

From: [Tom Orr](#)

To: [List;](#)

CC:

Subject: Timely quotes

Date: Saturday, December 18, 2004 6:40:40 PM

Attachments:

I was thrilled to see such a divergent presentation of quotes in the quota paper that I thought of one myself.

“Oh what tangled web we weave when first we practise to deceive” Sir Walter Scott

A lot of time and energy went into the papers and it was helpful to have Mr. Bruce Turis along with the caucus members present the quota paper for review. Doesn't anybody have any questions or suggestions? Both papers are in the draft stage but will be going out to the fleet in 2005. Constructive criticisms and suggestions are encouraged.

From: [steve](#)
To: [List;](#)
CC:
Subject: trap pull quotas
Date: Sunday, December 19, 2004 7:18:47 PM
Attachments:

Tom, could you please tell me what you expect trap haul quotas would do, to protect the livelihood of prawn fishers who feel threatened by rampant sport fishermen using irresponsible fishing methods all year round, as well as totally unregulated aboriginal food fishing that is growing by leaps and bounds each winter? I'm one of many who envision that, in the not so distant future, May 1st will roll around, and due to the fact that everyone but me has been fishing unregulated all winter long, the spawner index will already be too low for me to continue fishing. You can downplay this scenario but if we continue this fishery the way we are going, the question is not if, this scenario plays out, but when. I read your proposal and while I don't doubt the intentions of trap haul quotas, I guarantee you this is not only not a step forward but, given that you have brought back the possibility of double or triple hauling, is actually a step backward. Weren't you one of the many that supported an end to double hauling for environmental concerns, how does this differ, environmentally speaking, from the 'high grading' that you envision happening under a IVQ fishery? I was under the impression that one of the goals of management change was to extend the commercial season, thus increasing our presence on the grounds and improving market conditions. Do you really believe that any fisherman in his right mind would choose to take a chance to not start on May 1st and fish continuously until their hauls were exhausted?? Sure I might take a weather day here and there when I'm well over the hump, but make no mistake, and I think I can speak for almost everyone when I say, it would be a good month in, before I would start missing days. Perhaps the season could be extended by a week or two initially but this would only be a temporary correction since the sport/aboriginal effort will only continue to increase. I believe if you check the data, you will also find that the majority of the fleets landings are caught in the first month, therefore there would still be a huge glut of prawns on the live market as usual. Any fishermen that I have spoken to, and I strongly

agree, consider not starting on opening day financial suicide since any boats on the water would have free reign to cream all the hot spots. In fact I will pledge here and now to throw my support behind your proposal, if you and your membership promise to delay setting your gear until say, June 1st. Could you also explain how treaty settlements would affect our fishery should we adopt a trap haul quota system vs an IVQ system? I look forward to your response, Steve Starbuck.

From: [steve](#)
To: [Listerve;](#)
CC:
Subject: Re: Timely quotes
Date: Monday, December 20, 2004 6:59:39 PM
Attachments:

Tom Orr wrote:

I was thrilled to see such a divergent presentation of quotes in the quota paper that I thought of one myself.

“Oh what tangled web we weave when first we practise to deceive”
Sir Walter Scott

A lot of time and energy went into the papers and it was helpful to have Mr. Bruce Turis along with the caucus members present the quota paper for review. Doesn't anybody have any questions or suggestions? Both papers are in the draft stage but will be going out to the fleet in 2005. Constructive criticisms and suggestions are encouraged.

What are implying, where is the deception??

From: [Tom Orr](#)

To: [List;](#)

CC:

Subject: RE: trap pull quotas

Date: Monday, December 20, 2004 7:30:19 PM

Attachments:

You have raised some good questions. I have attempted to answer them.

1) I agree there is abuse of the recreational sport licence to fish prawns. The Sports Fishing Advisory Board also agrees that it is a problem. Talks continue to try and come up with solutions. I'm not sure that any commercial management plan will deal with poachers. That is a Conservation and Protection Branch responsibility. I would be hopeful that since recreational fishers are limited to 4 traps with presently no limit on trap hauls that the rec fishery may take an example of string haul limits and limit the number of trap hauls per season for the rec fishery. I find this approach significantly better than what is currently going on in the Halibut quota fishery where we now see a shortfall (how did they determine a shortfall) in recreational percent of quota, being fished by halibut fishermen to pay the rec sector the difference.

2) Double hauling; the reality of double hauling with a maximum limit at 6 strings per day is very different than double or triple hauling for a total of 12 to 18 strings hauled per day in the previous fisheries. Each vessel is limited to 360 string hauls per season and a maximum of 6 per day in the proposal. I doubt very much if a fisher would waste trap hauls by pulling non producing strings twice, however if he decided to move after pulling the third string, he would not be penalized to pick the two strings already pulled and be able to relocate without waiting a day. Such decisions are made quite often on the

North and Central Coasts. A fishing plan tries to address all participants and the differences in fishing strategies. The quota proposal does not include single haul as proponents of IVQ state no one will double haul. **Imagine (well you don't have to imagine, its proposed in the quota paper) if you will vessels with quota with no limit on the amount of trap hauls per day. That is the quota proposal in a nutshell. The fishery would end up with thrashing machines with flocks of seagulls for miles around.**

