

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: ITQs; Fishing for a pension or peanuts?
Date: Monday, January 03, 2005 1:27:17 PM
Attachments: [art02.pdf](#)

while I really hate long e-mails , some people may find the attached document interesting ?

Tom Tobacco

From: [mmadfish](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: Fool me once...
Date: Thursday, January 06, 2005 2:51:06 PM
Attachments:

The following is an excerpt from the Carpenter Fishing Corp vs Canada case (1997). The full document is posted on Prawnvoice

http://www.mmadfish.com/prawnvoice/quota_carpenter01.php

"I suppose it can be said that, with regard to the public interest, the ends of getting the IVQ formula implemented, including the Current Owner Restriction, justify the means of promoting a private interest through a discriminatory decision. But, in my opinion, this argument does not reflect the values that most Canadians expect of the Government of Canada.

As a representative of the Government of Canada, Mr. Turris was conducting the quota system initiative to act in the best interests of not only the fishery but also the licence holders as those most affected. From this standpoint, I would expect that he would be cautious to ensure that the greatest care possible be taken to protect licence holders' interests in the radical change contemplated. I would think that if one licence holder was aggrieved by this change that this should be cause for great concern.

From this point of view, I would expect Bruce Turris to have shunned any suggestion that would benefit some licence holders to the detriment of others, particularly when the benefit derived would be based in pure self interest, or greed, to uncut the language.

He did not do this, but rather turned from facilitator of the ideas of licence holders to an advocate for a certain group who would personally benefit by the COR decision reached. As I have said, Bruce Turris should have known that the "democratic process" which he designed was unreliable. Thus, he should have been extremely careful in agreeing to, much less advocating for, something which was so much in the self interest of the few at the table on May 3rd when so many were outside with absolutely no

knowledge of what was being decided.

Bruce Turris should have listened to the strong statements of concern made by Art Sterrit, who spoke not only on behalf of Aboriginal fishers, but really also on behalf of the then unidentified 44 licence holders who would be detrimentally affected by the decision. This objection alone should have caused him to pause to reflect, to get the information and statistics requested, to have adjourned the meeting then in its eleventh hour, to have consulted his superiors and possibly the Minister on the precise details of COR before anything was done, and then to have reconvened HAC after this careful analysis and expressed the concerns of DFO, if there were any.

But most of all, he should have consulted with those licence holders who would be detrimentally affected and given their opinions on the subject much greater weight than"

http://www.mmadfish.com/prawnvoice/quota_carpenter01.php

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC: [bdfish@oberon.ark.com](mailto:bdfish@oberon.ark.com;); [talisman@aisl.bc.ca](mailto:talisman@aisl.bc.ca;); lqfish@shaw.ca; sundown1@shaw.ca; Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net; prawns@spotshrimp.com; stephens-dan@shaw.ca; laukk@mars.ark.com; coldfish@shaw.ca; loxton@connected.bc.ca; vicki_larson@telus.net; kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca; cullen@mars.ark.com; ppfa@telus.net; rhappach@shaw.ca; rick@mmadfish.com; rfairfield@dccnet.com; mtorr@shaw.ca
Subject: TACs for IVQ
Date: Friday, January 07, 2005 1:08:14 PM
Attachments:

"TACs are established based on historical catch levels that have been sustainable over time"(pg4)

"Historical catch records for the commercial prawn fishery indicate that the total annual catch of prawns between 1996 and 2003 has been relatively consistent."(pg4 IVQ Proposal)

Yet the proposal uses data for only 3 yrs. , with 2 of the yrs. being well above the 8 yr. avg.

2001 is 263 tonnes(578,600 lbs.) above the 8 yr. avg. (1842 tonnes)(4,052,400 lbs)

2003 is 479 tonnes(1,053,800 lbs.) above the 8 yr. avg. catch

(1) If a RISK ADVERSE approach is to be used would you not use the 8 yr avg instead of the 3 yr above avg catch used in the proposal??

Therefore 1842 tonnes(4,052,400 lbs) * 80% =1473.6 tonnes(3,241,920 lbs)

also 4,052,400lbs/252 licenses = 16,080 lbs avg

3,241,920lbs/252 = 12,865 lbs avg

(2) I'm also very puzzled as to how it will be possible to increase the coastwide TAC during this extended 8 month season ?

