

The Area H Troll Sockeye Demonstration Fishery in 2006

A Review

Prepared for:

*Canada Fisheries & Oceans
Nanaimo, BC*

Prepared by:

*GSGislason & Associates Ltd.
Vancouver, BC*

June 2007

Preface

Canada Fisheries & Oceans retained GSGilson & Associates Ltd. to review the Area H troll sockeye demonstration fishery in 2006.

The consultants have benefited from discussions with industry, government, and others. Notwithstanding this assistance, the authors have final responsibility for the analyses and conclusions of the study.

Table of Contents

PREFACE	i
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. DEMONSTRATION FISHERY DESIGN.....	3
3. SOCKEYE CATCH LEVELS 2006	5
4. IMPACTS – RESOURCE SUSTAINABILITY	6
5. IMPACTS - BUSINESS.....	7
6. IMPACTS - LABOUR	8
7. IMPACTS - ADMINISTRATION & ENFORCEMENT	9
8. CONCLUSIONS	10
ATTACHMENTS A: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	11
B: AREA H BACKGROUND DATA.....	12
C: SAMPLE SCIENTIFIC LICENCE.....	13
D: GTA SURVEY REPORT	19

I. Introduction

- DFO with the support of the Gulf Trollers Association (GTA) conducted a demonstration Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) program for the Area H troll sockeye fishery in 2006
- this report presents a review of the 2006 demonstration fishery – its design, performance and “lessons learned”
- The review address issues of:
 - resource sustainability
 - business impacts
 - labour impacts
 - administration & enforcement
- the research program involved:
 - interviews with 18 individuals (Area H fishermen, DFO, southern BC seine and gillnet fishermen, processors, the recreational industry)
 - meeting with the GTA Board of Directors in Nanaimo
 - review of the Jan 25/07 Gulf Trollers Association Survey Report
 - review of DFO catch database plus other material
- the text is supported by several attachments:
 - a list of people interviewed
 - background data on the Area H fleet
 - a sample scientific licence
 - the GTA Survey Report

Exhibit 1: Selected Interview Comments

1. "it will take some time for the market to respond to better quality fish"
2. "with any fresh fish, you can increase the price by offering the product over an extended season"
3. "sockeye is only available for a limited time – you are constrained as to how far you can extend the season"
4. "Area H fishermen are afraid DFO will close the fishery prematurely – DFO needs to schedule openings and keep to the schedule"
5. "it takes time to get value out of the market"
6. "the last nine days, after the derby fishery was finished, was more pleasant-lots more room, safer with less boats"
7. "fishermen don't change fishery practices overnight"
8. "the allocation formula in Area F up north provides more certainty"
9. "there is more certainty in the Area F troll chinook fishery than the Area H sockeye fishery – in Area H they may shut down early, in Area F you have a much longer window of opportunity to catch your IQ"
10. "IQ boats fished hard because they feared DFO would pull the plug"
11. "you have to prove your better quality to the market first before you reap a higher price, words are easy to say"
12. "validation creates problems if you market your own fish but by and large validation was unnoticeable"
13. "lack of validation creates distrust for all fleets. Dockside monitoring instills public confidence – it is a necessary evil"
14. "perhaps we should use the chum constant effort approach for Area H sockeye i.e., have effort IQ not catch IQ"
15. "when you can't get crew, you tend to go to ice"
16. "DFO is a major problem – there is lack of trust between DFO and the fleet. DFO downgraded the Area H IQ level mid season"
17. "IQ heaven for Fraser sockeye would involve several steps: 1) DFO announces TAC and IQ levels in June, and does not change them in-season, 2) DFO allows 3 weeks to catch your IQ, 3) fishermen slows down harvest and takes better care of fish, 4) company processes and markets to niche customers willing to pay premium price for premium quality, 5) company gets a higher price, fishermen gets a higher price"

2. Demonstration Fishery Design

- the 122 Area H licence holders were given the option to choose the ITQ fishery or the Traditional Fishery (often called the derby or non-ITQ fishery)/the total Area H sockeye allocation was 7.5% of the Canadian commercial Fraser sockeye TAC
- the ITQ demonstration fishery operated under scientific licence – see Appendix C
- the initial ITQ was set pre-season at 2,557 sockeye per ITQ vessel, but reduced to 1,763 in-season as a result of a decrease in Fraser River sockeye run size; the aggregate TAC for non-ITQ vessels was 86,377 sockeye (1,762.8 x 49) i.e., TAC levels were set based on in-season run size information which may differ from the final post-season run size figure
- ITQs were transferable
- both ITQ and non-ITQ vessels were allowed retention of incidental pink and chum caught (but no retention of coho, chinook or steelhead)
- it is mandatory for ITQ vessels to have catch validation, either on shore or on packers; non-ITQ vessels had the option to participate in catch validation (8 volunteered to participate pre-season and several others volunteered during the season)
- there were 8 designated shoreside landing points for boats to be validated – Campbell River, French Creek, Greater Vancouver, Kelsey Bay, Nanaimo, Port Hardy, Port McNeill, Quadra Island – and 2 designated packers for deliveries at sea (2 with on-board validators, 5 without)
- the Gulf Trollers Association conducted a survey of Area H licence holders at the end of the season – a total of 49 responses were received (33 ITQ and 16 non-ITQ)
- Exhibit I presents selected comments on the 2006 demonstration fishery from the interview program

Exhibit 2: Area H Sockeye Fishing Activity 2006

<u>Boat-Days</u>	Fishery Type			Total
	Exploratory	Non-ITQ	ITQ	
Aug 4/06	3			
5	3			
6	3			
7		45	50	
8		45	56	
9		45	54	
10		44	54	
11		43	54	
12		44	54	
13		44	51	
14			33	
15			33	
16			29	
17			15	
18			11	
19			2	
20			3	
21			3	
22			3	
	<u>9</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>824</u>
<u>Licences</u>				
Total	NA*	49	73	122
Active	NA*	46	64	110
<u>Sockeye pieces</u>				
TAC	NA*	86,377	128,684	215,061
Total Catch	NA*	89,740	119,154	208,894

* does not include 3 ITQ vessels who caught 1,419 pieces over the three days in a exploratory fishery (the licence counts and catch are included under the ITQ fleet since the exploratory catch was deducted from their ITQ)/does not include 1 non-ITQ vessel that fished illegally on Aug 14 and caught 217 sockeye (which was relinquished to the Crown)

Source: DFO phone-in hail data.

3. Sockeye Catch Levels 2006

- a total of 110 vessels were “active” i.e., reported landings – 64 of the 73 ITQ, 46 of 49 non-ITQ (an ITQ licence holder who transferred all his or her quota holdings was deemed “inactive”)
- 7 of the 73 ITQ vessels transferred all of their ITQ, and 2 ITQ vessels did not fish and did not transfer any quota
- Exhibit 2 shows that the ITQ fleet caught 119,154 sockeye or an average of 1,632 for the 73 ITQ licences (93% of the TAC for ITQ vessels) – or an average of 1,678 for the 71 ITQ vessels who fished or transferred quota to others
- the non-ITQ fleet caught 89,740 sockeye or an average of 1,831 for the 49 non-ITQ licences (104% of the TAC for non-ITQ vessels) – or an average of 1,951 for the 46 active non-ITQ vessels
- the non-ITQ fishery was open 7 days from Aug 7-13/07 (the average active non-ITQ vessel fished 6.7 days catching 289 sockeye per boat-day on average)
- the ITQ fishery was open 16 days from Aug 7-22/07 (the average active ITQ vessel fished 7.9 days catching 236 sockeye per boat-day on average)
- the ITQ fleet was more likely to participate in other salmon troll fisheries than the non-ITQ fleet

Licences Held	Area “H” Fleet		
	ITQ	Non-ITQ	Total
Area “H” Alone	37	44	81
Areas “H” & “F”	30	4	34
Areas “H” & “G”	1	1	2
Areas “H”, “G” & “F”	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
	73	49	122

- the Area H fleet also had a co-management catch to fund participation in the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board (CSAB) process and for GTA activities under a Joint Project Agreement (JPA):
 - 8,250 sockeye for CSAB purposes
 - 7,274 sockeye for GTA purposes