3) Starting on May 1st; Yes, there is no doubt that all fishers will start opening day. No one said that they wouldn't. Some did say they would soak their traps for four days...I doubt that too. Yes, we may have as short a fishery however we will have a level playing field with an enforced hauling limit of six strings per day. Just eliminating double hauling may well extend the season as spawner index done on double pulls tends to shut areas down quickly. There is the possibility that all areas would not close on spawner index, however the season would close anyway as there is no way to manage a fleet of vessels ready to pounce on the last surplus prawn. Vessels with sting hauls left over may well enjoy excellent market rewards at prices double that of the normal season. So some fishers may trade off some hauls for less prawns but a higher quality product with significant price increases. Some fishers may enjoy the added insurance against lost fishing days due to break downs or personal priorities. They may also enjoy the ability to move and explore without a doomsday clock ticking away the season. I do agree with you that it will take time for a change to take hold and fishers to realize the benefits such a proposal may bring to the industry. String Haul Limits can provide a secure equal building base for fishermen to adjust to changing circumstances in the fishery, such as reducing traps in some areas and increasing them in others. **I see no benefits to the fishery through quota, only an unequal transfer of fishing privilege to those that have taken, from those who have taken less. Doesn't make any sense to me.**

There is another consideration between the proposals. If the TAC based on the 3 best years ever goes down, vessels with marginal quota will not be viable...they might have to sell out, but I guess that is the idea behind quota fisheries. String haul limits however maintain an equal share of opportunity thus the owner of a licence will not lose money because his share has been diminished.

Treaty Question, at the last sectoral meeting a treaty negotiator stated quite plainly that historic catch would be granted and that demands past that would be purchased. I don't see a problem.

Both options are in the review stage.

Season Greetings Thanks for the questions Steve. Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: steve [<mailto:sstarbuck@dccnet.com>]

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 3:18 AM

To: List

Subject: trap pull quotas

Tom, could you please tell me what you expect trap haul quotas would

do, to protect the livelihood of prawn fishers who feel threatened by

rampant sport fishermen using irresponsible fishing methods all year

round, as well as totally unregulated aboriginal food fishing that is

growing by leaps and bounds each winter? I'm one of many who envision

that, in the not so distant future, May 1st will roll around, and due

to the fact that everyone but me has been fishing unregulated all winter

long, the spawner index will already be too low for me to continue

fishing. You can downplay this scenario but if we continue this fishery

the way we are going, the question is not if, this scenario plays out,

but when. I read your proposal and while I don't doubt the intentions of

trap haul quotas, I guarantee you this is not only not a step forward

but, given that you have brought back the possibility of double or

triple hauling, is actually a step backward. Weren't you one of the many

that supported an end to double hauling for environmental concerns, how

does this differ, environmentally speaking, from the 'high grading' that

you envision happening under a IVQ fishery? I was under the impression

that one of the goals of management change was to extend the commercial

season, thus increasing our presence on the grounds and improving

market conditions. Do you really believe that any fisherman in his right

mind would choose to take a chance to not start on May 1st and fish

continuously until their hauls were exhausted?? Sure I might take a

weather day here and there when I'm well over the hump, but make no

mistake, and I think I can speak for almost everyone when I say, it

would be a good month in, before I would start missing days. Perhaps the

season could be extended by a week or two initially but this would only

be a temporary correction since the sport/aboriginal effort will only

continue to increase. I believe if you check the data, you will also

find that the majority of the fleets landings are caught in the first

month, therefore there would still be a huge glut of prawns on the live

market as usual. Any fishermen that I have spoken to, and I strongly

agree, consider not starting on opening day financial suicide since any

boats on the water would have free reign to cream all the hot spots. In

fact I will pledge here and now to throw my support behind your

proposal, if you and your membership promise to delay setting your gear

until say, June 1st. Could you also explain how treaty settlements would

affect our fishery should we adopt a trap haul quota system vs an IVQ

system? I look forward to your response, Steve Starbuck.

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: IVQ Proposal : Questions ?
Date: Monday, December 20, 2004 8:02:10 PM
Attachments:

- 1)What history will recent purchasers use to calculate history ?
- 2) Why would the FAS Fleet want to subsidize the Live fleet in regards to individual validation ?

If a FAS boat has 3 or 4 deliveries 4*2hrs. 8hrs. @ \$60/hr= \$480.00
Live boat maybe 50 validations * \$105 min. call out = \$5,250 . Or /2
Boats = 2625 . But if live boats are getting an extra buck or two a lb. ,
its still worth it to the live boat, so why are these or other #'s left out?
(only talking about landing fees not management

3) Whats up with 0.400031792 , while I realize its what you get when you divide in millionths , but you're only multiplying by ; i.e. 30,000lbs *
0.000031792= 0.95 of a LB , would it not have been easier to say take 40% of
your average poundage . ?? Is halibut to the 4th or 5th decimal point?