Tom Tobacco

From: [steve](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com; bdfish@oberon.ark.com;
talisman@aisl.bc.ca; lqfish@shaw.ca; sundown1@shaw.ca;
Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net; prawns@spotshrimp.com;
stephens-dan@shaw.ca; laukk@mars.ark.com; coldfish@shaw.ca;
loxton@connected.bc.ca; vicki_larson@telus.net;
kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca; cullen@mars.ark.com; ppfa@telus.net;
rhappach@shaw.ca; rick@mmadfish.com;
rfairfield@dccnet.com; mtorr@shaw.ca;
Subject: Re: TACs for IVQ
Date: Friday, January 07, 2005 7:30:57 PM
Attachments:

Tom Tobacco wrote:

> "TACs are established based on historical catch levels that have been
> sustainable over time"(pg4)
>
> "Historical catch records for the commercial prawn fishery indicate
> that the total annual catch of prawns between 1996 and 2003 has been
> relatively consistent."(pg4 IVQ Proposal)
>
> Yet the proposal uses data for only 3 yrs. , with 2 of the yrs. being
> well above the 8 yr. avg.
> 2001 is 263 tonnes(578,600 lbs.) above the 8 yr. avg. (1842
> tonnes)(4,052,400 lbs)
> 2003 is 479 tonnes(1,053,800 lbs.) above the 8 yr. avg. catch
>
> (1) If a RISK ADVERSE approach is to be used would you not use the 8
> yr avg instead of the 3 yr above avg catch used in the proposal??
>
> Therefore 1842 tonnes(4,052,400 lbs) * 80% =1473.6 tonnes(3,241,920 lbs)
>
> also 4,052,400lbs/252 licenses = 16,080 lbs avg
> 3,241,920lbs/252 = 12,865 lbs avg

>
> (2) I'm also very puzzled as to how it will possible to increase the
> coastwide TAC during this extended 8 month season ?

> Tom Tobacco
>
>
>
>
>

THE TAC THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED IS NOT BASED ON THE THREE
YEARS

2001-2003!!! THOSE ARE MERELY THE YEARS USED TO SPLIT THE TAC UP
PROPORTIONALLY!!!! THE PROPOSED TAC IS SMALLER THAN THE
REPORTED

LANDINGS FOR EIGHT OUT OF THE LAST NINE YEARS, AND IS ONLY
SLIGHTLY

HIGHER THAN THE WORST OF THOSE YEARS, THAT BEING
1999!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

As to raising the TAC, since the proposed TAC is smaller than eight of the last nine years landings, it is most likely that the first year of fishing would see the season close well above index, obviously not in all areas, as some of the more popular areas would be fished to index. This would obviously be good for the stocks and would be reflected in following years. Secondly the removal of the derby mentality would encourage some (with or without incentives) to seek other underutilized areas to fish thus lowering pressure on traditional grounds, there is currently no incentive to do this, as every set made in an unknown area is one less set made in a familiar area. Personally I would like to see a system where each boat is issued quota for each area of the coast (Gulf, West Coast, Central, North Coast, Johnstone Straight) and they either fish their quota from each of these areas themselves or they trade quota amongst each other to avoid the problem of everyone trying to fish the same area. There would also be less incentive to retain mediums or borderline legal size prawns, therefore someone fishing an area full of mediums would probably move on to another area with a better grade. There would also be incentive to gradually phase in a larger mesh size trap which would achieve a larger grade without stressing undersized prawns by returning them AFTER being caught, perhaps more than once. Simply retaining less mediums early in the season and harvesting them later as larges has the potential to increase the TAC by probably 10-20 %. As for all those guys that try to say that we will be taking a cut in pay because we are getting less quota than we

usually catch, tell them to go to the library and get a book on economics. It is the theory that all of economics is based that "as supply declines the demand increases" or in laymen's terms the less prawns landed ie; (a reduced initial TAC) the higher the unit price.
THIS IS A FACT THAT CANNOT BE ARGUED! Steve Starbuck

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC: bdfish@oberon.ark.com; talisman@aisl.bc.ca; bill.stefiuk@telus.net; lqfish@shaw.ca; sundown1@shaw.ca; Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net; prawns@spotshrimp.com; stephens-dan@shaw.ca; laukk@mars.ark.com; coldfish@shaw.ca; loxton@connected.bc.ca; vicki_larson@telus.net; kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca; cullen@mars.ark.com; ppfa@telus.net; rhappach@shaw.ca; rick@mmadfish.com; rfairfield@dccnet.com; mtorr@shaw.ca;
Subject: TAC & ALLOCATION
Date: Saturday, January 08, 2005 10:03:13 AM
Attachments:

