll. Ms. Fisher summarized that the DCTF is unable to vote on a recommendation at this time and their message to the Tri-State Committee is the DCTF is split on issues related to effort shift and District 10 joining Tri-State.

Tri-State Agreement: Fair-Start Language Concerns

A member of the public, Mark Schear, Attorney from Washington, explained when a company owns several boats/permits and one of the boats fish in District 10 in a delayed season in the north all boats owned by the company are also subject to a 30-day delay. He requested the DCTF recommend an amendment to the fair-start provision so it is tied to the trap tags and not the permitholder. He further explained that one of the issues that makes this topic most relevant to people with multiple boats is the penalty is revocation of the permit.

CDFW read Fish and Game code section 8279.1 (a-d) aloud and explained that references to a "person" in the code includes any entity that is legally connected to the permitholder including a company, business, partnership, etc. If a company or individual owns multiple permits/vessels, all vessels within that company/individual's fleet are required to operate as a single entity. Although CDFW has not been aggressively pursuing these violations, they still must advise people who own multiple boats to fish all boats in a single management area.

The DCTF agreed the code should be amended. A Member explained this issue does not just pertain to vessels; it also pertains to crewman. An amendment would help increase the already small labor pool. Another Member stated that as long as someone is willing to buy two boats and two permits, and two crews, he should be able to fish in multiple places.

Tri-State Response: CDFW Director Authority



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

The DCTF discussed the Tri-State Committee's recommendation to give more authority to the Director of CDFW to modify the "presoak, start date, start time, management area lines to have the ability to draw new lines for softshell delays, and new delay increments for season start." Some Members were concerned the Director could make changes that were not beneficial to fishery participants. CDFW asked the DCTF to consider how California can be more responsive to changes to improve the way the fishery operates (e.g. changes in fishing grounds, environmental changes, etc.). CDFW further explained that California is not very flexible in its ability to address issues that may emerge in the fishery.

One Member disagreed with CDFW and felt California has enough flexibility to make changes through its current structure. Various Members expressed concern about giving too much power to the Director and/or the Fish and Game Commission. One Member explained that Oregon and Washington have more fishermen friendly commissions than California, and he would be more open to a change in California if there were more direct lines of communication between Fish and Game Commissioners, CDFW Director and fishermen. Ms. Fisher pointed out it takes longer to make changes through the Legislature than through the Commission. Various Members agreed that the Legislature is a slow process, but it provides ample opportunity for everyone to find out about potential changes, comment on them, and respond accordingly, thereby giving fishermen greater control. The DCTF discussed the feasibility of requiring all potential changes requested by Tri-State to go through the DCTF for approval.

Some Members suggested flexibility should only be given to the Director on certain issues (e.g. increments between quality testing, changing start dates, and drawing management area lines). A Member stated that giving the Director the ability to make some of these decisions would only be beneficial until the decisions are not preferable by the industry. CDFW explained they try to work cooperatively with California fishermen at Tri-State and the Director would make decisions after conferring with members of the fleet. One Member expressed concern if the Director was given authority to move something forward through at Tri-State, he would also have authority to make changes outside of the Tri-State Committee.

Public comment was taken on the topics at hand.

- Dave Colpo, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission- Acknowledged he may not have a complete historical picture, but expressed dismay that the DCTF believes the California Legislature is less political than fisheries managers. He expressed concern the DCTF wants the Legislature to manage one of the most important fisheries in the state.

Tri-State Response: Tri-State Testing Protocol

A couple Members expressed interest in discussing the Tri-State testing protocol. Members discussed the fact that projecting was eliminated because it hindered Oregon price negotiations. Some Members had concerns about testing protocols, while others believed the protocols were fine as-is.

Public comment was taken on the topics at hand.

- Travis Hunter, Commercial Fishermen- Expressed concern that crab quality tests can be manipulated to benefit those conducting/not conducting the tests as experienced in 2013-2014.
 - One Member voiced agreement. CDFW stated that the agency followed the Tri-State protocol last season and made a decision to open the season based on best available data. That decision resides ultimately with Director and with the data available to him, and at the time he concluded that California crabs were ready.

Actions taken by the DCTF during agenda item 4:

***ACTION:** Consideration and possible adoption of recommended Dungeness crab fishery management*



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

measures or policy statements, including season opener dates, changes to commercial fishing regulations, and future data needs.