Tom Tobacco

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: More Questions
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 5:16:28 PM
Attachments:

Regarding what history a boat uses ? Am I correct to assume a boat/lic. , bought after the 2002 season , would just use 2003 as their history , or add 2004? , then again , will every boat just use their best year from the seasons 2001-2004 ?

Yes with the more live participants delivering at the same time validation costs will go down , seems it helps to have some incentive for individuals to keep their own costs down .

Tom Tobacco

From: mmadfish
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: repost from DFO
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 5:28:57 PM
Attachments:

Please be advised that DFO will assemble information regarding prawn licence landings, and will supply that information to W licence holders in the prawn pilot program description mail out, in the new year. In the interim, we are unable to deal with individual requests for information.

Jim Morrison

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Barton, Leslie
> Sent: December 21, 2004 11:31 AM
> To: Morrison, Jim
> Subject: Request from prawn fishers for annual landings to feed into
> quota calculation
>
> Hi Jim,
> Would you be able to advise the prawn industry members (perhaps through
> the list serve) that the Shellfish Data Unit will be placing a lesser
> priority on filling requests for summaries of annual landings (for feeding
> into the proposed quota options calculations) while we are working through
> the licence renewal processes for the crab, geoduck, euphausiid and opal
> squid fisheries. I will be able to turn my attention back to the prawn
> data requests in January.
> Thanks
>
> Leslie Barton
> Shellfish Stock Assessment Biologist
> Shellfish Data Unit
>
>

From: [Tom Orr](#)

To: [List;](#)

CC:

Subject:

Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 7:29:46 PM

Attachments:

Caucus meetings over the most recent years to discuss log book improvements have revealed that some many or most prawn fishermen guess at the landings for the day. Some individuals suggested that their log book could be at least 5000 lbs. over what was actually caught.

Others buying their own product can write any amount in a fish slip and or log.

Some can have large quantities of prawns spoil in a freezer somewhere...not sold but logged.

Do I think fishers cheat? Well a whole bunch of them fed up and frustrated with double haulers on the North Coast admitted to DFO that they double hauled to compete. Every year there are charges for double hauling. Makes a 5000 dollar fine pretty insignificant doesn't it?

How is a 50% quota formula based on log book information ever going to be accurate to determine what was really caught?

Double hauling, guessing at poundage, and padding log books for higher catch. How can this be justified? Maybe some fishermen actual underestimated their catch. What do we do? Reward those that cheat?

Let's work with solid information such as; Length of vessel, 40%, time in the fishery, 40% equal history, 20% and shoe size? Maybe we should go back to include years before single haul where double hauling was acceptable?

From: [Nathan and Megin Pearl](#)
To: [List;](#)
CC:
Subject: Re:
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 8:23:32 PM
Attachments:

I think Tom makes a good point. Not only has double hauling hurt the fishery we have but those who did it and increased their landings will be laughing all the way to the bank. I don't really care what system we use as long as it works. I am curious what the cost of a quota system would be and has DFO accepted either proposal as workable or have they given any feed back at all? Also what is the next step? I much prefer the fishery we have over either of the new proposals because I just can't see them working very well. I should explain why but I'm afraid my fingers have a very small typing quota.

Nate

Pearl

From: [steve](#)
To: [List;](#)
CC:
Subject: nate
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 1:15:17 AM
Attachments:

I'm happy with the fishery as is too, but we are at the pinnacle and there is only one way to go from there, five great years in a row + high prices + fewer days every year = equals an unsustainable fishery. When treaties are settled, if we are on quota the gov't will purchase quota from TAC to settle, under any other system they give resource away and we get the scraps. Either way the natives get their needs met, which I have no problem with. The only difference is whether it is on the backs of 252 licenced prawn fishermen or the collective population of Canada. As for the allocation issue I would prefer it be more equitable also, maybe not equal but less emphasis on history. There are cheats under every system, going status quo because a small minority may benefit unfairly, is like 'cutting off your nose to spite your face'. SS

From: [steve](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC: [List;](#)
Subject: Re: toms shoe size
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 1:34:04 AM
Attachments:

Tom Orr wrote:

Caucus meetings over the most recent years to discuss log book improvements have revealed that some many or most prawn fishermen guess at the landings for the day. Some individuals suggested that their log book could be at least 5000 lbs. over what was actually caught.

Others buying their own product can write any amount in a fish slip and or log.

Some can have large quantities of prawns spoil in a freezer somewhere...not sold but logged.

Do I think fishers cheat? Well a whole bunch of them fed up and frustrated with double haulers on the North Coast admitted to DFO that they double hauled to compete. Every year there are charges for double hauling. Makes a 5000 dollar fine pretty insignificant doesn't it?

How is a 50% quota formula based on log book information ever going to be accurate to determine what was really caught?

Double hauling, guessing at poundage, and padding log books for higher catch. How can this be justified? Maybe some fishermen actual underestimated their catch. What do we do? Reward those that cheat?

Let's work with solid information such as; Length of vessel, 40%, time in the fishery, 40% equal history, 20% and shoe size? Maybe we should go back to include years before single haul where double hauling was acceptable?

