

Appendix A. Considered but Rejected Actions and Alternatives

Previous Action 1. Implement a catch share program for the golden crab fishery

Alternative 1. No action. Do not implement a catch share program for the golden crab fishery.

Alternative 2. Implement a catch share program for the golden crab fishery.

Action Rejected by the Council, June 2011

Rationale: The Council rejected the action to implement a catch share program because the purpose and need of this amendment specifically requires a catch share program.

Action 1: Establish eligibility requirements for a golden crab catch share program

Rejected Alternatives:

Alternative 5. Restrict eligibility to valid commercial golden crab permit holders and golden crab captains and crew.

Alternative 6. Restrict eligibility to valid commercial golden crab permit holders and federally permitted golden crab dealers.

Alternative 7. Restrict eligibility to valid commercial golden crab permit holders, federally permitted golden crab dealers, and golden crab captains and crew.

Rationale for Removal: The Council removed alternatives that limited eligibility to dealers and crew. Determining crew as eligible golden crab catch share participants would be too difficult and would result in a larger pool of eligible participants.

Action 2: Establish vessel catch history initial allocation

Rejected Alternatives:

Alternative 4. Use 1998-2008 aggregate catch history for each vessel to allocate initial allocation to each vessel owner. Vessels with below 5% initial allocation receive an extra 2% per vessel excluding those receiving greater than 30% initial allocation on all vessels owned combined. The extra 2% comes out of highest share holder portion. Must have 25,000 pounds aggregate catch history from 1998-2008 to receive bonus.

Alternative 5. Use 1998-2008 aggregate catch history for each vessel only if vessel has catch history in 1998. Vessels with below 5% initial allocation receive an extra 5% per vessel

excluding those receiving greater than 30% initial allocation on vessels owned combined. The extra 5% comes out of highest share holder portion. Must have 25,000 pounds aggregate catch history from 1998-2008 to receive bonus.

Alternative 6. Use 2006-08 aggregate catch history for each vessel to allocate initial allocation to each vessel owner. Vessels fishing between 2007 and 2009 that get less than 10% initial allocation receive an additional 7% per vessel excluding those that receive greater than 20% initial allocation on vessels owned combined. The extra 7% comes out of highest share holder. Must have 50,000 pounds aggregate catch history from 2006-08 to receive bonus.

Alternative 7. Use 2006-08 aggregate catch history for each vessel to allocate initial allocation to each vessel owner. If vessels fished in the last 5 years and received less than 20% initial allocation, each vessel owner receives an additional 5% excluding those that receive greater than 20% initial allocation on vessels owned combined. The extra 5% comes out of highest share holder. Must have 50,000 pounds aggregate catch history from 2006-08 to receive bonus.

Alternatives 8, 9 & 11:

Sub-alternative c. Vessel catch history for 2005-2008. Must have 25,000 pounds aggregate to receive allocation portion.

Sub-alternative d. Vessel catch history for 2005-2008. Must have 50,000 pounds aggregate to receive allocation portion.

Sub-alternative e. Vessel catch history for 2002-2008. Must have 25,000 pounds aggregate to receive allocation portion.

Sub-alternative f. Vessel catch history for 2002-2008. Must have 50,000 pounds aggregate to receive allocation portion.

Alternative 10: Allocate through equal allocation of the total quota (ACL)

Sub-alternative 10a. 11 vessel owners

Sub-alternative 10b. 4 active vessels

Rationale for Removal: The Council decided to remove alternatives 4-7 because the share cap implemented under Action XX would ensure that the participants with a lower level of allocation would receive slightly more allocation due to the higher level participants allocation being capped. **The Council decided to remove alternatives 8-11 because** Alternative 10 was removed from consideration because both the Council and the AP agreed to issue allocation based on some form of historical participation in the fishery.

Rejected Action: Establish eligibility for harvest

Alternative 1. No Action. Do not establish eligibility for harvest.

Alternative 2. Any person holding a current (as in paid fees) permit in any zone is eligible to participate in the golden crab catch share program. New entrants to the fishery must purchase annual pounds and purchase or lease a permit.

Rationale for Removal: The Council removed this action from consideration because it was unnecessary. Currently, only golden crab permit holders are authorized to harvest golden crab in their permitted zones. The action alternative would not provide any other regulations or restrictions than those that are currently required.

Monitoring and Enforcement:

Rejected Alternatives:

Alternative 2. Phase in additional monitoring as necessary based on the economic capacity of the fishery. Explore real-time reporting via electronic monitoring (recording trip ticket and logbook data on a website upon landing).

Note: There may be a discrepancy between logbook landings and trip ticket if, during shipping, there is shrinkage (5-10%) and any such comparison between logbooks and trip tickets would need to account for this. This could happen given that there could be a time difference of 5-7 days between when a crab is caught and when it is sold due to the length of the trip.

Rationale for Removal: The Council removed Alternative 2 from consideration because it is unnecessary. If deemed necessary, at any time, the Council may phase-in additional monitoring. This would be done through Council action and the rule-making process at a later date.

Sub-alternative 3b. The purchase, installation, and maintenance of the VMS equipment and communications costs will be paid for or arranged by NMFS.

Sub-alternative 3c. The purchase, installation, and maintenance of the VMS equipment and communications costs will be paid for jointly by the shareholder and NMFS.

Rationale for Removal: Through the advice of the Office of Law Enforcement, it was determined that these alternatives were not suitable for consideration. The NMFS does not pay for VMS in its entirety and communication costs are always the responsibility of the shareholder.

Alternative 4. Implement hail-in requirement (at least 3 hrs ahead of time whereby a message could be left or texted in excess of 3 hours) when landing with location and time or other information deemed necessary by enforcement.

Rationale for Removal: Alternative 4 was removed from consideration by the Council because the hail in requirement can be included in the structure of the catch share program. However, the IPT and the OLE has requested that the alternative be included in the amendment to make sure fishermen are aware that this may be required.