4. Impacts – Resource Sustainability

- participation - it does not appear that the ITQ demonstration fishery affected the overall number of active vessels in the fishery i.e., very few ITQ vessels leased out their entire quota
- catch levels - the total Area H fleet needs to fish to a TAC even in the absence of the ITQ option
 - the ITQ fleet caught 93% of their TAC/the non-ITQ fleet caught 104% of their TAC/the total fleet caught 97% of the Area H TAC
- overages - one non-ITQ vessel fished the day after the non-ITQ fishery was closed; the 217 fish landed was relinquished to the Crown
 - there were no relinquishments of overages for the other non-ITQ vessels (the non-ITQ fleet was over its allocation by 3,363 sockeye)
 - eight (8) of the ITQ vessels were marginally over their 1,763 sockeye ITQ allocation (the total overage for the 8 vessels was under 100 fish); 4 of the 8 leased unutilized quota post-season to comply; the other 4 paid penalties amounting to \$10 per fish, approximately the full landed value of the overage, to the Gulf Trollers Association
- highgrading - the ITQ fleet reported no issues of highgrading; the non-ITQ fleet claimed that, in a few instances, #2 grade sockeye caught by the ITQ fleet were not landed
- other users - our discussions with the recreational and other commercial salmon sectors in the area indicated no significant gear conflicts
 - however, the seine fleet indicated that a minor conflict did occur, a conflict that they expected would not happen in the future with better planning/ communication
- data quality - it is unknown how reliable the data on released fish in DFO's catch database is; there is no compulsory observers and/or cameras on board the vessels (the discard data is self-reporting)
 - DFO could not use the validated catch data for in-season management as: 1) the delivery of fish to packers resulted in a delay of catch reporting, and 2) freezer boats do not deliver fish every day and therefore it is impossible to assess catch-to-date on a daily basis only from landings information (DFO had to use hail data to judge when to close the non-ITQ fishery)

5. Impacts - Business

- handling & quality
 - the ITQ fleet and some processors report that the ITQ fish was handled better and was superior quality, on average, to non-ITQ fish; some ITQ fishermen slowed down the harvest per day and paid more attention to on-board handling
 - however, quality improvements were impeded by:
 - the fact you can not change the behaviour/traditional fishing practices of fishermen overnight
 - the ITQ fleet feared that DFO would close the ITQ fishery early due to another downgrade in the run size i.e., the ITQ was not secure, and therefore many ITQ vessels were reluctant to significantly lengthen their fishing period
- prices
 - it appears that ITQ and non-ITQ fish generally received the same price from processors, namely \$2 per lb for dressed head-on fish (or \$10 per 5 lb fish)
 - if the ITQ program continued in the future and the better quality ITQ fish was recognized in the market place, our interviews suggest that it may be possible for the ITQ fleet to receive a 10-15% price premium
 - in our view, much greater price benefits are possible with stunned and bled superior quality fish
- ITQ transfers & Leasing
 - about 15,300 pieces of sockeye were transferred within the ITQ fleet (about 12% of the total ITQ TAC)
 - the average lease price was about \$2.50 per fish, about 25% of landed value, or \$38,000 in total lease payments overall
- cost savings
 - we could not identify any cost savings attributable to the ITQ program (fuel costs per day may be lower but the ITQ fleet fished marginally more days)
- financial benefits
 - to the fleet are constrained by: 1) the relatively short window fish are available, and 2) concern that the ITQ level will change in-season (in contrast the Area F ITQ northern troll chinook fishery operates over an extended period of time and the ITQ level does not change in-season)
 - the option to lease quota to/from others conferred business flexibility

6. Impacts - Labour

- crew sizes
 - crew sizes did not appear to change because of the ITQ option

- crew payments
 - crew payments/share systems did not appear to change except, in the case of ITQ boats leasing quotas from others, the lease cost was subtracted from gross stock before determining percentage crew shares
 - maintaining the integrity of the crew share system appears to be a concern of industry

- safety
 - some ITQ vessels reported improvements in safety
 - but the weather was relatively mild in 2006 (and non-ITQ vessels did not need to fish in inclement weather)

7. Impacts - Administration & Enforcement

- the industry found the transfer process for quotas uncomplicated
- ITQ and non-ITQ boats fishing side by side on the same days created potential for ITQ boats to offload onto non-ITQ boats before validation occurred
- packers were allowed to accept troll fish - ITQ and non-ITQ - and gillnet fish (the Area D gillnet fishery was open at the same time as the Area H troll fishery); this created the potential for misidentification of catch
- the GTA paid for validation out of funds received previously through a Joint Project Agreement; this may no longer be possible in the future with recent court decisions
- the validation program for the ITQ fleet provided better catch data, better acceptance by other user groups & public at large
- but the validation program did not provide the catch data to DFO in a timely manner due to delays in receiving validation data from packers and due to the lack of daily deliveries on the part of the freezer troll fleet
- DFO personnel incurred increased workloads from designing, implementing and monitoring the ITQ program e.g., administering experimental licences, interacting with fishermen as to fishery option selections, completing quota transfers, briefing enforcement personnel
- however, the administrative workload should decrease somewhat in the future, if the demonstration fishery continues, as DFO personnel and fishermen become more familiar with the process

8. Conclusions

- the demonstration ITQ program met sustainability objectives with improved catch monitoring and adherence to the ITQ TAC; but the non-ITQ fleet exceeded their TAC – this is a concern and needs to be addressed in the future
- quality appears to have improved for ITQ fish
- the financial benefits to the fleet and processors were minimal in this first year – it takes time to build market value from increased quality; other constraints to success of the ITQ program exist
 - Fraser sockeye have to be caught during a short period of time due to concerns for weak stocks e.g., late run Fraser sockeye
 - this means that the benefits from extending the season by several months, such as exist for halibut or Area F troll, are not available
 - in addition, the management of the Area H fishery for sockeye is intertwined with that of Fraser sockeye fishery management overall and the US-Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty
 - the ITQ per licence for Area H sockeye can change in season (e.g., this happened in 2006), and ITQ fishermen justifiably worry that they will not be allowed to catch their quota if they spread their catch out too long i.e., the ITQ is not secure
- the fact that the ITQ fleet and the non-ITQ fleet operate side-by-side, one with mandatory validation and one with voluntary validation, and that offloads to packers are allowed creates problems
- in our view, all fish (ITQ and non-ITQ) should be validated; so doing would create trust in the system to Area H participants, other user groups and the public at large
- the other four southern salmon fleets – Area B seine, Area G troll, and Areas D and E gillnet – did not have ITQ systems but these fleets, in whole or part, were allowed to fish at the same time as the Area H fleet; this can create problems in validation
- the validation program, as executed in 2006, did not provide timely information to DFO for management purposes. This needs to be addressed for the future
- the Area H ITQ demonstration fishery is a work in progress/more knowledge can be gained from continuing the demonstration in 2007

Attachment A: List of People Interviewed

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Bergh, Steve | Area H Troll |
| 2. | Boyes, David | Area H Troll |
| 3. | Goruk, Andrea | DFO |
| 4. | Griswold, Mike | Area H Troll |
| 5. | Henderson, Doug | Area H Troll |
| 6. | Hughes, John | Area H Troll |
| 7. | Maynard, Jeremy | Sport Fish Advisory Board |
| 8. | Mirau, Brad | Aero Trading Co. |
| 9. | Nightingale, Jim | Area H Troll |
| 10. | Nordstrom, Ric | Area F Troll |
| 11. | Paquet, Roger | Hub City Fisheries |
| 12. | Pirie, Bill | Walcan |
| 12. | Rezansoff, Bob | Area B Seine |
| 13. | Rombough, Les | Area D Gillnet |
| 14. | Sakich, Peter | Area H Troll |
| 15. | Sanderson, Mike | Area H Troll |
| 16. | Schafhauser, Jerome | Area H Troll |
| 17. | Wright, John | Area H Troll |
-

Attachment B: Background Data – Area H Troll Commercial Catch

	Pieces	Weight kg	Value \$
2002			
Chinook	320	2,000	7,900
Sockeye	112,560	369,300	2,344,800
Coho	0	0	0
Pink	8,410	12,500	7,200
Chum	<u>29,660</u>	<u>148,800</u>	<u>97,700</u>
All	150,950	532,600	2,457,600
2003			
Chinook	690	4,500	19,300
Sockeye	100,980	286,700	1,713,500
Coho	0	0	0
Pink	59,960	117,500	54,300
Chum	<u>81,520</u>	<u>358,100</u>	<u>327,200</u>
All	243,150	766,800	2,114,300
2004			
Chinook	1,250	9,400	65,800
Sockeye	121,770	306,900	2,191,400
Coho	0	0	0
Pink	5,780	9,500	10,400
Chum	<u>82,350</u>	<u>365,000</u>	<u>456,600</u>
All	211,150	690,800	2,724,200
2005			
Chinook	0	0	0
Sockeye	16,520	41,200	185,900
Coho	0	0	0
Pink	18,330	34,400	25,800
Chum	<u>44,730</u>	<u>222,800</u>	<u>266,400</u>
All	79,580	298,400	478,100
2006			
Chinook	0	0	0
Sockeye	221,890	601,400	2,440,300
Coho	0	0	0
Pink	840	1,800	1,400
Chum	<u>57,150</u>	<u>260,500</u>	<u>323,600</u>
All	279,880	863,700	2,765,300

Source: DFO Catch Statistics (including Test & Research)

Attachment C: Sample Scientific Licence



2006 EXPERIMENTAL FISHING LICENCE

This Scientific Licence is issued under the authority of the Fisheries Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chapter F-14.