Fish slips

are required to match logs, prawns rotting in your freezer are still supposed to have a fish slip submitted, nobody significantly underestimates their catch, which is moot anyways if fishslips have been submitted, unless you mean by way of under the table cash sales. Maybe you should propose equal allocation, you might have a lot of support including with DFO, this tends to reward armchair fishers instead of double haulers and logbook cheats (just goes to show that no system is perfect), I'm sure this would ruffle the feathers of those you seem to be concerned with though, far more than your resistance to their proposal does. Steve

From: [steve](#)
To: [Tom Tobacco; Listerve;](#)
CC:
Subject: Re: More Questions
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 8:27:57 AM
Attachments:

Tom Tobacco wrote:

> Regarding what history a boat uses ? Am I correct to assume a
> boat/lic. , bought after the 2002 season , would just use 2003 as
> their history , or add 2004? , then again , will every boat just use
> their best year from the seasons 2001-2004 ?
>
> Yes with the more live participants delivering at the same time
> validation costs will go down , seems it helps to have some incentive
> for individuals to keep their own costs down .
>

> Tom Tobacco

>
>
>
>
>
Regardless what year someone bought a boat, it would have had a landing history for the years previously ,it would have just been under another owner, this is the history they would use in addition to the years the new owner fished it. Steve

From: [steve](#)
To: [Tom Orr; Listerve;](#)
CC:
Subject: Re: trap pull quotas
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 10:06:27 AM
Attachments:

Tom Orr wrote:

You have raised some good questions. I have attempted to answer them.

1) I agree there is abuse of the recreational sport licence to fish prawns. The Sports Fishing Advisory Board also agrees that it is a problem. Talks continue to try and come up with solutions. I'm not sure that any commercial management plan will deal with poachers. That is a Conservation and Protection Branch responsibility. I would be hopeful that since recreational fishers are limited to 4 traps with presently no limit on trap hauls that the rec fishery may take an example of string haul limits and limit the number of trap hauls per season for the rec fishery. I find this approach significantly better than what is currently going on in the Halibut quota fishery where we now see a shortfall (how did they determine a shortfall) in recreational percent of quota, being fished by halibut fishermen to pay the rec sector the difference.

2) Double hauling; the reality of double hauling with a maximum limit at 6 strings per day is very different than double or triple hauling for a total of 12 to 18 strings hauled per day in the previous fisheries. Each vessel is limited to 360 string hauls per season and a maximum of 6 per

day in the proposal. I doubt very much if a fisher would waste trap hauls by pulling non producing strings twice, however if he decided to move after pulling the third string, he would not be penalized to pick the two strings already pulled and be able to relocate without waiting a day. Such decisions are made quite often on the North and Central Coasts. A fishing plan tries to address all participants and the differences in fishing strategies. The quota proposal does not include single haul as proponents of IVQ state no one will double haul. **Imagine (well you don't have to imagine, its proposed in the quota paper) if you will vessels with quota with no limit on the amount of trap hauls per day. That is the quota proposal in a nutshell. The fishery would end up with thrashing machines with flocks of seagulls for miles around.**

3) Starting on May 1st; Yes, there is no doubt that all fishers will start opening day. No one said that they wouldn't. Some did say they would soak their traps for four days...I doubt that too. Yes, we may have as short a fishery however we will have a level playing field with an enforced hauling limit of six strings per day. Just eliminating double hauling may well extend the season as spawner index done on double pulls tends to shut areas down quickly. There is the possibility that all areas would not close on spawner index, however the season would close anyway as there is no way to manage a fleet of vessels ready to pounce on the last surplus prawn. Vessels with sting hauls left over may well enjoy excellent market rewards at prices double that of the normal season. So some fishers may trade off some hauls for less prawns but a higher quality product with significant price increases. Some fishers may enjoy the added insurance against lost fishing days due to break downs or personal priorities. They may also enjoy

the ability to move and explore without a doomsday clock ticking away the season. I do agree with you that it will take time for a change to take hold and fishers to realize the benefits such a proposal may bring to the industry. String Haul Limits can provide a secure equal building base for fishermen to adjust to changing circumstances in the fishery, such as reducing traps in some areas and increasing them in others. **I see no benefits to the fishery through quota, only an unequal transfer of fishing privilege to those that have taken, from those who have taken less. Doesn't make any sense to me.**

There is another consideration between the proposals. If the TAC based on the 3 best years ever goes down, vessels with marginal quota will not be viable...they might have to sell out, but I guess that is the idea behind quota fisheries. String haul limits however maintain an equal share of opportunity thus the owner of a licence will not lose money because his share has been diminished.

Treaty Question, at the last sectoral meeting a treaty negotiator stated quite plainly that historic catch would be granted and that demands past that would be purchased. I don't see a problem.

Both options are in the review stage.

