

From: Ryan McEachern <ryanmceachern@shaw.ca>
Sent: Sunday, June 8, 2008 2:00 AM
To: Aaron Murray <aaronmurray@shaw.ca>; Barry Stuart <bdstuart@telus.net>; Bob Rezansoff <bob.rezansoff@telus.net>; Craig Orr <corr@telus.net>; Darrel McEachern <grandpadarrel@hotmail.com>; Edwin Blewett <edwin@gocounterpoint.com>; Glenn Sigurdson <cse@direct.ca>; Hughes, John <vegaenterprises@shaw.ca>; Jessica Bratty <jessica_bratty@telus.net>; John Murray <jr90mesh@hotmail.com>; Les Rombough <lrombough@connected.bc.ca>; Ryall, Paul <RyallP@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Richard Diamond <richard@diamondmc.com>; Kadowaki, Ronald <KadowakiR@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Ryan McEachern <ryanmceachern@shaw.ca>; Sakich, Peter <sakich@island.net>; Stuart Nelson <stuart_nelson@telus.net>
Subject: Area D Quota Discussion Part 8
Attach: 6119_sustainingfisheries.pdf

-Ryan McEachern

From: Ryan McEachern [mailto:ryanmceachern@shaw.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2008 2:48 AM
To: ryanmceachern@shaw.ca
Subject: Quota - My thoughts

Area D Gillnet Members,

Thanks to _____, _____ and _____ for explaining their thoughts and being willing for everyone to read them. I would like to reply to what I see as key points from their messages, as well as those from other responses that I cannot forward.

- 1) "Why am I bothering all of you with this again? What does it matter what people voted or why? "

-I am interested in gathering as much support as possible for a change in how our fishery is managed. I didn't come up with this poll, but when I heard that Area H and Area B were going to be polled on this project, I wanted Area D to be polled as well. More information is good – and it wasn't very difficult for the license holders to participate, even though they had to fill out two ballots by mistake. I am genuinely interested in why people voted against the project, I am not just doing this because I enjoy staring at a computer screen for hours. I hope that through furthering discussion and fostering debate we can come up with a system that works for Area D in the present time and situation we find ourselves in. I was hoping to hear from the Northern Native Co-op who control approximately 55 Area D licenses. Based on my previous discussions with Mabel, I am assuming that she voted against the project with her 55 licenses. Under that assumption, If she had abstained from this vote, the poll result for ITQ on JS sockeye would have been 58% for and 42% against. Also under that assumption, If she had voted to support ITQ on JS sockeye, the result would have been 70% for and 30% against. So it becomes obvious that the Northern Native Co-op has a large role to play in how we go forward from here and any recommendations or advice coming from the fleet will have to consider the needs and interests of the Co-op, and rightly so.

- 2) "ITQ is not working for halibut"

-I have no experience with the Halibut fishery and have never suggested that we should use it as a model for the salmon fishery.

- 3) "It will be interesting for Area D to sit and watch for a few years while Area B + H cannibalize each other's quota."

-I am not interested in sitting and watching anything. If there is any fishing going on, I want Area D to be in on it. What some would call cannibalizing, I would call adapting and evolving to conditions of reality. The troll/seine exchange is a good example. I think the trollers will try to structure their fisheries to catch fish at a speed that enables them to maximize quality, which is really the troller niche. On years when they have more than that number – they will try to lease the surplus out to the market. When they think they could use more for their high quality markets they will go out and try to lease it from the market.

- 4) "Take a small catch data sample from the whole and a good result can be expected within a margin of error."

-Unfortunately, there is less and less acceptance of any margin of error. Since the Williams inquiry and the huge stink that we have raised over the Fraser Sockeye being poached – there is more and more scrutiny on catch numbers and data, for all sectors. One of the most frustrating things is when the chief of the Musqueam stands up and goes on and on about how they have 100% dockside monitoring in their commercial fisheries, and each fish gets counted three times and isn't that great? All the government and environmental folks just sit there and ohhh and ahhh while I sit there with smoke coming out my ears. I don't like it, but the reality is that we are going to face more and more monitoring and we had better come up with a plan to deal with it. The reality is that if we want to accuse other sectors of poaching or poor data collection, we have to be near perfect ourselves. The way I see it, we either have to raise up our level of catch reporting and monitoring, or stop pointing the finger at other sectors.

