

Doug Vincent Lang's response - SEE BELOW IN CAPS

Subject: Feedback I am getting on Moratorium

To All,

I am about to disappear over the southern horizon for a few weeks to flush my head (no pun intended) and wanted to pass this on before I got distracted and forgot about it...age you know.

Now what was I saying?

Oh yes...Feedback I have been getting on the Moratorium. Things to ponder before we meet again.

1. This one some of you have already heard about from me. Question:

A. Does the Angler/Days concept equate to a fixed allocation, i.e., the same number of Angler/Days per operator each year after initial issue? Or,

B. Do the Angler/Days fluctuate with abundance the way IFQs would? **THIS ONE**

C. If you answered "A." how do we grow, or alternatively, do we grow at all during the moratorium period, or does a business just consolidate (buy)

Angler/Days from someone else within the industry if it needs to grow?

D. If you answered "B." how do we do that? (Fluctuate Angler/Days with abundance.) **THE OLD IFQ FISHERY ADJUSTED POUNDS INTO NUMBERS BY DIVIDING BY AN AVERAGE WEIGHT. UNDER THIS CASE AN ANGLER-DAY WE WOULD CONVERT USING AN ADDITIONAL CORRECTION BASED ON AVERAGE CATCH RATE.**

2. On the threshold to qualify:

A. How do we deal with the long-timer that doesn't do a lot of halibut? For instance, the overnight guy that has been in business for fifteen years but only does a few halibut days a season.

B. I submit that we need to include him, but how do we address the latent capacity issue if he sells his license? It seems like we might have to look at license classes or some other mechanism to ensure that these folks can continue to operate at the level they have historically maintained, but the license can't turn into a windfall for him or come back to bite us in the future. **IT IS BASED ON THE ACTUAL DAYS USED DURING THE QUALIFYING YEARS. SO A GUY WHO OPERATES A FEW DAYS WILL GET A FEW DAYS, A GUY WHO OPERATES MORE WILL GET MORE.**

Also...my feeling is that there is momentum gaining for an IFQ-like permanent solution now that GHL reality has set in with the one-fish recommendation from IPHC. That could be wishful thinking. You all know my support for a system that will merge with the setline IFQ and provide for an orderly and compensated allocation shift. No smoldering wreckage left behind us please. The main concern with the IFQ seems to be how to deal with a drop in abundance when quota is so expensive. If we can figure that one out we may have a deal.

By the way, with "IFQ" being a dirty word, Tim Evers has suggested "Guided Angler Shares." The acronym would be "GAS" and it somehow seems appropriate!

Hasta la vista, via con Dios and all that...amigos y amigas.

Senor Mac

Larry ""Mac" McQuarrie
Sportsman's Cove Lodge