Season Greetings Thanks for the questions
Steve. Tom

First of all,
Tom, you have said nothing that would put my mind

at ease regarding the settlement of treaties, I however can assure that I have also spoken, in private, to someone involved in the treaty negotiation process who assures me that THE ONLY WAY FOR THE COMMERCIAL FLEET TO RETAIN LONG TERM ACCESS TO THIS FISHERY IS TO IMPLEMENT IVQ's, I'll chose to believe him. As to point 1) you apparently still have your head in the sand, the sport sector considers us, to paraphrase Wayne Harling the head of the SFAB, a bunch of irresponsible, overfishing yahoos, using poor science to manage their, prawn stocks. This from a former biologist who heads a group that still uses small mesh traps, insists on fishing during spawning season, permits multiple hauling of gear, has no minimum size limits, encourages high-grading of catch, and refuses any attempt to follow any type of science. As to your statement that "talks continue" it is my understanding that sports fishers have refused more than once to enter into meaningful discussions with representatives of the commercial fleet, so the only talks I see are SFAB members talking to the media about how endangered the prawn resource is and how it is all to blame on irresponsible, greedy commercial fishermen. I'll not put my faith in DFO 'Protection and Conservation', as you suggest, since they have it within their power to at least hold the sport fishers responsible for their poor fishing methods but refuse to for fear of confrontation, a typically spineless stance. As for your twisted view of the agreement between sporties and the halibut fishers the fact that they have an 'agreement' proves that it is better than our system and the only reason that there is a shortfall is that the sport sector received a larger portion of the TAC than they presently catch which is a good thing for all parties as it leaves them plenty of room to grow, not at the expense of other user groups, specifically the commercial fleet. As to item 2) your defense of double hauling in your proposal, doesn't exclude the fact that shorter soak times result in higher catch of small prawns, an accepted fact I've read the quota proposal and nowhere does it

mention double hauling. Your colorful but equally ridiculous description of " thrashing machines with flocks of seagulls for miles around" barely deserves recognition other than to point out that seagulls prefer chasing shrimp boats And finally 3) you yourself state that the season will probably be just as short under your system which contradicts everything in your proposal, not to mention it ignores the purpose of a change in management styles which is meant to lengthen the season, maintain more prescence on the grounds, increase prices, and decrease the need to fish all days at all costs. You seem intent on destroying 252 livelihoods just to assure that a very small number of what you refer to as cheaters, don't benefit more than yourself. The only reason you see no benefits is because you are closed minded and obsessed with the fact that your neighbor may get more despite the fact that you have enough. As for "unequal transfer of priveledge", I'm not thrilled with some aspects of the allocation formula myself for the same reasons as you. Instead of bellyaching why don't you put forth some constructive input. You are becoming almost as bad as the guy at the sectoral meeting on Friday who hated uota, hated status quo, hated trap haul limits, yet had no constructive input of his own. I'm sick of idiots , not necessarily you, that recognize all the problems but have no answers. If your biggest problem is allocation come up with another method of distribution, there is probably alot of support for it. But remember we need change and it should be done according to the will of the majority don't miss the opportunity to have your input. By the way you keep referring to the halibut fishery, remember the facts; 1) huge majority of participants satisfied with quota, 2) prices 2-3 times higher than under pre-quota management system, 3) 2-3 day openings under old system, 8 month season under quota, dispute any of these facts. Merry Christmas, Steve.

From: [Dan Singleton](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: Re Quota Pilot Program
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 11:25:12 AM
Attachments:

I have the preliminary results for the 2004 prawn season landings which total 3,508,918 lbs this does not include landings from areas where less than 3 boats reported landings (as it compromises confidentiality).

I added 100,000 lbs ,which is probably generous for these areas for a total of 3,608,918lbs.

Applying the example used in the quota draft of a boat length of 37 ft. and av. landings of 18,000 lbs. to the 2004 season this vessel would have had a quota of 13,125 lbs.(This is based on data which includes double hauling so what is the real 2004 catch,it's anyone's guess.).It gets worse, if we use the average landings for 2004 rather than the18,000 this boat would get a quota of approx.11,500 lbs. for the season.

Using the 2001,2&3 landings to calculate individual estimates of quota are unrealistic these being the best fishing seasons on record.

Maybe 1/3,1/3,1/3 -license,length and history would cause less hardship to some fishers and be more reasonable to consider,however I'm pretty turned off by the whole process and would prefer status quo and fix our problems-maybe cameras would fix double hauling and as Tom said a treaty negotiator did attend a caucus meeting and assured us the gov.'t would buy licenses to settle native demands. Understand why you are skeptical on the native issue Steve but I suppose we've got to have some faith in the system,which believe me I also find very difficult.

Dan

From: [steve](#)
To: [Dan Singleton; Listerve;](#)
CC:
Subject: reply to Dan
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004 2:23:01 PM
Attachments:

Dan Singleton wrote:

I have the preliminary results for the 2004 prawn season landings which total 3,508,918 lbs this does not include landings from areas where less than 3 boats reported landings (as it compromises confidentiality).

I added 100,000 lbs ,which is probably generous for these areas for a total of 3,608,918lbs.

Applying the example used in the quota draft of a boat length of 37 ft. and av. landings of 18,000 lbs. to the 2004 season this vessel would have had a quota of 13,125 lbs.(This is based on data which includes double hauling so what is the real 2004 catch,it's anyone's guess.).It gets worse, if we use the average landings for 2004 rather than the18,000 this boat would get a quota of approx.11,500 lbs. for the season.

