

**FINAL REVIEW DRAFT
REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW/
INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS**

**For Amendments to the
Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands
Management Area (BSAI) and the BSAI Crab FMP
To revise the Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab Rebuilding Plan.**

September, 2011.

Lead Agency: National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Alaska Region

Responsible Official: James Balsiger
Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
Alaska Regional Office

For Further Information Contact:

Scott A. Miller
NMFS Alaska Region
709 W. 9th Street, Suite 801
P.O. Box 21668
Juneau, AK 99802-1668
907-586-7416

Diana Stram
North Pacific Fishery Management Council
605 West 4th, Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501-2252
(907) 271-2809

Abstract: This Regulatory Impact Review/Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (RIR/IRFA) evaluates a suite of spatial closure alternatives, affecting groundfish fisheries, around the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea. These alternatives are being proposed to reduce bycatch of Pribilof Island Blue King Crab, (PBKC) which is presently in an overfished status, as part of a revised rebuilding plan and in order to enhance the long term sustainability of the PIBKC stock.

Tables and Figures	iii
1.0 REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW	1
1.1 What is a Regulatory Impact Review?.....	1
1.1.1 Statutory Authority	1
1.1.2 Purpose and Need for Action.....	2
1.2 Description of the Fishery.....	2
1.3 Description of the Alternatives	4
1.3.1 Alternative 1: Status Quo.....	4
1.3.2 Alternative 2: Modify the current Pribilof Island Habitat Conservation Zone (PIHCZ) to apply to: all groundfish fishing and only Pacific cod pot fishing	4
1.3.3 Alternative 3: ADF&G crab closure areas applied to select groundfish fishing, and just Pacific cod pot fishery.....	4
1.3.4 Alternative 4: Closure which covers the entire distribution of the Pribilof Island blue king crab stock	5
1.3.5 Alternative 5: Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) level established for PIBKC in all groundfish fisheries.....	5
1.3.6 Options for Increased Observer Coverage.....	8
1.3.1 Exempted Groundfish Fisheries.....	8
1.4 Analysis of the Alternatives.....	9
1.4.1 Economic Benefits of Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab Rebuilding.	9
1.4.2 Groundfish Fishery Gross Revenue Effects.....	10
1.4.3 Comparison of Impacts by Alternative	32
1.4.4 Potential Impacts on Fishing Operations, Fishery Dependent Communities, Markets, and Consumers.....	42
INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS	43
1.5 The Purpose of an IRFA	43
1.6 What is required in an IRFA?	43
1.7 What is a small entity?.....	44
1.8 Reason for considering the action.....	45
1.9 Objectives of, and legal basis for, the proposed action.....	46
1.10 Number and description of small entities regulated by the proposed action	46
1.11 Impacts on Regulated Small Entities	47
1.12 Recordkeeping and reporting requirements	49
1.13 Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with proposed action.....	50
1.14 Description of significant alternatives to the proposed action	50
References:	51

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1-1 Round weight Equivalent First Wholesale value of Retained Groundfish by Species Group and Sector, 2004-2008 (\$/mt)	11
Table 1-2 BASI total tonnages by target and gear from Table 2 of Econ SAFE (1000s of metric tons)...	11
Table 1-3 BASI total value by target and gear (\$ Millions)	11
Table 1-4: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line).....	19
Table 1-5: Hypothetical Aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” in round weight equivalent first wholesale value (\$ millions) based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line)	19
Table 1-6: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line).....	19
Table1-7: Hypothetical Aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential).....	20
Table1-8: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (\$ millions) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)	20
Table1-9: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)	20
Table1-10: Hypothetical aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential).....	21
Table 1-11: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (\$ millions) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)	21
Table 1-12: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential).....	22
Table 1-13: Hypothetical aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential).....	23
Table 1-14: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (dollars) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)	23
Table 1-15: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010.	24

Table 1-16: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the PIHCZ area, 2003-2009. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)..... 26

Table1-17: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the ADF&G area, 2003-2008. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)..... 27

Table1-18: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) area, 2003-2008. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)..... 27

Table 1-19: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) area, 2003-2008. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)..... 28

Table 1-20: Alternative 5d Threshold Analysis Fishery Impacts: Potentially Foregone Catch, Gross revenue, and Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue 30

Table 1-21: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Tons at Risk 32

Table 1-22: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk 32

Table 1-23: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk as percent of Target Fishery Total Gross revenue. 32

Table 1-24: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Tons at Risk 34

Table 1-25: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk 34

Table 1-26: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk as percent of Target Fishery Total Gross revenue..... 34

Table 1-27: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Tons at Risk 37

Table 1-28: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Gross revenue at Risk 37

Table 1-29: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Gross revenue at Risk as a Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue 38

Figure 1: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Effects..... 33

Figure 2 All Fisheries Combined, Effects of Alternatives 35

Figure 3: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Options; Tons at Risk 37

Figure 4: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Options; Gross revenue at Risk..... 38

Figure 5: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closures; Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue... 39

Figure 6: Effects of Alternative 5 Threshold Trigger Closures 41

1.0 REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW

This Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) examines the costs and benefits of a proposed regulatory amendment to revise the Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab (PBIKC) stock rebuilding plan.

