



NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

605 W. 4th Ave. Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501
(907) 271-2809
Fax (907) 271-2817

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: Catch 17-010 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Catch Shares/Allocation Issue **Status:** Other Issue
File created: 2/28/2017 **In control:** North Pacific Council
On agenda: 4/3/2017 **Final action:**
Title: BSAI Tanner Crab Custom Processing Cap - Discussion Paper

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. D2 Tanner Crab Custom Processing Exemption, 2. D2 PUBLIC COMMENT, 3. MOTION: D2, 4. D2 Testimony SignUp Sheet/Public Comment Handouts

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
4/3/2017	1	North Pacific Council		

Dan Hull, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Executive Director

SUBJECT:
BSAI Tanner Crab Custom Processing Cap - Discussion Paper

STAFF CONTACT: Jon McCracken

ACTION REQUIRED:
Review discussion paper; action as necessary.

BACKGROUND:

At its June 2016 meeting, the Council took final action on Amendment 47 to the BSAI FMP for Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs (FMP) to exempt custom processing arrangements for Bering Sea *C. bairdi* Tanner crab from IPQ use cap. The Council's preferred alternative complemented and followed the management approach the Council recommended and NMFS implemented under the emergency rule (81 FR 4206, January 26, 2016) that was effective for the 2015/2016 crab fishing season. Amendment 47 to the FMP was approved on December 6, 2016. NMFS published the final rule with implementing regulations for Amendment 47 on December 20, 2016 (81 FR 92697).

In addition to taking final action on Amendment 47 to the FMP in June 2016, the Council tasked staff to evaluate additional solutions to the *C. bairdi* crab IPQ use cap issue. Specifically, it requested analysis of three options: (1) raise the *C. bairdi* crab IPQ use cap to 40 percent; (2) convert Class A IFQ shares to Class B IFQ shares; and (3) apply exemption only in years when capacity to process is not sufficient (i.e., when there are less than four processors). The discussion paper evaluates these options under a scenario where Amendment 47 was repealed and one of these options would replace it.