Using the 2001,2&3 landings to calculate individual estimates of quota are unrealistic these being the best fishing seasons on record.

Maybe 1/3,1/3,1/3 -license,length and history would cause less hardship to some fishers and be more reasonable to consider, however I'm pretty turned off by the whole process and would prefer status quo and fix our problems-maybe cameras would fix double hauling and as Tom said a treaty negotiator did attend a caucus meeting and assured us the gov.'t would buy licenses to settle native demands.Understand why you are skeptical on the native issue Steve but I suppose we've got to have some faith in the system,which believe me I also find very difficult.

Dan

Hey Dan, the allocation, in the proposal, is based on a TAC that is firmly set @ about 1670 tons, this is very conservative, and realistic since it is less than the amount landed in eight of the last nine years (it also doesn't include the cash sales that so many 'forget' to submit paperwork for each year. The years chosen to arrive at a boats history is not going to change the TAC but is rather a proportional indicator, therefore if you used different years you may have a different correction factor ie. you may get 38% of these 4 years avg landings or 37.5% of those 5 years landings. Some fishermen want to use different years, I think if you look deeper it's because they had better landings in those years, it may be though, that so did everyone else so they would not benefit from changing the history years. As for your calculations a 37' boat with 18,000 lbs avg landings would receive; (37' x 118.22 lbs/foot) 4374 lbs for their length + 2936 lbs for their equal portion + (.40 x 18,000 lbs) 7,200 lbs for their history, for a total of 14,510 lbs. As I've said 2004 catch wouldn't matter, especially since I'm sure there are slips and logs that have not been submitted and that would leave the door too wide open for guys to conveniently send some late landings, and as I've said it wouldn't matter anyways because in general the whole fleet on average probably suffered the same drop/increase in landings. As for the treaty issue I can't believe anyone would be so complacent as to put their well being at the mercy of an organizations that has everything to gain by screwing us. Remember, it costs far less to satisfy treaties under the present system, than under an IVQ system, this doesn't take into account 2,3,5, or 6 years from now when I can guarantee you, W tabs will not be selling for what they are today, if we are still fishing under status quo or a trap haul quota system which will play out EXACTLY THE SAME AS STATUS QUO. This is incentive alone for treaty negotiators to (officially) dissuade us from changing to a IVQ system. Also when people assure you, that you will still have access, remember, the Fraser River gillnetters and the Gulf trollers never really officially lost access, they just had to wait 'til everyone else had filled their boots, and then there was nothing left for them. Also even if licences were retired, under the present system, to satisfy treaties they would buy the cheapest, smallest licences from those willing to sell (the ones with the smallest landings), and value that licence the same as your licence and mine, ie they would buy 10% of the fleet but transfer a larger percentage of the TAC. There is also nothing to stop them from giving 1500 tons out to satisfy treaties, what does that leave you and me. Happy thought for the holiday, Steve.

From: mmadfish
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: re IVQ proposal
Date: Sunday, December 26, 2004 8:39:00 PM
Attachments:

If a proposed quota prawn fishery pilot project were to be implemented without equal allocations to the participating fishers, then if such a project were to fail, or not proceed for whatever reason, how would the fishers be compensated for their lost earning potentials during the pilot time? Would an 'equalizer' be established and fishers above it then reduce their catch in the following years...re-allocating to the fishers below their levels?

I fail to understand why the IVQ proposal gets so 'complicated' at this early stage. This serves only to alienate fishermen right from the start. Keep the allocation simple and fair and up front. There are many more serious bugs to work out such as validation, costs, fleet dispersal, monitoring, enforcement, spawner index adaptation ...

Rick Jerema
cfv bison

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: IVQ Questions and comments.
Date: Tuesday, December 28, 2004 7:05:12 PM
Attachments:

(1) "where possible seek to avoid significant changes in the distribution of benefits that are currently derived from the fishery" (pg.3 IVQ proposal)

I was wondering why the Historical part of the formula is based strictly on Lbs. and not Dollars???

I personally am below the poundage average , but I have a very low % of Med./Large . so I would suggest I'm closer to the \$ average / boat . Also as more vessel/lics. change hands I would suggest the new owners are a hell of a lot hungrier than the prior ones , so distribution of benefits are and always will change .

(2) "an allocation formula that leaves no license holder worse off financially than prior to IVQs(as measured by considering the combined affects of an IVQ program on the value of their license and ANNUAL LANDED VALUE)" (pg.8 IVQ proposal)

Here it would seem you're talking about \$. Also in a properly managed IVQ system the TAC should go up , the \$/lb. goes up , expenses should go down dramatically (presently 300 traps/day If i could single haul 600 traps/day. in theory 2 times the Lbs/day = 1/2 the expenses) MY POINT BEING ;; JUST BECAUSE SOMEONE CATCHES LESS LBS/SEASON DOES NOT NECESSARILY MEAN THEY WOULD EARN LESS MONEY .At the end of the season its how much \$ are in your pockets.

