



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 #: HAL 17-034 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Halibut Issue **Status:** Action Item
File created: 11/3/2017 **In control:** North Pacific Council
On agenda: 12/4/2017 **Final action:**
Title: Charter Halibut Permits: Latent Capacity; RQE Ownership Caps - Discussion Papers
Sponsors:
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments: 1. C2 Action Memo, 2. C2 CHP Latency, 3. C2 RQE Ownership Caps, 4. C2 Public Comment, 5. MOTION: C2, 6. C2 Public Testimony Sheet

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
12/4/2017	1	North Pacific Council		

Dan Hull, Chairman
David Witherell, Executive Director

SUBJECT:
Charter Halibut Permits: Latent Capacity; RQE Ownership Caps - Discussion Papers

STAFF CONTACT: Sarah Marrinan (NPFMC)

ACTION REQUIRED:

- Review two discussion papers on charter halibut permits actions.
- Determine what future Council action is warranted for each of these proposals.
- Determine if and how actions will interact, if both proposals are moved forward.

BACKGROUND:

Two discussion papers are presented under C2. These discussion papers are presented under one action item to allow the AP and the Council the opportunity to hear both issues before deciding how to proceed.

The first, "Charter Halibut Permit (CHP) latency discussion paper", is a proposal that would add a new annual trip limit designation to each CHP. The categories would restrict the number of vessel (or angler) trips for each CHP within the year (i.e., annual CHP trip limits). This paper highlights the way CHP use can impact annual charter halibut sector management measures (e.g. bag limits, size restrictions) and demonstrates the extent of unused and underutilized (latent) capacity among CHPs. The paper scopes out the Council's initially-suggested mechanisms for establishing annual CHP trip (or angler-trip) limits, highlights additional decision points and points of clarification, and provides initial discussion of the impacts of this management change.

The second paper, "Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) ownership caps discussion paper," analyzes a proposal that would allow the RQE to purchase and hold up to 30% of the CHPs in IPHC regulatory Area 2C and regulatory Area 3A. Currently, regulations state that a person (or entity) may not own, hold, or control more than five CHPs, with some exceptions for initial recipients. It is assumed that the intent of this action would be to temporarily remove some CHPs from use, in order to limit some charter halibut effort. This paper discusses the ability for this action to control effort and broader implications of this management change.

Depending on the continued interest in moving action forward, these are actions could be considered independently of one another, or as alternatives under the same purpose and need statement.