Licence Number: XEX 40 2006

Commence Date: 31 Jul 2006

Expiry Date: 15 Sep 2006

Purpose: The Project is an investigation to explore a new management approach for the Area H troll fleet. Each participating vessel (total of 73) will have an assigned individual transferable quota (ITQ) based on an equal share of the available total allowable catch (TAC) for all Area H troll licences in 2006. This ITQ will adjust to in-season run size changes. This project will assess the benefits and drawbacks of this style of fishery and management and a final report will be produced including the documentation of the data collected and an analysis of this data. The information generated from this Project may be used in consideration of future fishing and management strategies.

Goals: To assist in determining whether ITQ management in the troll fishery is a viable and workable way to meet the four main themes of the Pacific Fisheries Reform; to increase the knowledge of ITQ fisheries management in the troll fishery and assess the benefits and drawbacks of this system; and to test the feasibility of changing to an ITQ management system in the troll fishery.

Objectives: 1) To demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative harvest management strategies that improve management control and the economic performance of the fishery through an ITQ fishery; 2) To improve the manageability of the fishery by exploring ways to improve catch monitoring and verification of landings in the Area H troll fishery through dockside and packer-based catch validation, on-board observers, logbooks and phone-ins; 3) To demonstrate the ability of harvesters to take on greater responsibility in harvest planning and management through the implementation of this project in co-operation with DFO.

Licensee:

JOHN D HUGHES

Assisted by: On-grounds Project Co-ordinators:

John Hughes

Area H Gulf Trollers Association

Dane Chauvel

Area H Gulf Trollers Association



Project Manager:
Andrea Goruk
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Telephone: 250-756-7186
Cell: 250-713-4054
Fax: 250-756-7162
Email: goruka@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Designated Vessel: STEADFAST VRN:28186
Vessel Owner: JOHN D HUGHES

This licence is subject to the terms and conditions that are included herein and/ or attached hereto. These conditions are part of the licence and may not be removed.

Andrea Goruk July 31/06

Andrea Goruk, Project Manager

Date

Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Pacific Region

Species and Catch Limits:

Species of fish permitted to be taken:

- (a) Retention of sockeye salmon and the incidental catch of pink, and chum salmon while targeting sockeye salmon;
- (b) Non-retention of coho, chinook and steelhead.

Quantities of fish permitted to be taken:

- (a) The overall quantity of sockeye salmon permitted to be taken under this licence will be an equal share of the total Area H TAC as allocated by DFO based on the Canadian commercial TAC identified by the Fraser River Panel dependent on the following;
 - Canadian Commercial Fraser River sockeye TAC
 - Domestic Allocation to Area H 7.5 percent
 - Number of Salmon Area H licences 122
 - (b) The overall quantity of sockeye salmon permitted to be taken during the fishing permitted under this licence will be limited to 0.8197 percent of the total Area H TAC of Fraser River sockeye salmon;
 - (c) During the fishery authorized by this licence the TAC available to Area H may be adjusted up or down in relation to changes in Fraser River sockeye salmon run-size and available TAC and when this occurs, the ITQ available to the vessel named in this licence will be communicated to the Vessel Master by the Project Manager.
 - (d) The Vessel Master will cease fishing when the vessel quota is achieved.
-



Collection Methods / Gears:

TROLL, FREEZER, SALMON
TROLL, DAYBOAT, SALMON
TROLL, ICEBOAT, SALMON

Commercial troll gear in accordance with the
Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence.

Areas:

SOUTH COAST
Management Area 12
Management Area 13
Management Area 18
Management Area 29

(a) Subareas 12-1, a portion of 12-2 (closed south of a line from a boundary sign at 50 degrees 28.570 minutes north by 126 degrees 18.117 minutes west to a boundary sign at 50 degrees 28.393 minutes north by 126 degrees 15.279 minutes west (Adams River boundary)), 12-3, 12-4, 13-7 (excluding Deepwater Bay), 13-8, 13-9, and 13-27 to 13-32, will be permitted for fishing at the start of this Project as communicated by the Project Manager;

(b) The following Subareas may be permitted for fishing upon approval by the Project Manager; a portion of 12-5 westerly of a line from Burnt Point on Hanson Island to Red Point on Harbledown Island, a portion of 12-6 westerly of a line from Red Point on Harbledown Island, to Flower Island, to the west shore entrance of Freshwater Bay on Swanson Island to Bold Head on Swanson Island then to the light on Wedge Island then from the most northern tip of Wedge Island to the most northerly islet in the White Cliff Islets and then to the Penfold Islets; those portions of 12-8 and 12-9, excluding those areas south-westerly of a line from Doyle Island to Pulteney point on Malcom Island; 12-10, 12-11, and those portions of 12-12 excluding those waters southerly of a line from Greeting Point on Nigei Island to Cape James on Hope Island.

(c) Subareas 18-1, 18-4, 18-11 and 29-1 to 29-6 are under the control of the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC), therefore fishing in these areas, except for rockfish conservation closed areas, will be permitted when the PSC approves troll fishing for these areas and this is communicated by the Project Manager

(d) Fishing will not be permitted in the areas closed for rockfish conservation as outlined and listed on the DFO website at:

www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/ or at the nearest Fisheries and Oceans Canada office. Specifically Numas Island, Weynton Passage, Mayne Island

North, South Pender Island, Halibut Bank and Galiano Island North.

Reporting Requirements:
Daily reports

This licence was prepared by: Andrea Goruk

Dated: 31 Jul 2006
Licence Serial No.: 198489

Terms and Conditions

Licensing Requirements:

- (a) In addition to being in possession of a valid scientific licence for this fishery the vessel master and vessel participating in this fishery must be in possession of a valid 2006 Salmon Area H licence complete with Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence;
- (b) Vessel Masters will be required to follow both the conditions of this scientific licence and the Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence;
- (c) The conditions of this scientific licence supersede those in the in the Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence and where there is an inconsistency this scientific licence will take precedence.

Period during which fishing or transporting fish is permitted to be carried out:

- (a) Fishing is permitted to be carried out seven days per week, in the areas and in accordance with the times set out in this licence, until the individual vessel allocation has been reached, the Project Manager closes the sockeye ITQ demonstration fishery, or the fishing areas are closed for all commercial trolling within Salmon Licence Area H.

Information that the vessel master shall report to the Department:

- (a) In-season Reports: Start-fishing, end-fishing, trip cancellation, in-season catch reports and interim reports in accordance with the Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence

Records that vessel master shall keep of fishing activity:

- (a) Harvest Log in accordance with the Conditions of 2006/ 2007 Salmon Area H Licence;
- (b) The vessel master will record the number and species of all salmon caught in the ITQ fishery and maintain and update that count at least daily so as not to exceed the ITQ outlined in this licence;
- (c) Information and data as directed by the Project Manager.

Catch Validation:

- (a) Prior to any dockside landing of fish, the vessel master must hail-in to the designated service provider at 1-866-930-4000 between 0600 and 1800 seven days per week and provide the following information:

- vessel name;
- vessel registration number;

- name and Fisher Identification Number of the vessel master
- contact phone number
- date, time, port and location of landing of the fish;
- name of fish buying station where fish are to be landed;
- product type
- estimated number of pieces by species
- area fished

(b) For dockside landings a dockside validator must be present during all offloading of catch to record the number, weight and species of all salmon delivered;

(c) For dockside landings all fish shall be landed at one of the following locations:

Campbell River, French Creek, Greater Vancouver, Kelsey Bay, Nanaimo, Port Hardy, Port McNeill, Quadra Island

(d) For landings to packers: the vessel master must deliver only to packers designated to this project. The vessel master must retain a copy of the validation record provided by the packer at each delivery.

(e) If a vessel leaves the ITQ fishery to fish in another fishery with the intention to re-enter the ITQ fishery, without offloading the onboard catch, the catch must be verified by a validator prior to entering another fishery, and verified again by a validator upon re-entering the Project fishery; or, the catch must be offloaded and verified by a validator prior to entering another fishery.

Evaluation:

All relevant data will be recorded and the Proponent will facilitate the analysis of the data and the production of a final report that will be submitted to Fisheries and Oceans Canada in a suitable quality and format.

Time within which findings and data obtained as a result of fishing for experimental or scientific purpose are to be forwarded to the Minister:

(a) Findings and data are to be forwarded to the Project Manager as requested and a final report due December 15, 2006

Copies of this licence must accompany the collecting personnel, be on board any collecting vessel and be carried with the transport vehicle at all times during collection and transport of samples. The licence must be produced upon the request of a Fishery Officer or Guardian.

The Licensee is responsible for ensuring that all necessary health and safety training has been completed by those persons working on the project, and that those persons working under authority of this licence will employ safe working conditions and practices according to the Canadian Labour Code.

A breach of licence conditions is a Fisheries Act offence.

This licence may be revoked or amended by the Department prior to the expiry date as may be considered necessary by the Department.