(3) "Historical catch reflects the operator's investment in effort, gear and technology combined with experience and ingenuity." (pg.5 IVQ proposal)

(4) "Restrictions on the number of hauls per day were implemented in 2001 and have proven difficult to enforce with the current monitoring and enforcement resources." (pg 1 IVQ proposal)

#3 historic catch means something else different than #1&2 , so which is it
??? And considering #4 and the fact every extra 1000 LBS of Quota = Apprx.
\$64,000 how accurate can the 2001-2003 data be.

Tom Tobacco

From: [Nathan and Megin Pearl](#)
To: [List;](#)
CC:
Subject: IVQ - season length
Date: Wednesday, December 29, 2004 5:29:46 PM
Attachments:

the IVQ proposal suggests an eight month season. With spawner index as the tool for closures I can not imagine the season reaching the three month mark and possibly less depending on the condition of the stocks. Obviously if there are 5 million lbs available and we only catch 3.5 million it should result in a longer season, but that's quite a trade off. How does the live fleet know that the local areas won't be closed in 60 days. The price gap between L and XL prawns is smaller and fuel prices are up so I know I will start the season May 1 freezing in the gulf and I will fish every day till my quota is caught. I would love to catch 50% in october but I would need a guarantee that there would still lots of inshore area still open. If the season is not considerably longer most of the benefits of IVQ are gone and we end up with huge fees, less product and the same price. Nate

From: [Tom Orr](#)
To: [List;](#)
CC:
Subject:
Date: Thursday, December 30, 2004 9:34:19 AM
Attachments:

Steve said;

First of all, Tom, you have said nothing that would put my mind at ease regarding the settlement of treaties, I however can assure that I have also spoken, in private, to someone involved in the treaty negotiation process who assures me that THE ONLY WAY FOR THE COMMERCIAL FLEET TO RETAIN LONG TERM ACCESS TO THIS FISHERY IS TO IMPLEMENT IVQ's, I'll chose to believe him. As to point 1) you apparently still have your head in the sand, the sport sector considers us, to paraphrase Wayne Harling the head of the SFAB, a bunch of irresponsible, overfishing yahoos, using poor science to manage their, prawn stocks. This from a former biologist who heads a group that still uses small mesh traps, insists on fishing during spawning season, permits multiple hauling of gear, has no minimum size limits, encourages high-grading of catch, and refuses any attempt to follow any type of science. As to your statement that "talks continue" it is my understanding that sports fishers have refused more than once to enter into meaningful discussions with representatives of the commercial fleet, so the only talks I see are SFAB members talking to the media about how endangered the prawn resource is and how it is all to blame on irresponsible, greedy commercial fishermen. I'll not put my faith in DFO 'Protection and Conservation', as you suggest, since they have it within their power to at least hold the sport fishers responsible for their poor fishing methods but refuse to for fear of confrontation, a typically spineless stance. As for your twisted view of the agreement between sporties and the halibut fishers the fact that they have an 'agreement' proves that it is better than our system and the only reason that there is a shortfall is that the sport sector received a larger portion of the TAC than they presently catch which is a good thing for all parties as it

leaves them plenty of room to grow, not at the expense of other user groups, specifically the commercial fleet. As to item 2) your defense of double hauling in your proposal, doesn't exclude the fact that shorter soak times result in higher catch of small prawns, an accepted fact I've read the quota proposal and nowhere does it mention double hauling. Your colorful but equally ridiculous description of " thrashing machines with flocks of seagulls for miles around" barely deserves recognition other than to point out that seagulls prefer chasing shrimp boats And finally 3) you yourself state that the season will probably be just as short under your system which contradicts everything in your proposal, not to mention it ignores the purpose of a change in management styles which is meant to lengthen the season, maintain more presence on the grounds, increase prices, and decrease the need to fish all days at all costs. You seem intent on destroying 252 livelihoods just to assure that a very small number of what you refer to as cheaters, don't benefit more than yourself. The only reason you see no benefits is because you are closed minded and obsessed with the fact that your neighbor may get more despite the fact that you have enough. As for "unequal transfer of privilege", I'm not thrilled with some aspects of the allocation formula myself for the same reasons as you. Instead of bellyaching why don't you put forth some constructive input. You are becoming almost as bad as the guy at the sectoral meeting on Friday who hated uota, hated status quo, hated trap haul limits, yet had no constructive input of his own. I'm sick of idiots , not necessarily you, that recognize all the problems but have no answers. If your biggest problem is allocation come up with another method of distribution, there is probably a lot of support for it. But remember we need change and it should be done according to the will of the majority don't miss the opportunity to have your input. By the way you keep referring to the halibut fishery, remember the facts; 1) huge majority of participants satisfied with quota, 2) prices 2-3 times higher than under pre-quota management system, 3) 2-3 day openings under old system, 8 month season under quota, dispute any of these facts. Merry Christmas, Steve.

Tom answers; First, Merry Christmas to you Steve and thank you for taking the time to air your opinions.