" A risk averse approach for the prawn fishery could be to set the the TAC at 80% of the the most recent three year average catch. Using 2001-2003 data, this would equate to a TAC of 1678 tonnes $((2105 + 1866 + 2321) / 3 \times .80 = 1678)$." (Pg 4 IVQ proposal)

"Please remember that the allocation is based on a Tac of 1678 tonnes(3,699,319lbs) which equates to 80% of the 2001-2003 total average catch of 2,097 tonnes (4,623,046 lbs). "

Pg 6 IVQ proposal

(1) $1678 / 1842 = 91\%$ of the 8 yr average . AGAIN I ASK IS THAT A RISK ADVERSE APPROACH TO USE ONLY 2001-2003 TO SET THE TAC???. also considering

that the 2004 catch dropped to aprox 1700 tonnes (I admit , I'm not sure on the 1700 tonnes catch # for 2004 ,but it was a substatial drop from 2003)

Talking about economics , back to my previous letter as to why history is based on Poundage and not Dollars.

"where possible seek to avoid significant changes in the distribution of benefits that are currently derived from the fishery" (pg3 IVQ proposal)

"historical catch reflects the operator's investment in effort, gear and

technology combined with experience and ingenuity." (pg5 IVQ proposal)

"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)" (pg8 IVQ proposal)

SO BASICALLY, PERSON X , WHO HAS CAUGHT A HIGHER POUNDAGE OF LOWER VALUE(\$)

PRAWNS WILL RECEIVE MORE QUOTA(% OF TAC) THAN PERSON Y WHO HAS CAUGHT A

LOWER POUNDAGE OF HIGHER VALUE(\$) PRAWNS , WHEN BOTH OF THEIR LANDED

VALUES(\$) COULD BE IDENTICAL. AND NOW PERSON X CAN GO FISH THE HIGHER VALUE

PRAWNS , MEANING PERSON X LANDED VALUE WILL BE SUBSTANTIALLY HIGHER THAN

PERSON Y , WHEN PRE QUOTA THEIR LANDED VALUES WHERE SIMILAR.

(2) iS THE ABOVE FAIR ????

Tom Tobacco

From: [steve](#)
To: [Tom Tobacco;](#)
CC: [prawnvoice@mmadfish.com](#); [bdfish@oberon.ark.com](#); [bill.stefiuk@telus.net](#); [lqfish@shaw.ca](#); [sundown1@shaw.ca](#); [Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net](#); [prawns@spotshrimp.com](#); [stephens-dan@shaw.ca](#); [laukk@mars.ark.com](#); [coldfish@shaw.ca](#); [loxton@connected.bc.ca](#); [vicki_larson@telus.net](#); [kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca](#); [cullen@mars.ark.com](#); [ppfa@telus.net](#); [rhappach@shaw.ca](#); [rick@mmadfish.com](#); [rfairfield@dccnet.com](#); [mtorr@shaw.ca](#);
Subject: Re: TAC & ALLOCATION
Date: Sunday, January 09, 2005 1:49:42 AM
Attachments:

Tom Tobacco wrote:

> " A risk averse approach for the prawn fishery could be to set the the
> TAC at 80% of the the most recent three year average catch. Using
> 2001-2003 data, this would equate to a TAC of 1678 tonnes ((2105 +
> 1866 + 2321) / 3 x .80 = 1678)." (Pg 4 IVQ proposal)
>
> "Please remember that the allocation is based on a Tac of 1678
> tonnes(3,699,319lbs) which equates to 80% of the 2001-2003 total
> average catch of 2,097 tonnes (4,623,046 lbs). "
> Pg 6 IVQ proposal
>
> (1) 1678 / 1842 = 91% of the 8 yr average . AGAIN I ASK IS THAT A RISK
> ADVERSE APPROACH TO USE ONLY 2001-2003 TO SET THE TAC???. also
> considering that the 2004 catch dropped to aprox 1700 tonnes (I admit
> , I'm not sure on the 1700 tonnes catch # for 2004 ,but it was a
> substatal drop from 2003)
>
> Talking about economics , back to my previous letter as to why history
> is based on Poundage and not Dollars.
>
> "where possible seek to avoid significant changes in the distribution