APPROVED The DCTF feels the issues identified by Tri-State for giving the CDFW Director more authority and/or flexibility are currently resolved. Issues include presoak, start date, start time, management area lines to have the ability to draw new lines for softshell delays, and new delay increments for season start. The DCTF would like to retain California’s current structure for making recommendations to Tri-State.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
6	13	0	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (6): Anderson, Blodgett, Collins, Goucher, Hemmingsen, Powers

Thumbs sideways (13): Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blue, Caito, de Solenni, Doyle, Fahning, Helliwell, Lawson, Nolte, Wolford, Yarnall, Yearwood

Thumbs down (0): None

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

APPROVED The DCTF recommends changing all references to “a/the person” in Fish and Game code 8279.1 (a)-(d) to “any Dungeness crab permitted vessel”.

Thumbs up	Thumbs Sideways	Thumbs Down	Abstained	Absent
7	11	1	0	3

Vote of all DCTF Members (nonvoting Members abstained):

Thumbs up (7): Collins, de Solenni, Doyle, Fahning, Hemmingsen, Lawson, Nolte

Thumbs sideways (11): Anderson, Atkinson, Bettencourt, Blodgett, Blue, Caito, Goucher, Helliwell, Powers, Wolford, Yarnall

Thumbs down (1): Yearwood

Abstain (0): None

Absent (3): Bennett, Cunningham, Johnson

5. *Discussion of the long-term functioning of the DCTF including, but not limited to, the need to develop an advisory committee or marketing commission.*

The Admin Team [shared a memo](#) with the DCTF outlining that if the DCTF is interested in continuing its role informing the management of the Dungeness crab fishery and/or other roles identified by the Dungeness crab fishery following submission of their 2017 legislatively mandated report, they must determine goals for the body, a structure, funding streams, etc. The memo outlined the current yearly cost of the DCTF and provided options for other organizational structures for the DCTF’s consideration. The Admin Team asked if the DCTF, or similar body, should continue long term. Some Members expressed support for the DCTF’s continuation while others said they could not make a decision until speaking to their constituents.



~California Dungeness Crab Task Force~

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2009/04/dungeness-crab-task-force/>

One Member expressed support for retaining the current facilitation team. The Admin Team thanked the group and explained the DCTF may select whomever they want as administrators.

Members discussed funding options. They determined that \$0.50/trap or 0.1% landing tax would generate approximately \$50,000/year. One Member explained fees based on individual production (e.g. landing taxes or fees on trap tags) is harder to collect than a flat fee. Ms. Fisher reminded the DCTF that \$50,000/year does not include overhead, which has been covered by OPC to-date. She explained if the DCTF would like to fund other projects (e.g. research, gear retrieval, etc.), additional budget should be considered. One Member stated it would cost substantially less if industry administered the DCTF, rather than the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA). Another Member stated that the fishery generated \$58M last season, and gaining more legitimacy through CDFA for \$150,000 seems reasonable.

Members discussed how to structure the DCTF to maintain legitimacy and credibility, especially with fisheries managers. Members discussed the pros and cons of voluntary and mandatory fleet contributions. Members asked if the industry could fund OPC instead of CDFA to continue administering the DCTF. Other Members expressed the optics associated with OPC “dropping” the DCTF. The Admin Team explained OPC is supportive of the DCTF’s work, but has less funding than previous years and must be strategic in how it spend those funds.

6. General Public Comment

Public comment was taken on non-agenda items.

- Carrie Pomeroy, California Sea Grant- Provided information on a colleague’s research project investigating an injury prevention project in the West Coast Dungeness crab fleet. She explained project investigators are keen to work and engage with California fishermen. The project contact information will be distributed in the DCTF’s next monthly email update.
- Brett Fahning, Commercial Fisherman and DCTF Member- Reminded the group that a new EPA permit, required for any discharge from a boat, will be put into law December 19. The Admin Team will provide details about this in the DCTF’s next monthly email update.

7. Next Steps

The Admin Team will draft the meeting summary and circulate it to the DCTF for final approval. The Admin Team will also draft the January 15, 2015 report including DCTF recommendations from the October and April 2014 meetings, and will circulate it to the DCTF for final approval before forwarding to the Legislature. Future DCTF meetings will be held in 2015 and 2016. The Admin Team will circulate information and documents relevant to the work of the DCTF via email in the coming weeks.

8. Adjourn