Attachment D: GTA Survey Report



Gulf Trollers Association

www.gulftrollers.com email president@gulftrollers.com

**2006 Area H
Individual Transferable Quota
Demonstration Fishery and
Validation Project**

**Questionnaire
Results**

January 24, 2007

Background

Area H Individual Transferable Quota Project

In 2006, an Area H Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) demonstration fishery for Fraser River sockeye was implemented. Area H Licence holders were given the option to choose the ITQ fishery or the Traditional Fishery (TF). Out of a total of 122 Area H salmon licence holders, 73 chose the ITQ option and 49 chose the TF option. Shares were calculated by dividing Area H's TAC as allocated by DFO by the total number of licences. Initial quotas were set at 2,557 sockeye per vessel and reduced to 1,763 in-season as a result of a decrease in the Fraser River sockeye run-size and available TAC.

Catch Validation Project

A Catch Validation project was undertaken during the 2006 Fraser River sockeye fishery. ITQ vessels were required to have 100% catch validation either dockside or on packers. Vessels fishing in the Traditional Fishery had the option to participate in this project; a total of eight TF vessels chose this option. The purpose was to test different types of validation procedures and associated outcomes.

Two packers had on-board validators, the rest were validated shore-side. On packers where there were no on-board observers, packer personnel were responsible to record data on validation forms and perform random hold checks on the last delivery of validation project vessels.

The Questionnaire

The Gulf Trollers Association mailed out a questionnaire to all Area H licence holders in the last week of November, 2006 to get feedback on the ITQ project and the Validation project. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, Part 1, the Individual Vessel Quota Demonstration Fishery Project and Part 2, the Validation Project. The deadline for submission was Friday, December 29/06. Out of a total of 122 Area H licences (49 TF and 73 ITQ), a total of 49 completed questionnaires were received equaling an overall response rate of 40% (45% of ITQ participants and 33% of TF participants).

To put context around the responses note that of the 73 ITQ participants, 37 are single Area H licenced; 30 are licenced for Area H and Area F; five are licenced for Area H, F and G; and one is licenced for Area H and G. Of the 49 TF participants, 44 are single licenced; four are licenced for Area H and Area F; none are licenced for Area H, F and G; and one is licenced for Area H and G. For further details see Appendix 1, question 1.

Responses are broken down into two categories, TF and ITQ, depending on how each licence holder participated in the 2006 Fraser River sockeye fishery. Not all comments are included in the summary; where responses were lengthy, main points have been presented. Detailed responses and a copy of the questionnaire can be found in the appendices. The results of this survey will assist in the final evaluation of these projects.

Part 1 - 2006 Area H Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) Demonstration Fishery Project (Summary)

1) What licence(s) do you hold?

- 36% of ITQ participants held single Area H licences as compared to 75% of TF participants. The remaining were double licenced or greater.

2) Did you choose the ITQ demonstration fishery option or the traditional (derby) fishery option for Fraser River sockeye in 2006?

- Out of 49 responses received, 33 were ITQ (67%) and 16 were TF (33%)
- This represents 45% (ITQ) and 33% (TF) of the total number of participants in each fishery.

3) If you chose the ITQ fishery option, did you transfer or purchase any quota?

- 18% transferred some of their quota
- 6% transferred all of their quota
- 30% leased some quota from others
- 3% transferred some of their quota and leased some quota from others
- 42% did not transfer or lease any quota

3) Other comments (relating to transferring or purchasing quota)

- 33% of ITQ responses found the transfer process uncomplicated; 9% indicated that they didn't transfer or purchase any quota; 6% couldn't find quota; 3% said that a buyer facilitated the transfer; and 48% did not comment.

4) Have you participated in other quota fisheries?

- 79% of ITQ participants had participated in other quota fisheries in comparison to 31% of TF participants; the remainder had not.

4) If yes, please describe (what year, what licence area, what species) and indicate how it worked for you.

- Predominant responses for ITQ participants were the Area F chinook fishery (2005 and 2006); Herring; Halibut; and Area H sockeye (2003).
- Responses from TF participants included halibut, prawn, ZN, lingcod and the Area F chinook fishery (2005 and 2006).

5) Based on your own experience during the 2006 Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery, did the ITQ demonstration fishery result in the following:

5a) Increased incidence of high-grading

- 6% of ITQ participants in comparison to 50% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in increased incidence of high-grading.

5b) Better safety at sea

- 76% of ITQ participants in comparison to 6% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in better safety at sea.

5c) Greater emphasis on quality rather than quantity

- 82% of ITQ participants in comparison to 13% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in a greater emphasis on quality rather than quantity.

5d) More careful handling of bycatch

- 58% of ITQ participants in comparison to 6% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in more careful handling of bycatch.

5e) More accurate catch records

- 79% of ITQ participants in comparison to 13% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in more accurate catch records.

5f) Higher prices received

- 21% of ITQ participants in comparison to 0% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in higher prices received.

5g) Changed crew sizes and/or payment structure

- 12% of ITQ participants in comparison to 6% of TF participants thought that the ITQ fishery resulted in changes to crew sizes and/or payment structures.

5) Additional comments (relating to 5a to 5g)

- Predominant responses from ITQ participants were that it takes more than one year to see changes in value, or to secure better market; that there was more time to care for fish/quality improved; and that prices were low this year overall.
- Predominant responses from TF participants were that the ITQ fishery resulted in release of #2's/smaller sockeye.

6) The following statements refer to an ITQ fishery for Area H in the long term. How much do you agree with each statement?

6a) Fishing revenue will increase

- 78% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 6% of TF participants.

6b) Fishing costs will decrease

- 63% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 6% of TF participants.

6c) Licence value will increase

- 72% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 13% of TF participants.

7) Do you feel that in years of lower Fraser River sockeye abundance an ITQ system would improve Area H's chances of obtaining its full TAC?

- 91% of ITQ participants answered yes, in comparison to 13% of TF participants.

7) Additional comments (relating to whether an ITQ system would improve Area H's chances of obtaining its full TAC in years of lower Fraser River sockeye abundance)

- Predominant ITQ responses were that Area H's chances of obtaining its full TAC would improve with an ITQ system as there would be better control/less risk/better opportunity.
- TF responses included: Fraser River TAC and Area H's ability to catch it are determined to a major extent by external factors that are out of the control of Area H or commercial salmon management as a whole and that there are other mechanisms to catch small amounts of fish.

8) Do you feel that management of the Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery improved through the ITQ demonstration fishery?

- 79% of ITQ participants answered yes, in comparison to 6% of TF participants.

8) Describe

- Predominant ITQ responses were that there was better catch accounting/better management/better quality; and that Area H achieved its TAC with no overage.
- TF responses included: having ITQ and derby open at same time led to infractions (ITQ boats offloading to derby boats); encouraged cheating as ITQ remained open when other fisheries were closed (and enforcement was gone).

9) In the long term, do you feel that the transfer of access to fishing opportunities between commercial fishers and others such as First Nations will be facilitated through a quota style fishery?

- 82% of ITQ participants answered yes, in comparison to 6% of TF participants.

9) Describe

- ITQ responses included: ITQ gives a quantifiable value to the salmon licence; it is the only fair way to do an orderly transfer; there should be compensation /there is a better chance of compensation; and that it should be transferable both ways.
- TF responses included: it is the identification of established harvest shares by sector that enables this transfer.

10) What were the positive aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

- ITQ responses included: the fishery was slower and there was more time, thus improving quality; the fishery was more relaxed; there was less pressure, competition and stress; there was more security; there was improved catch reporting and accountability; Area H stayed within its TAC; the fishery was more controllable; it was safer; the fleet was less concentrated; there was less aggression on tacks and less conflict; more sleep for crew; it can compensate for breakdowns; more time to fish in other fisheries.

- The predominant TF response was that there were no positive aspects; other comments included that there was more time and security.

11) What were the negative aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

- ITQ responses included: there were no negative aspects; the downgrade of run/TAC/quota in-season; having the quota and derby fishery at same time; increased cost (e.g. leased fish, fuel, validation); no knowing how long the opening would be.
- TF responses included: high-grading; illegal activity (e.g. sale of quota fish to traditional fisher, illegal offloading)/not enough enforcement/cheating.

12) Should the Area H ITQ fishery for Fraser River sockeye continue in 2007?

- 100% of ITQ participants answered yes (61% said yes, with same regulations as 2006 and 39% said yes, with modifications).
- 56% of TF participants answered no, 38% said yes, with modifications, 6% did not answer.

12) Additional comments (relating to whether an ITQ fishery for Fraser River sockeye should continue in 2007)

- ITQ responses included: start fishery on a conservative run size and TAC estimate and then upgrade not vice versa; implement coast-wide transferable quotas; allow Area H into upper Area 12; with guarantee of extra time; close during seine openings; if window of opportunity is small - employ another gear type; have ITQ or traditional fishery - not both; allocation should be based on past production and vessel size instead of equal split; set ITQ and do not change; include other species; start earlier.
- TF responses included: have ITQ or traditional fishery - not both; does not work (e.g. on small window fishery)/no advantage; only of benefit to those with more than one licence; have IVQ not ITQ (no armchair fishers).