> of benefits that are currently derived from the fishery" (pg3 IVQ
> proposal)
>
> "historical catch reflects the operator's investment in effort, gear
> and technology combined with experience and ingenuity." (pg5 IVQ
> proposal)
>
> "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)" (pg8 IVQ proposal)
>
> SO BASICALLY, PERSON X , WHO HAS CAUGHT A HIGHER POUNDAGE OF
LOWER
> VALUE(\$) PRAWNS WILL RECEIVE MORE QUOTA(% OF TAC) THAN
PERSON Y WHO
> HAS CAUGHT A LOWER POUNDAGE OF HIGHER VALUE(\$) PRAWNS ,
WHEN BOTH OF
> THEIR LANDED VALUES(\$) COULD BE IDENTICAL. AND NOW PERSON X
CAN GO
> FISH THE HIGHER VALUE PRAWNS , MEANING PERSON X LANDED
VALUE WILL BE
> SUBSTANTIALLY HIGHER THAN PERSON Y , WHEN PRE QUOTA THEIR
LANDED
> VALUES WHERE SIMILAR.
>
> (2) iS THE ABOVE FAIR ????

Tom Tobacco

>
>
>
> I stand corrected on how they arrived at the proposed TAC, however
> I'm familiar with the figure of 1678 tons and this is a reasonable and
> conservative figure which is less than the reported landings in eight
> of the last nine years. In comparing reported landings coastwide to a
> proposed TAC there is also the issue of un-reported cash sales that
> nobody wants to mention. I would venture to guess that the actual
> historical landings are at least 5-10% higher than published
> statistics. Although I agree enforcement could be a challenge, the
> severe punishments handed out in other quota fisheries ,usually
> licence suspensions, should be enough to discourage most of these
> unreported landings, which should also have the effect of raising the

> TAC in future years. I have no doubt that more than a couple of
> people opposed to this proposal are those that have been selling a
> significant portion of their catch under the table. As for the issue
> of measuring catch in lbs or dollars it seems that the guy that has
> been maximizing the value of his catch, perhaps at the expense of
> higher landings, should still see his value rise proportionally to
> everyone else. It sounds as though you are more concerned that one
> guy may prosper more than another, even though they both stand to come
> out ahead, I believe that is called envy, and it is a very self
> destructive emotion. Also keep in mind that under this proposal, THE
> HIGHER A VESSELS HISTORICAL LANDINGS, THE LESS QUOTA (AS A
> PERCENTAGE
> OF PAST LANDINGS) THEY WILL RECEIVE , example; a boat averaging 45,000
> lbs per year will receive roughly 50% of this history as their quota
> where as a boat catching the average, 18,000 lbs, would receive quota
> equal to about 80% of their historical landings. I must admit that I
> don't agree with certain aspects of the proposed allocation either but
> that is no reason to support the status quo, which is exactly what we
> will get under this trap haul quota proposal. Trying to manage the
> fishery under a status quo, or trap haul quota system system,
> guarantees us only one thing, OUR BEST YEARS, AS A FISHERY, ARE BEHIND
> US! If the biggest negative of an IVQ fishery is allocation, take
> heart that the last several fisheries to go quota have gone equal to
> avoid the expense of the appeals process. Cheers, Steve.
>

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)
To: [prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;](#)
CC: [bdfish@oberon.ark.com](#); [talisman@aisl.bc.ca](#); [bill.stefiuk@telus.net](#); [lqfish@shaw.ca](#); [sundown1@shaw.ca](#); [Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net](#); [prawns@spotshrimp.com](#); [stephens-dan@shaw.ca](#); [laukk@mars.ark.com](#); [coldfish@shaw.ca](#); [loxton@connected.bc.ca](#); [vicki_larson@telus.net](#); [kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca](#); [cullen@mars.ark.com](#); [ppfa@telus.net](#); [rhappach@shaw.ca](#); [rick@mmadfish.com](#); [rfairfield@dccnet.com](#); [mtorr@shaw.ca](#);
Subject: Landed & License Values
Date: Sunday, January 09, 2005 3:25:25 PM
Attachments:

Pre Quota , person x who has caught a higher poundage of lower value prawns ,WILL RECEIVE MORE QUOTA (% of TAC) than person y who has caught a lower poundage of higher value prawns when BOTH OF THEIR LANDED VALUES coulld be identical .

Post Quota , person x (with more quota (% of the TAC) will have a higher landed value and also a higher license value . PERSON Y WILL NOT SEE THEIR VALUE RISE PROPORTIONALLY TO PERSON X
when you consider pre quota their landed value and license value were identical (assuming equal vessel length) Remember an extra 1000 lbs of quota means + \$8,000 landed value and supposedly an extra \$ 64,000 lic. value.