I wish I was so sure that the only way for us to hang onto our privilege to fish was to implement an Individual Vessel

Quota system in the prawn fishery. From where I sit there is a difference of opinion concerning the outcome of Native settlements and how they will impact commercial fishers. I think this question should be raised at the next (or soon) discussion on future management proposals. Rumors, hearsay, and heard it from my best friend are not good enough to justify a quota management system. (There may be other reasons but that one should be investigated before relied upon)

Did Wayne Harling say anything bad about us? Sectoral Reps and the executive director of the PPFA have had a number of well meaning exchanges. The SFAB is considering methods to better manage the sport sector. It's a two way street however a common sense approach to resource management from both sectors may get us going in one direction. Most of, if not all the reps (at the meetings) from the sport side are learning that what you have stated Wayne said about us is not true. They are very receptive of the management practices in the commercial fishery and seemed to have had no idea that we may bring up less than expected catches too. We can wall slam or negotiate.

No, the quota paper did not mention double hauling. Nor did it mention single hauling. The presenters assured the meeting room that single haul was not an option. That certainly double hauling would be permitted, even triple hauling...but because it is a quota fishery they explained no double hauling would occur? Think about that for a moment. Any way I understand the predicament. How would you enforce single haul in an 8 month fishery, let alone a 63 day fishery? Is it important? These are the questions.

Double hauling would not be a practical exercise when the number of string hauls is limited. One would only double haul when prawns were abundant, when one couldn't get to their other strings or for convenience, such as moving gear. Double hauling in a string limit program would only allow 6 strings to be hauled per day so a person could not double haul all their

strings. The fishery would have a daily cap on the number of strings hauled... i.e. $6 \times 252 = 1512$ strings.

Hauling practices in a quota fishery would be very different. With no limit on the number of string hauls and every incentive to find the main batch or reset at the desired depth, the numbers of string hauls would soar to unknown numbers such as 3000 per day. That's what's meant by thrashing machines...going through gear at high speed throwing back mediums and large only to keep XLs. The race would be on; to capture the highest value prawn with the least amount of expense...got a crew? Work hard all day flipping as many traps as possible from dawn to dusk. I thought that's what we were trying to get away from with single haul or a string limit to lengthen the season. Imagine what that would do for spawner indexing values? The fishery areas would be closed down faster than you could say "I got my quota, did you get yours?"

Other quota fisheries the quota discussion paper refers to are very different than quota proposed for the prawn fishery. Halibut for instance has a set Total Allowed or Allocated Catch. All participants know they can catch it, that the fish will be there. The halibut fishery does not have area closures or a spawner index to halt fishing. The spawner index used in the prawn fishery represents the TAC regardless of what has or has not been caught. There is no guarantee that anyone would catch their quota in the prawn fishery...nor is there any guarantee anyone would be able to use all their string hauls. We only know an average catch, and conservatively create an administrative limit or quota based on past fishing practices.

String haul limits are purely based on what we have been doing for the last 3 years, and that is hauling 300 traps per day for as long as the index permits. The possibilities and considerations to modify the Coastal management plan with a fair and equal opportunity based option are almost limitless for these reasons;

- 1) No need for area licencing, areas may be allocated a variable string haul limit per day.
- 2) Fleet concentration may be offset if required by incentives to fish more remote areas...more string hauls permitted for instance on a daily basis (fewer in the Straight, and more in the North for example)
- 3) Ability for the commercial sector to relieve fishing pressure where other user groups are concentrated.(without losing presence on the water)
- 4) An ability to meet market expectations by controlling the speed of extraction, if desired.
- 5) A variable management tool to adjust in sensitive areas of index results

to maintain fishing opportunity, that may be applied in season
All these aspects can be used without giving or taking from licence holders as all
licenced vessels have the same opportunity to use up a set number of string
hauls, in a short period of time or an extended period of time.

The commercial sector would, under string haul limits have an opportunity based
on a set number of string hauls (numbers of traps to be hauled)

The sport sector already has a trap limit per day. (4 traps per day)

The native fishery is an unknown; however it would seem logical to also
negotiate an opportunity based on numbers of trap hauls as 2 out of three
sectors would already have trap limits in place.

Management of the fisheries would ultimately be made simpler with all sectors
be given a fair opportunity which could be adjusted across the board evenly area
by area if necessary, to deal with stock fluctuations.

My constructive input is demonstrated with the paper on an alternative to quota,
namely string haul limits. Both systems put an individual cap on production.

String hauls would seem to be enforceable. I can not see how quota would be
enforceable. Unloading may present a huge problem for daily deliveries to
specialized ports, demanding tight scheduling and the possibility of out of the
way destinations.

No matter which way a person looks at it, to lengthen the season, catches must
be landed over a longer period of time.

Some fishers would rather fish a full day of gear when possible and have their
season over quickly. String hauls could accommodate this by permitting more
than six hauled per day in different areas. For example; if a person hauled 8
strings per day consecutively that vessel would finish the season in 45 days.
This may be an advantage in remote areas.

Fishers wishing to extend a season may find hauling less than 6 strings a day
will lengthen the season. Hauling 4 strings per day for example would
theoretically stretch a season to 90 days fished consecutively.

The point is an enforceable way to limit trap or string hauls gives meaning to
lengthen the season. A quota fishery to have meaning to this regard may have
weekly or daily catch limits that are enforceable as well as some method to
control the numbers of trap hauls.