- 5) "How is it that fish slips worked fine all through the 60's 70's and 80's"

-The old-school style of data collection used hails from fishboats and packers to monitor the level of catch during an opening, and fish slips and tallies to establish actual catch after the opening and post-season. We may never again see that level of simplicity or trust in our fisheries. It is too easy for a fisherman to report inaccurate numbers with a hail-in. We wouldn't accept those kind of numbers from the other fishing sectors, so don't expect them to accept ours. The reason it seemed to work so well through the 60's 70's and 80's was because there was way more productive returns from far lower escapements, which created a nice resilient system that didn't mind being stretched a bit at the edges some times. There was also a lot less poaching going on during those times, and also people from outside the fishery weren't looking at everything with a magnifying glass back then, zooming in on every little creek and ditch to point out possible problems.

- 6) "Why can't we set up a hail in fishery"

-We can try to set up a registration type fishery for small TAC's. There are several challenges to this type of fishery, one being that I imagine we would have to go through this "polling" of the fleet again to make a management shift to allow us to exclude fishermen from the opening if they didn't register beforehand. After the Laroque decision, the Federal Justice department took a closer look at the way DFO was running some of its programs and decided that they shouldn't be using special permits to run commercial fisheries, but that the same rules need to apply to all licenses in a given area. The challenge is that there is no legal way to stop anyone from fishing in an open fishery if they have a license to do so. There would need to be some language put into the conditions of license to set it up, and of course it would need to be in the IFMP (Integrated Fisheries Management Plan) so all the other sectors and their lawyers can poke holes in it until they like it, and the deadline for submissions to the IFMP for this season has long passed. I will start up another message thread on this issue soon.

- 7) "One Halibut fisherman I know is tied to the dock waiting for prices to go higher so it is affordable to go out"

-I am sorry, but this seems to be a definite plus for a quota system over a derby system, or maybe I am missing something?

8) "the only cost a fisherman saves in an ITQ system is the cost of getting the extra boat to and from the grounds"

-Yes, under an ITQ, or any other system that promoted rationalization of the fleet, the fleet will save the money spent on moving extra boats to and from the grounds. Under a full ITQ they would also save the money in getting the boat ready to go fishing, and winterizing it after. This is not a small amount of money. Consider that we have around 250 regular fishermen in Area D, and on a year like this we probably only really need 50, if that. So we tie up 200 boats (not even counting the 105 that don't seem to ever go fishing) and we will save the fleet the associated cost of those 200 vessels, whatever that is. If it is \$5000 per boat, then we save \$1,000,000 (one million) if it is \$10,000 per boat, then we save \$2,000,000 (two million). The challenge of course, is how to split up the savings. One of the parts of ITQ that really is an irritant is paying fishermen to stay home, but if you don't reward them somehow for staying home they will keep coming out and getting in the way and splitting up the TAC until it is so small that nobody makes any money. The problem is that everyone loves to fish, and we need to create an incentive for more and more fishermen to stay home so that those who want to make a living out of fishing in Area D can. This is why we need to pay some fishermen to stay home.

9) "ITQ has not worked anywhere in the world"

-I cannot agree with that statement and would encourage you all to read the Environmental Defense paper titled, "Sustaining America's Fisheries and Fishing Communities". I have attached a copy in a PDF file to this message.

10) "If we go ITQ, my quota works out to many times less the amount that I used to catch"

-Yes, If we were to go to an ITQ system, one share would be less than anyone used to catch in the good old days. If it turns out we can't get in the water without some sort of defined share system in place, then one quota would be worth a lot more than your non-existent historical catch.

11) "We must demand compensation for the cruel 15 years of hell that they've dragged us into."

-Yes, we have been dealt a poor hand. We have been treated poorly by politicians from both the Provincial and the Federal Government, and we have been especially damaged by the conservation/protectionist lobby and the environmental/science groups. I am not a good person to talk to about compensation. I am more of a pick up the pieces and try to put them back together into something that works better kind of guy. I encourage you to contact someone who has more skill and interest in the compensation concept and give them your support. We could definitely use some help, that is for sure.

12) "fishing is a way of life that I believe is worth fighting to preserve"

-Now here is a statement that I think we can all agree on! I am a fourth generation gillnet fisherman, and I refuse to be the last generation in my family. I am fighting as hard as I can to preserve our industry in the way I see as the most likely to succeed. Others are fighting in ways they think are better, each to his own. I will continue to promote an ITQ system for Area D until I come up with a better plan, or someone introduces me to a system that will work better and then I will promote that one.

Good Night!

-Ryan McEachern
CFV Ryan D
CFV Silver Totem

\\svbcvanfp1\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\Policy\Angela Bate\Email_001\Email 01\Cohen-BateAngela\Deleted Items\Cohen emails - Kadowaki\