Regarding un-reported cash sales lowering the historical catch data , theres probably some people who have been inflating their logbooks / sales slips in anticipation of a quota system that has history as part of the allocation formula ! Does one equal the other , who knows ?

ANYHOW , so far I've only tried to point out some of the flaws with the proposed allocation and tac used in the current proposal , if as was suggested the allocation was based on equality I could start with my critism of the management part of the proposal (considering the plan is basically status quo , yet now we've got a % of a tac)

Tom

Tobacco

From: mmadfish
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: moderation on this list
Date: Sunday, January 09, 2005 4:48:28 PM
Attachments:

Thanks to all who have joined this list-serve and to those who are participating in the discussion. Our prawn industry is undergoing major changes which will impact all of us and it is important that we as prawn fishermen keep informed. PrawnVoice list can be a valuable platform to discuss items of interest to the fishery and keep fishers up to date. Comments here will be noticed by many segments of the prawn industry.

The previous list-serve, provided by DFO, was withdrawn due to 'abuse' by a few members. Much good information and discussion passed through that list and we all lost when it went down.

The success of any list depends on the willingness of the members to participate, contribute and exchange ideas. When discussion gets out of hand and the 'flames' start people leave....the result is we all lose.

We must exercise some care in the tone of messages we send and refrain from a few things. CAPS are considered shouting in this medium. The occasional word may benefit from this emphasis but not sentences/paragraphs. Try using single quotes or an underline. One exclamation mark gets the point across as well or better a line of them.

If you feel that someone has not got your point as you intended...try to explain it a bit better. Insults, flames and accusations are detrimental and will not be tolerated.

So far this list is unmoderated and it would be preferable to leave it that way. What this means is that all messages that are posted get posted as, and when, you send them. The alternative is to have a moderator(s) receive the post, check it over, then repost for all to see. That amounts to extra work for someone plus a delay in having your message appear on the list until it gets approved. As well there is no desire to 'censor' anyones posts.

So, lets all play nice and take advantage of everyones constructive criticisms of IVQ, String Haul Quota, Status Quo or any other ideas that might, or might not, work and benefit all of the industry. We need everyones input.

regards
Rick
List-administrator

From: [Quest Fishing Ltd.](#)
To: [Prawnvoice;](#)
CC:
Subject: W Licence Length and Boat Length Re:Quota
Date: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:43:01 PM
Attachments:

Some interesting thoughts on boat lengths and using length in quota calculations. Length has nothing to do with catch capability because smaller boats on average catch more than larger boats. If boat length is to be considered as part of quota equation, then boats with incorrect (false) lengths would have to get quota adjusted accordingly. Generally would have to be reduced as these boats I refer to are larger than their W licence they hold. For example one 32 ft. W licence being on a 38 ft. boat equals 19% too long. Quota on length for that boat should rightly have be reduced by 19%.

Doug

From: [Quest Fishing Ltd.](#)
To: [Prawnvoice;](#)
CC:
Subject: How will Sports Fishers & First Nations Erode Prawn Fishery?
Date: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:43:01 PM
Attachments:

People pushing this proposed quota plan say that the prawn fishery will erode for commercial fishers because of the other user groups. For example the Sports fishing sector and the First Nations impacting the prawn fishery. Maybe the author of the quota proposal and or DFO could explain as to how this is going to happen and when. Personally I think this type of fear mongering is wrong and creates undue tensions and animosity amongst user groups. Direct dialogues with other user groups will achieve far better results for all concerned.

Doug

From: [steve](#)
To: [Quest Fishing Ltd.; Listerve;](#)
CC:
Subject: Re: How will Sports Fishers & First Nations Erode Prawn Fishery?
Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2005 12:24:19 AM
Attachments:

Quest Fishing Ltd. wrote:

People pushing this proposed quota plan say that the prawn fishery will erode for commercial fishers because of the other user groups. For example the Sports fishing sector and the First Nations impacting the prawn fishery. Maybe the author of the quota proposal and or DFO could explain as to how this is going to happen and when. Personally I think this type of fear mongering is wrong and creates undue tensions and animosity amongst user groups. Direct dialogues with other user groups will achieve far better results for all concerned.