13) Should an Area H quota fishery of some sort, e.g. using pieces or time, be explored for Johnstone Strait chum fisheries in 2007?

- 85% of ITQ participants answered yes, in comparison to 6% of TF participants.
- 0% of ITQ participants answered no, in comparison to 75% of TF participants.
- 12% of ITQ participants answered maybe, in comparison to 13% of TF participants.
- 3% of ITQ participants did not answer, in comparison to 6% of TF participants.

13) Additional comments

- ITQ responses included: the current system of opening and closing each week is not ideal for freezer boats; quota fishery should use pieces; there are differing needs of freezer and ice boats; could make own fishing plan with quota fishery; it would have to be at least for 1000 chums; do it the same as for sockeye; quota would stop fleet concentration in hot spots; quota would increase roe quality; puts everyone on same footing; can't get enough low-priced fish to make it

worthwhile; only way to recapture licence value through reallocation to natives; should use time as it is less costly.

- TF responses included: would create armchair fishermen; supporters will want a weighted allocation (reflecting years involvement); majority would sell quota; there is no advantage; creates micro-management; use pieces if there is one.

14) Do you have any other comments?

- ITQ responses included: quota fishery was improvement/worked well; should consider coast-wide quota; Area H was the most successful sockeye fishery this year - should be given credit; derby fisheries only work with unlimited time; would like to see a quota of 2500 sockeye and 1000 chums for each Area H licence averaged over a 4 year period; if there ends up being only one troll area coast-wide consider taking sockeye on the west coast of QCI; quotas will increase cost of fishery (e.g. catch monitoring); quality is not a problem to start with.
- TF responses included: if there are quotas they should be based on historical involvement/past production in any given fishery.

Part 2 - 2006 Area H Validation Project (Summary)

1) Did you participate in the Area H Validation Project for Fraser River sockeye in 2006?

- 88% of ITQ participants participated in the Validation Project in comparison to 44% of TF participants.

Note: validation was mandatory for ITQ participants, however, 12% of ITQ respondents did not actively fish their quota and therefore did not validate any fish.

2) If you answered yes to question 1, what type of validation service did you use?

- packer-based with certified validator on board (3% ITQ and 0% TF)
- packer-based with no certified validator on board (3% ITQ and 31% TF)
- dockside with certified validator (58% ITQ and 6% TF)
- packer-based with certified validator on board/dockside with certified validator (12% ITQ and 0% TF)
- packer-based with certified validator on board/packer-based with no certified validator on board (3% ITQ and 0% TF)
- packer-based with certified validator on board/packer-based with no certified validator on board/Dockside with certified validator (3% ITQ and 6% TF)
- no answer (6% ITQ and 0% TF)

3) The following statements refer to the validation service provided. How much do you agree with each statement?

3a) Convenient and organized service

- Of those that participated, 66% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 29% of TF participants; 15% of ITQ participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed in comparison to 29% of TF participants.

3b) Timely completion of validations

- Of those that participated, 63% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 14% of TF participants. 12% of ITQ participants disagreed or strongly disagreed in comparison to 14% of TF participants.

3c) Friendly and knowledgeable service

- Of those that participated, 66% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 29% of TF participants. 9% of ITQ participants disagreed or strongly disagreed in comparison to 29% of TF participants.

3) Other comments (relating to 3a to 3c)

- ITQ responses included: there were wait times for validators/delays on packers/too few validators; service provider did a good job/worked well; some packers were particularly efficient/packer system worked well; continuous validations problematic; certify packer crew as validators; validator had no idea of individual status of catch and didn't have ability to issue hard copy of validation

on one delivery; packers were over taxed (accepting both gill net and troll fish); validating helped me keep track of fish I had caught.; it was the same as other quota fisheries.

- TF responses included: waste of money/costly; their count didn't match ours most times; no different than past years; quota could be offloaded or transferred on the grounds before validation occurred.

4) The following statements refer to the 2006 Area H Validation Project. How much do you agree with each statement?

4a) Catch monitoring improved

- 69% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 13% of TF participants.
- 3% of ITQ participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed in comparison to 38% of TF participants.

4b) Management of fishery improved

- 57% of ITQ participants either agreed or strongly agreed in comparison to 12% of TF participants.
- 3% of ITQ participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed in comparison to 36% of TF participants.

4) Other comments (relating to 4a and 4b)

- ITQ responses included: streamline accounting process (monitoring/logbooks/phone-ins over done); responsible, accountable groups should be given credit for their effort; ITQ allowed the managers to open the fishery and keep it open longer; management improvements must come from DFO; more timely data facilitates better management; removed some opportunity to poach; didn't provide any more information than with daily hails and logbook.
- TF responses included: catch monitoring did not improve/didn't provide any more information than with daily hails and logbook/logbooks are a better tool; validation had no bearing on identification of increases in Area H TAC; increased comfort level of managers; increased cost, high-grading and bycatch; offloads occurred without validators.

5) Improvements to catch monitoring are becoming increasingly important. If catch validation continues, or is a requirement in the future, how should it be paid for?

- user pay at offload (24% ITQ and 19% TF)
- Gulf Trollers Association through Joint Project Agreement (36% ITQ and 25% TF)
- user pay at offload or Gulf Trollers Association through Joint Project Agreement (9% ITQ and 0% TF)
- other (18% ITQ and 25% TF)
- no answer (12% ITQ and 31% TF)

5) If other, describe

- ITQ responses included: DFO; through income tax.
- TF responses included: DFO; random checks; people of Canada.

6) What were the benefits of the 2006 Area H Validation Project?

- ITQ responses included: accurate catch data/catch accepted by all/better public perception; achieved/stayed within our share of TAC; honesty; better/easier resource management/sustainability; created more jobs; showed it can be done; not such a panic/less risk; reduces fishing hours per day; if have mishap can recoup; fishery open longer (had opportunity to make more money by leasing fish); too soon to tell; defends ability to work with DFO and in turn receive the maximum amount of fish to harvest; better to get out ahead; of benefit if whole fleet is IVQ; decreased operating costs; better quality.
- TF responses included: better/easier resource management; none (there was no benefit); proved our logs are accurate.

7) What were the drawbacks of the Area H Validation Project?

- ITQ responses included: raises cost; slow turn around/discharge; inconvenience; call in every night not necessary; not knowing the time constraints for the season; derby boats working after closures, when quota boats are still fishing; reduces quality of freezer fish if must be validated and then reloaded; inability to distinguish between derby and ITQ vessels; some packers didn't have validators; too restrictive; none (there were no drawbacks); punished for being controllable.
- TF responses included: raises cost; slow turn around/discharge; growing pains; quota boat transfers fish to derby boat until derby closes, quota boat then fishes his quota; more paperwork; catch counted too many times.

8) Other comments

- ITQ responses included: catch monitoring will destroy the fishery; validation is necessary; validation should be carried out in the most cost effective fashion; derby or quota - not both; public system to advertise persons wanting to list quota; need option to use counts and average weights; consider coast-wide allocation.
- TF responses included: keep it simple; work towards certifying packers.

**Appendix 1: Part 1 - 2006 Area H Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ)
Demonstration Fishery Project (detailed responses)**

1) What licence(s) do you hold?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
Area H	12	36%	12	75%
Area H/other	3	9%	2	13%
Area H/F	8	24%	0	0%
Area H/F/other	7	21%	2	13%
Area H/F/G/other	3	9%	0	0%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

The following table is provided for comparison:

Break-out of total Area H licences

ITQ vessels	# of licences	% of total
Area H	37	51%
Area H/F	30	41%
Area H/F/G	5	7%
Area H/G	1	1%
Total	73	100%

TF vessels	# of licences	% of total
Area H	44	90%
Area H/F	4	8%
Area H/F/G	0	0%
Area H/G	1	2%
Total	49	100%

2) Did you choose the ITQ demonstration fishery option or the traditional (derby) fishery

		% of total
ITQ	33	67%
Trad	16	33%
Total	49	100.0%

3) If you chose the ITQ fishery option, did you transfer or purchase any quota?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
transferred some of my quota	6	18%	0	n/a
transferred all of my quota	2	6%	0	n/a
leased some quota from others	10	30%	0	n/a
transferred some of my quota and leased some quota from others	1	3%	0	n/a
none	14	42%	0	n/a
not applicable	0	0%	16	100%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

3) Other Comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
didn't transfer or purchase any quota	3	9%	0	0%
easy/uncomplicated/worked well	11	33%	0	0%
couldn't find quota	2	6%	0	0%
transfer done by buyer	1	3%	0	0%
transfers were poorly done	0	0%	1	6%
transfers should be done before the season	0	0%	2	13%
no comment	16	48%	13	81%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

4) Have you participated in other quota fisheries?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	26	79%	5	31%
no	7	21%	11	69%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

4) If yes, please describe (what year, what licence area, what species) and indicate how it worked for you.

	ITQ	%	TF	%
Area H sockeye 2003 demonstration	4	12%	0	0%
Area H sockeye demonstration 2003; Area F chinook (2005 and 2006) and Halibut	2	6%	0	0%
Area F chinook (2005 and 2006)	5	15%	1	6%
Area F chinook (2005 and 2006); Herring and/or Halibut	4	12%	1	6%
Halibut and/or Herring	3	9%	0	0%
Halibut and ZN	1	3%	0	0%
Sablefish, Halibut and ZN	1	3%	0	0%
Other (Lingcod, prawn or ZN)	2	6%	3	19%
not applicable	7	21%	11	69%
no answer	4	12%	0	0%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

5) Based on your own experience during the 2006 Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery, did the ITQ demonstration fishery result in the following:

5a) Increased incidence of high-grading		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	2	6%	8	50%
	no	24	73%	3	19%
	no change	5	15%	2	13%
	no answer	2	6%	3	19%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5b) Better safety at sea		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	25	76%	1	6%
	no	3	9%	4	25%
	no change	4	12%	9	56%
	no answer	1	3%	2	13%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5c) Greater emphasis on quality rather than quantity		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	27	82%	2	13%
	no	2	6%	4	25%
	no change	4	12%	8	50%
	no answer	0	0%	2	13%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5d) More careful handling of bycatch		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	19	58%	1	6%
	no	1	3%	8	50%
	no change	13	39%	5	31%
	no answer	0	0%	2	13%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5e) More accurate catch records		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	26	79%	2	13%
	no	2	6%	9	56%
	no change	5	15%	3	19%
	no answer	0	0%	2	13%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5f) Higher prices received		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	7	21%	0	0%
	no	13	39%	13	81%
	no change	12	36%	1	6%
	no answer	1	3%	2	13%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5g) Changed crew sizes and/or payment structure		ITQ	%	TF	%
	yes	4	12%	1	6%
	no	12	36%	8	50%
	no change	16	48%	4	25%
	no answer	1	3%	3	19%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

5) Additional Comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
resulted in release of #2's/smaller sockeye	1	3%	2	12%
takes more than one year to see changes in value, or to secure better market	5	13%	0	0%
very little bycatch to deal with	1	3%	0	0%
prices low this year overall	4	10%	0	0%
more time to care for fish/quality improved	7	18%	0	0%
more flexibility in sale of fish	2	5%	0	0%
still small window to catch fish	1	3%	0	0%
reduction in TAC caused problems with crew shares	1	3%	0	0%
caught smaller fish at the beginning of fishery	1	3%	0	0%
worked well	2	5%	0	0%
made it easier to cheat (unvalidated docksales)	0	0%	1	6%
fishing longer increased bycatch	0	0%	1	6%
prices low due to continuous offloading	0	0%	1	6%
quota fisheries in JS should be stopped	0	0%	1	6%
crews suffer (not as many needed and price of lease deducted)	0	0%	1	6%
catch records and bycatch not recorded	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	14	36%	9	53%
Total	39	100%	17	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

6) The following statements refer to an ITQ fishery for Area H in the long term. How much do you agree with each statement?

6a) Fishing revenue will increase		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	0	0%	7	44%
	disagree	2	6%	3	19%
	neutral	2	6%	2	13%
	strongly agree	15	45%	0	0%
	agree	11	33%	1	6%
	don't know	3	9%	0	0%
	no answer	0	0%	3	19%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

6b) Fishing costs will decrease		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	0	0%	7	44%
	disagree	5	15%	3	19%
	neutral	6	18%	2	13%
	strongly agree	11	33%	0	0%
	agree	10	30%	1	6%
	don't know	1	3%	0	0%
	no answer	0	0%	3	19%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

6c) Licence value will increase		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	0	0%	3	19%
	disagree	1	3%	3	19%
	neutral	3	9%	2	13%
	strongly agree	12	36%	0	0%
	agree	12	36%	2	13%
	don't know	5	15%	2	13%
	no answer	0	0%	4	25%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

7) Do you feel that in years of lower Fraser River sockeye abundance an ITQ system would improve Area H's chances of obtaining its full TAC?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	30	91%	2	13%
no	1	3%	11	69%
not sure	2	6%	1	6%
no answer	0	0%	2	13%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

7) Additional Comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
better control/less risk/better opportunity	11	33%	0	0%
gives a better chance	2	6%	0	0%
unrelated comment	1	3%	0	0%
could lease enough to make up a trip; no risk to over harvest	2	6%	0	0%
if caught by another gear type	1	3%	0	0%
if there is enough time	1	3%	0	0%
depends on DFO	2	6%	1	6%
ITQ will not help when there are run downgrades	0	0%	1	6%
In years of lower abundance the TAC will be lowered to compensate	0	0%	1	6%
Fraser River TAC and Area H's ability to catch it are determined to a major extent by external factors that are out of the control of Area H or commercial salmon management as a whole	0	0%	1	6%
other	0	0%	2	13%
quotas would be too small and cost too much to lease	0	0%	1	6%
would become company controlled/smaller catch per boat	0	0%	1	6%
other mechanisms to catch small amounts of fish	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	13	39%	7	44%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

8) Do you feel that management of the Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery improved through the ITQ demonstration fishery?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	26	79%	1	6%
no	3	9%	12	75%
not sure	2	6%	1	6%
no answer	2	6%	2	13%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

8) Describe

	ITQ	%	TF	%
avoidance of other gear types	1	3%	0	0%
kept Area H open a long time	1	3%	0	0%
better catch accounting/better management/better quality	4	12%	0	0%
didn't get the downgrade back	1	3%	0	0%
improved over 2005	1	3%	0	0%
no race for fish	1	3%	0	0%
achieved our TAC with no overage	4	12%	0	0%
ITQ was improvement but derby still went over TAC	1	3%	0	0%
was still cheating by derby fishers	1	3%	0	0%
would like to see quota continue	1	3%	0	0%
may improve over time	1	3%	0	0%
less fish available for traditional fishery	0	0%	1	6%
ITQ good for marginal fishers	0	0%	1	6%
ITQ and derby open at same time led to infractions (ITQ boats offloading to derby boats)	0	0%	1	6%
should simplify not complicate	0	0%	1	6%
encouraged cheating as ITQ remained open when other fisheries were closed (and enforcement was gone)	0	0%	1	6%
was worse	0	0%	1	6%
DFO should not be involved with leasing quota	0	0%	1	6%
It is run the same every year - nothing changes.	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	16	48%	9	53%
Total	33	100%	17	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

9) In the long term, do you feel that the transfer of access to fishing opportunities between commercial fishers and others such as First Nations will be facilitated through a quota style fishery?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	27	82%	1	6%
no	0	0%	5	31%
not sure	2	6%	2	13%
no answer	1	3%	7	44%
maybe	3	9%	1	6%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

9) Describe

	ITQ	%	TF	%
should be transferable both ways	2	6%	0	0%
important to have set number of fish that we are allowed to catch	1	3%	0	0%
contingent on availability of fish to commercial fleet	1	3%	0	0%
gives a quantifiable value to the salmon licence	3	9%	0	0%
must be compensation/better chance of compensation	3	9%	0	0%
it is the only fair way to do an orderly transfer	2	6%	0	0%
it will protect those wishing to continue fishing.	1	3%	0	0%
Those wishing to retire Government may be forced to pay a higher value for the licence to accommodate First Nations	1	3%	0	0%
all have to be on the same page	1	3%	0	0%
will result in fair, transparent transfer between user groups	1	3%	0	0%
transfers will be from the top down	1	3%	0	0%
will still have to deal with land claims	0	0%	1	6%
would be fair if the opportunities for commercial fishers and First Nations were equal	0	0%	1	6%
simpler to transfer licence not quota	0	0%	1	6%
it is the identification of established harvest shares by sector that enables this transfer	0	0%	1	6%
this is between First Nations and DFO	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	16	48%	11	69%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

10) What were the positive aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
more relaxed/less pressure/less competition/less stress/more security	13	24%	1	6%
slower/more time/improved quality	14	25%	1	6%
improved catch reporting/accountability/stayed within TAC/more controllable	5	9%	1	6%
more sleep for crew	2	4%	0	0%
prospects for better markets	2	4%	0	0%
less concentrated fleet/less aggression on tack/less conflict	2	4%	0	0%
don't know/not enough information to comment	0	0%	2	13%
safer/can pick weather	3	5%	0	0
more time to fish in other fisheries (Area G/F/Halibut)	2	4%	0	0
compensate for breakdowns	2	4%	0	0
allows for inexperienced crew	1	2%	0	0
good for small boats	1	2%	0	0
lower operating cost	1	2%	0	0
pretty good/excellent/got to fish/predictable outcome	4	7%	0	0
none	1	2%	7	44%
no answer	2	4%	4	25%
Total	55	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