Doug

Is this different than the fear mongering that certain ex-advocates of quota are now purveying to the uninformed/ undecided? That "the quota proposal is based on false science", that " if you vote for quota you will actually get 20% less than what is in the proposal because the TAC is too high" (even though it is well below the 9 year avg.). The ideas for change are based on what is best for the long term health of the industry as a whole. I agree that under this proposal some may feel shorted but it is still what is best for the industry overall. You may have a good argument that you should get more quota than the next guy, but that doesn't mean that a system of IVQ's is not the best solution, but merely that the system of allocation is perhaps flawed. Go to the appeals board, I'll give you a shining recommendation. How have the fundamentals of quota changed from a couple of years ago when you were so in favor of them?? Every thoughtful prawn fisherman wants the same things, maximum dollar value for their product (achieved by longer season), secure long term access to resource, and the knowledge that the business that they spend years paying for, has some reasonable monetary value at

the end of the day. The only one of the three options available to us (IVQ's, trap haul quotas, status quo), that has any chance of providing this to us is an IVQ system and despite what you now seem to be preaching, I'm pretty sure deep down you know this is true. As to your concerns about boat length, this is just another example of DFO lack of enforcement and has nothing to do with quota allocation, but I agree, DFO should go out in the last week of April and measure everyone's boat, especially all those Stapleton's out there with the bolt on bows, and take appropriate action. As for all the fishermen out there worried about the well being of other user groups, don't, the good old boys of impeccable integrity in Ottawa will make sure that they get what they deserve and then some, so I would refrain from trying to be too diplomatic, remember, give them an inch they will take a mile. Cheers.

From: [Tom Tobacco](#)

To: [prawnvoice@mmadfish.com](#); [bdfish@oberon.ark.com](#);
[talisman@aisl.bc.ca](#); [bill.stefiuk@telus.net](#); [lqfish@shaw.ca](#);
[sundown1@shaw.ca](#); [Cwarrior@pacificcoast.net](#);
[prawns@spotshrimp.com](#); [stephens-dan@shaw.ca](#);
[laukk@mars.ark.com](#); [coldfish@shaw.ca](#); [loxton@connected.bc.ca](#);
[vicki_larson@telus.net](#); [kimmikkelsen@shaw.ca](#);
[cullen@mars.ark.com](#); [ppfa@telus.net](#); [rappach@shaw.ca](#);
[rick@mmadfish.com](#); [rfairfield@dccnet.com](#); [mtorr@shaw.ca](#);

CC:

Subject: Just rambling

Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2005 7:13:20 PM

Attachments:

Does anyone really believe the present IVQ proposal will lengthen the season , considering spawner index is what determines when areas will shut down (should the TAC be set to high those waiting won't get there quota/ most people can't afford that risk),anyone fishing live or fresh runs the risk of having areas close to their markets closed (increased travelling), also theres more prawns and larger ones at the beginning ,so by waiting , expenses will go up for the same poundage of prawns (so much for economic efficencies) , higrading , why deliver a \$6/lb prawn when you can deliver a \$8/9/lb prawn (north coast will close much sooner , the race is now for the highest valued prawns / relative to costs of doing so) , reversal of an IVQ system unlikely (anyone purchasing will now be basing price relative to poundage ,to go back would result in loss of asset value)

I am not nessecarily against IVQs , I am against this proposal because it will require other management constraints in order to achieve the desired results , all this proposal is about is establishing market share (% of TAC) for the benefit of some at the expense of others (boat length , catch history , special provisions for stacked lics.)

Tom Tobacco

From: [mmadfish](#)
To: prawnvoice@mmadfish.com;
CC:
Subject: latest IVQ draft proposal
Date: Friday, January 14, 2005 9:39:53 PM
Attachments:

The latest draft IVQ proposal was presented to the Prawn Sectoral Caucus today at the Pacific Biological Station in Nanaimo.

It is available for download at the top of News Links on the Prawnvoice site.

<http://www.mmadfish.com/prawnvoice/>

From: [Quest Fishing Ltd.](#)
To: [Prawnvoice;](#)
CC:
Subject: Encouraging Information Exchange
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:49:25 PM
Attachments:

Fishers it is time to inform and encourage other fishers to participate in this very informative list serve.

The phones, docks and coffee shops have been buzzing lately over the proposed fishing changes. Some fishers are in the dark because they have to rely on the dock talk for their info. There is lots of discussions about changing the unequal quota proposal to equal allocation to make it more palatable. Also electronic monitoring needed for either the quota or trap haul proposals.

Some fishers don't know that status-quo is still available with little or no tweeking.

There is a group of skippers and communities that have a lot of interest in the proposed changes. Maybe they would post their contact number.

I was wondering if somebody could post the PPFA 's Terms of Reference.

Doug