11) What were the negative aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
more paper work	1	3%	0	0%
downgrade of run/TAC/quota in-season	7	21%	1	5%
Upper Area 12 opened to Area G and not Area H	1	3%	0	0%
not enough area open	1	3%	0	0%
should not have quota and derby at same time	2	6%	0	0%
increased cost (e.g. leased fish, fuel, validation)	2	6%	1	5%
no positive number of days/not knowing how long the fishery would remain open	2	6%	0	0%
hard to find fish to lease/having to find more quota	1	3%	1	5%
none	10	29%	0	0
not allowing vessels with quota remaining to continue fishing	1	3%	0	0
test fishing poorly organized	1	3%	0	0
poor prices	1	3%	0	0
high-grading	0	0%	5	24%
non-participant investment leads to degradation of net earnings	0	0%	1	5%
illegal activity (e.g. sale of quota fish to traditional fisher, illegal offloading)/not enough enforcement/cheating	0	0%	4	19%
increased bycatch	0	0%	1	5%
traditional fishery did not get to finish on forecast fishery number	0	0%	1	5%
don't know	0	0%	1	5%
no answer	4	12%	5	24%
Total	34	100%	21	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

12) Should the Area H ITQ fishery for Fraser River sockeye continue in 2007?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes, same as 2006 regulations	20	61%	0	0%
yes, with modifications	13	39%	6	38%
no	0	0%	9	56%
no answer	0	0%	1	6%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

12) Additional comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
ITQ or traditional - not both	1	3%	2	13%
Allocation should be based on past production and vessel size instead of equal split	1	3%	0	0%
guarantee of extra time	1	3%	0	0%
close during seine openings	1	3%	0	0%
If window of opportunity is small - employ another gear type	1	3%	0	0%
start fishery on a conservative run size and TAC estimate and then upgrade not vice versa	2	6%	0	0%
implement coastwide transferable quotas	2	6%	0	0%
allow Area H into upper Area 12	1	3%	0	0%
improve validation (e.g. better provision for individual catch results)	1	3%	0	0%
set ITQ and do not change	1	3%	0	0%
include other species	1	3%	0	0%
start earlier	1	3%	0	0%
With assurance that starting date is when you want to	1	3%	0	0%
DFO needs to stop worrying about fishing time	1	3%	0	0%
IVQ not ITQ (no armchair fishers)	0	0%	1	7%
does not work (e.g. on small window fishery)/no advantage	0	0%	3	20%
only of benefit to those with more than one licence	0	0%	1	7%
sale of quota fish to traditional fishers	0	0%	1	7%
It is not the ITQ I strongly disagree with it is the politics	0	0%	1	7%
no comment	17	52%	6	40%
Total	33	100%	15	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

13) Should an Area H quota fishery of some sort, e.g. using pieces or time, be explored for Johnstone Strait chum fisheries in 2007?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	28	85%	1	6%
no	0	0%	12	75%
maybe	4	12%	2	13%
no answer	1	3%	1	6%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

13) Additional comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
opening and closing not ideal for freezer boats	4	11%	0	0%
could make own fishing plan with quota fishery	2	6%	0	0%
in pieces/numbers of fish is preferable	4	11%	1	6%
differing needs of freezer and ice boats	2	6%	0	0%
it would have to be at least for 1000 chums	1	3%	0	0%
same as for sockeye	1	3%	0	0%
using time - less cost of management	2	6%	0	0%
quota would stop fleet concentration in hot spots	1	3%	0	0%
quota would increase roe quality	1	3%	0	0%
puts everyone on same footing	1	3%	0	0%
can't get enough low-priced fish to make it worthwhile	1	3%	0	0%
only way to recapture licence value through reallocation to natives	1	3%	0	0%
would create armchair fishermen	0	0%	2	12%
supporters will want a weighted allocation (reflecting years involvement)	0	0%	2	12%
majority would sell quota	0	0%	1	6%
there is no advantage	0	0%	1	6%
creates micro-management	0	0%	1	6%
leave the fishery alone	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	14	40%	8	47%
Total	35	100%	17	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

14) Do you have any other comments?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
Area H most successful sockeye fishery this year - should be given credit	1	3%	0	0%
consider coastwide quota	2	6%	0	0%
derby fisheries only work with unlimited time	1	3%	0	0%
number of fish need to be guaranteed and fishing time sufficient	1	3%	0	0%
quota fishery was improvement/worked well	2	6%	0	0%
quota of 2500 sockeye and 1000 chums for each Area H licence averaged over a 4 year period	1	3%	0	0%
if only one troll area coast-wide consider taking sockeye in QCI	1	3%	0	0%
quotas will increase cost of fishery (e.g. catch monitoring)	2	6%	0	0%
quality is not a problem to start with	1	3%	0	0%
if there are quotas they should be based on historical involvement/past production in any given fishery	0	0%	2	13%
Until First Nations have restrictions and are enforced to stay within their limits - disagree with any restriction placed upon us; why is there no talk about a designated pink fishery?	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	22	65%	13	81%
Total	34	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

Appendix 2: Part 2 - 2006 Area H Validation Project (detailed responses)

1) Did you participate in the Area H Validation Project for Fraser River sockeye in 2006?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
yes	29	88%	7	44%
no	4	12%	9	56%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

2) If you answered yes to question 1, what type of validation service did you use?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
packer-based with certified validator on board	1	3%	0	0%
packer-based with no certified validator on board	1	3%	5	31%
dockside with certified validator	19	58%	1	6%
packer-based with certified validator on board/dockside with certified validator	4	12%	0	0%
packer-based with certified validator on board/packer-based with no certified validator on board	1	3%	0	0%
packer-based with certified validator on board/packer-based with no certified validator on board/dockside with certified validator	1	3%	1	6%
no answer	2	6%	0	0%
not applicable	4	12%	9	56%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

3) The following statements refer to the validation service provided. How much do you agree with each statement?

3a) Convenient and organized service		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	1	3%	1	6%
	disagree	4	12%	2	13%
	neutral	0	0%	4	25%
	strongly agree	9	27%	0	0%
	agree	13	39%	3	19%
	don't know	0	0%	0	0%
	no answer	2	6%	0	0%
	not applicable	4	12%	6	38%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

% ITQ	% TF
3%	0%
14%	29%
0%	43%
31%	0%
45%	29%
0%	0%
7%	0%
100%	100%

*of those that participated (i.e. non-participant answers removed)

3b) Timely completion of validations		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	1	3%	0	0%
	disagree	3	9%	1	6%
	neutral	0	0%	5	31%
	strongly agree	8	24%	0	0%
	agree	13	39%	2	13%
	don't know	0	0%	2	13%
	no answer	4	12%	0	0%
	not applicable	4	12%	6	38%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

% ITQ	% TF
3%	0%
10%	14%
0%	43%
28%	0%
45%	14%
0%	29%
14%	0%
100%	100%

*of those that participated (i.e. non-participant answers removed)

3c) Friendly and knowledgeable service		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	1	3%	0	0%
	disagree	2	6%	2	13%
	neutral	1	3%	5	31%
	strongly agree	10	30%	0	0%
	agree	12	36%	3	19%
	don't know	0	0%	0	0%
	no answer	3	9%	0	0%
	not applicable	4	12%	6	38%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

% ITQ	% TF
3%	0%
7%	29%
3%	43%
34%	0%
41%	29%
0%	0%
10%	0%
100%	100%

*of those that participated (i.e. non-participant answers removed)

3) Other Comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
continuous validations problematic	1	3%	0	0%
wait times for validators/delays on packers/too few validators	4	11%	0	0%
certify packer crew as validators	1	3%	0	0%
service provider did a good job/worked well	2	5%	0	0%
validator had no idea of individual status of catch and didn't have ability to issue hard copy of validation on one delivery	1	3%	0	0%
packers were over taxed (accepting both gill net and troll fish)	1	3%	0	0%
some packers were particularly efficient/packer system worked well	3	8%	0	0%
validating helped me keep track of fish I had caught	1	3%	0	0%
waste of money/costly	0	0%	2	13%
their count didn't match ours most times	0	0%	1	6%
no different than past years/same as for other fisheries	1	3%	2	13%
quota could be offloaded or transferred on the grounds before validation occurred	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	22	59%	10	63%
Total	37	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

4) The following statements refer to the 2006 Area H Validation Project. How much do you agree with each statement?

4a) Catch monitoring improved		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	0	0%	2	13%
	disagree	1	3%	4	25%
	neutral	3	9%	1	6%
	strongly agree	10	30%	0	0%
	agree	13	39%	2	13%
	don't know	1	3%	2	13%
	no answer	5	15%	5	31%
	not applicable	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	33	100%	16	100%

4b) Management of fishery improved		ITQ	%	TF	%
	strongly disagree	0	0%	2	12%
	disagree	1	3%	4	24%
	neutral	5	15%	2	12%
	strongly agree	13	39%	0	0%
	agree	6	18%	2	12%
	don't know	3	9%	3	18%
	no answer	5	15%	1	6%
	not applicable	0	0%	3	18%
	Total	33	100%	17	100%

4) Other comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
streamline accounting process (monitoring/logbooks/phone-ins over done)	1	3%	0	0%
responsible, accountable groups should be given credit for their effort	1	3%	0	0%
ITQ allowed the managers to open the fishery and keep it opened longer	1	3%	0	0%
management improvements must come from DFO	1	3%	0	0%
more timely data facilitates better management	1	3%	0	0%
catch monitoring did not improve/ didn't provide any more information than with daily hauls and logbook/logbooks are a better tool	1	3%	3	15%
removed some opportunity to poach	1	3%	0	0%
ITQ stayed within quota	1	3%	0	0%
there will be a learning curve	1	3%	0	0%
validation had no bearing on identification of increases in Area H TAC	0	0%	1	5%
increased comfort level of managers	0	0%	1	5%
increased cost	0	0%	2	10%
increased bycatch	0	0%	1	5%
increased highgrading	0	0%	1	5%
offloads occurred without validators	0	0%	1	5%
no comment	25	74%	10	50%
Total	34	100%	20	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

5) Improvements to catch monitoring are becoming increasingly important. If catch validation continues, or is a requirement in the future, how should it be paid for?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
user pay at offload	8	24%	3	19%
Gulf Trollers Association through Joint Project Agreement	12	36%	4	25%
user pay at offload or Gulf Trollers Association through Joint Project Agreement	3	9%	0	0%
other	6	18%	4	25%
no answer	4	12%	5	31%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

5) If other, describe

	ITQ	%	TF	%
DFO	3	9%	1	6%
through income tax	1	3%	0	0%
not applicable	23	70%	7	44%
not sure	1	3%	0	0%
use logbooks or phone-ins	0	0%	2	13%
random checks	0	0%	1	6%
people of Canada	0	0%	1	6%
no answer	5	15%	4	25%
Total	33	100%	16	100%

6) What were the benefits of the 2006 Area H Validation Project?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
accurate catch data/catch accepted by all/better public perception	8	21%	0	0%
honesty	3	8%	0	0%
don't know	1	3%	0	0%
better/easier resource management/sustainability achieved/stayed within our share of TAC	3	8%	1	6%
created more jobs	3	8%	0	0%
showed it can be done	1	3%	0	0%
none	1	3%	0	0%
not such a panic/less risk	2	5%	4	25%
reduces fishing hours per day	2	5%	0	0%
if have mishap can recoup	1	3%	0	0%
fishery open longer (had opportunity to make more money by leasing fish)	1	3%	0	0%
too soon to tell	1	3%	0	0%
defends ability to work with DFO and in turn receive the maximum amount of fish to harvest	1	3%	0	0%
better to get out ahead	1	3%	0	0%
of benefit if whole fleet is IVQ	1	3%	0	0%
decreased operating costs	1	3%	0	0%
increased quality	1	3%	0	0%
proved our logs are accurate	0	0%	1	6%
no answer	6	15%	10	63%
Total	39	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

7) What were the drawbacks of the Area H Validation Project?

	ITQ	%	TF	%
raises cost	6	16%	3	16%
call in every night not necessary	1	3%	0	0%
inconvenience	1	3%	0	0%
don't know	2	5%	0	0%
slow turn around/discharge	3	8%	2	11%
none	5	14%	0	0%
not knowing the time constraints for the season	1	3%	0	0%
derby boats working after closures, when quota boats are still fishing	1	3%	0	0%
reduces quality of freezer fish if must be validated and then reloaded	1	3%	0	0%
inability to distinguish between derby and ITQ vessels	1	3%	0	0%
some packers didn't have validators	1	3%	0	0%
too restrictive	1	3%	0	0%
none	1	3%	0	0%
punished for being controllable	1	3%	0	0%
growing pains	0	0%	1	5%
quota boat transfers fish to derby boat until derby closes, quota boat then fishes his quota	0	0%	1	5%
more paperwork	0	0%	1	5%
catch counted too many times	0	0%	1	5%
no answer	11	30%	10	53%
Total	37	100%	19	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment

8) Other comments

	ITQ	%	TF	%
catch monitoring will destroy the fishery	1	3%	0	0%
validation is necessary	1	3%	0	0%
validation should be carried out in the most cost effective fashion	1	3%	0	0%
validation should also occur in recreational and First Nations fisheries	1	3%	0	0%
derby or quota - not both	1	3%	0	0%
public system to advertise persons wanting to list quota	1	3%	0	0%
need option to use counts and average weights	1	3%	0	0%
consider coast-wide allocation	1	3%	0	0%
keep it simple	0	0%	1	6%
work towards certifying packers	0	0%	1	6%
no comment	27	77%	14	88%
Total	35	100%	16	100%

* note that some participants may have made more than one comment



Gulf Trollers Association

www.gulftrollers.com email president@gulftrollers.com

2006 Area H Individual Transferable Quota Demonstration Fishery and Validation Project Questionnaire

November 24, 2006

This questionnaire is divided into two parts, Part 1, the Individual Vessel Quota Demonstration Fishery Project and Part 2, the Validation Project. Your feedback is important and will form part of the final report on these projects. Please take the time to fill it out. Individual responses will not be released.

The deadline for submission is Friday, December 29/06. Please send completed questionnaires to the Gulf Trollers Association, c/o Andrea Goruk at 3225 Stephenson Pt. Rd, Nanaimo, B.C. V9T-1K3 or fax to (250)-756-7020.

Part 1 – 2006 Area H Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) Demonstration Fishery Project

1) Check all boxes that apply to you.

- Area H licence holder
- Area G licence holder
- Area F licence holder
- Other licence holder, please indicate _____

2) Did you choose the ITQ demonstration fishery option or the traditional (derby) fishery option for Fraser River sockeye in 2006?

- ITQ fishery option
- Derby fishery option

3) If you chose the ITQ fishery option, did you transfer or purchase any quota? Check all boxes that apply to you.

- Transferred some of my quota
- Transferred all of my quota
- Leased some quota from others

Please provide any comments you may have on the transfer process.

4) Have you participated in other quota fisheries?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe (what year, what licence area, what species) and indicate how it worked for you?

5) Based on your own experience during the 2006 Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery, did the ITQ demonstration fishery result in the following: (check one per line)

	Yes	No	No change
Increased incidence of high-grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Better safety at sea	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greater emphasis on quality rather than quantity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More careful handling of bycatch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More accurate catch records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher prices received	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changed crew sizes and/or payment structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide comments.

6) The following statements refer to an ITQ fishery for Area H in the long term. How much do you agree with each statement?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know
Fishing revenue will increase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fishing costs will decrease	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Licence value will increase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7) Do you feel that in years of lower Fraser River sockeye abundance an ITQ system would improve Area H's chances of obtaining its full TAC?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please provide comments.

8) Do you feel that management of the Area H Fraser River sockeye fishery improved through the ITQ demonstration fishery?

9) In the long term, do you feel that the transfer of access to fishing opportunities between commercial fishers and others such as First Nations will be facilitated through a quota style fishery?

10) What were the positive aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

11) What were the negative aspects of the 2006 Area H ITQ demonstration fishery?

12) Should the Area H ITQ fishery for Fraser River sockeye continue in 2007?

- Yes, same as 2006 regulations
- Yes, with modifications
- No

Please provide comments.

13) Should an Area H quota fishery of some sort, e.g. using pieces or time, be explored for Johnstone Strait chum fisheries in 2007?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

Please provide comments.

14) Do you have any other comments? Attach a separate page if necessary.

Part 2 – 2006 Area H Validation Project

1) Did you participate in the Area H Validation Project for Fraser River sockeye in 2006?

- Yes
- No

2) If you answered yes to question 1, what type of validation service did you use? Check all boxes that apply to you.

- packer-based with certified validator on board
- packer-based with no certified validator on board
- Dockside with certified validator

3) The following statements refer to the validation service provided. How much do you agree with each statement?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know
convenient and organized service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
timely completion of validations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
friendly and knowledgeable service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide comments.

4) The following statements refer to the 2006 Area H Validation Project. How much do you agree with each statement?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know
Catch monitoring improved	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Management of fishery improved	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide comments.

5) Improvements to catch monitoring are becoming increasingly important. If catch validation continues, or is a requirement in the future, how should it be paid for?

- user pay at offload
- Gulf Trollers Association through Joint Project Agreement
- Other, please describe

6) What were the benefits of the 2006 Area H Validation Project?

7) What were the drawbacks of the Area H Validation Project?

8) Do you have any other comments? Attach a separate page if necessary.

Optional: Your name _____

Thank-you for taking the time to share your opinions. Area H licence holders will receive a copy of the evaluation report.

**Please remember to submit your completed questionnaire by
Friday, December 29/06 to:**

**Gulf Trollers Association
c/o Andrea Goruk
3225 Stephenson Pt. Rd, Nanaimo, B.C. V9T 1K
fax: (250)-756-7020
Phone: (250)-756-7186
Email: goruka@pac.dfo-mpo-gc.ca**