1.1 What is a Regulatory Impact Review?

The preparation of an RIR is required under Presidential Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 (58 *FR* 51735: October 4, 1993). The requirements for all regulatory actions specified in E.O. 12866 are summarized in the following Statement from the E.O.:

In deciding whether and how to regulate, agencies should assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, including the alternative of not regulating. Costs and Benefits shall be understood to include both quantifiable measures (to the fullest extent that these can be usefully estimated) and qualitative measures of costs and benefits that are difficult to quantify, but nonetheless essential to consider. Further, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches agencies should select those approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity), unless a statute requires another regulatory approach.

E.O. 12866 requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review proposed regulatory programs that are considered to be “significant.” A “significant regulatory action” is one that is likely to:

- Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, local or tribal governments or communities;
- Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or
- Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

1.1.1 Statutory Authority

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the United States has exclusive fishery management authority over all marine fishery resources found within the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The management of these marine resources is vested in the Secretary of Commerce and in the Regional Fishery Management Councils. The potentially affected groundfish fisheries in the Bering Sea EEZ are managed under the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island Fisheries Management Plan (BSAI FMP). In addition, the management of crab stocks has been deferred to the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Statutory authority for measures designed to reduce bycatch is specifically addressed in Sec. 600.350 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. That section establishes the ten National Standards.

1.1.2 Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of this proposed action is to reduce the risk of overfishing and to rebuild the Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab (PIBKC) stock by developing an amended rebuilding plan for this stock in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) and the National Standard Guidelines.

The Council's problem statement for this analysis is the following:

The Pribilof Islands blue king crab stock remains overfished and the current rebuilding plan has not achieved adequate progress to rebuild the stock by 2014. In order to comply with provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) an amended rebuilding plan must be implemented prior to the start of the 2011/2012 fishing season.

The directed blue king crab fishery has been closed since 1999 and action has been taken to limit bycatch mortality in other crab fisheries occurring near the Pribilof Islands; however no similar action has been taken for groundfish fisheries. Recent trends in crab bycatch suggest that groundfish fisheries occurring near the Pribilof Islands have the potential to exceed the annual overfishing level and acceptable biological catch for this stock.

This action is necessary to facilitate compliance with requirements of the MSA to end and prevent overfishing, rebuild overfished stocks and achieve optimum yield.

In crafting this problem statement the Council further noted that this problem statement reflects not only the Council's obligation under MSA to rebuild this stock, but also the Council's desire to prevent overfishing on an annual basis and ensure that all fisheries contributing to PIBKC bycatch mortality share in the rebuilding effort.

1.2 Description of the Fishery¹

The king crab fishery in the Pribilof District began in 1973, when vessels targeted blue king crabs in the vicinity of Saint George and Saint Paul Islands. The first reported catch in this area was 1.3 million pounds taken by eight vessels between July 1973 and October 1974. By the 1980/81 season, fishing effort had increased to 110 vessels that harvested 11.0 million pounds, the largest catch on record. However, fishery catch per unit effort had dropped from 26 legal crabs per pot lift to a low of two crabs per pot by the end of the 1986/87 season when harvest was 260,000 pounds, taken by 16 vessels. Due to this six-year decline in harvest and concurrently low annual population estimates, the blue king crab fishery was closed beginning with the 1988/89 season and remained closed through the 1994 season.

The 1993 National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) summer trawl survey of the Bering Sea indicated a marked increase in the abundance of red king crabs around the Pribilof Islands. Although no threshold abundance level for opening the fishery was established for Pribilof red king crabs, survey results indicated a harvestable surplus of legal-sized male crabs. Consequently, a red king crab fishery in the Pribilof District opened for the first time in September 1993 with a Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) of 3.4

¹ Information on Pribilof Islands blue and red king crab fisheries is excerpted from the ADF&G Annual Management Report for the commercial and subsistence shellfish fisheries of the BSAI.

million pounds. However, 2.6 million pounds was taken in 1993 and 1.0 million pounds of the 1994 GHL of 2.0 million pounds was taken in that year by 104 participating vessels.

In 1995, an increase in blue king crab abundance and a continued harvestable surplus of red king crabs resulted in a combined red and blue king crab GHL of 2.5 million pounds. Subsequent declines in red and blue king crab abundance over the next three years resulted in a combined GHL for 1998 of 1.3 million pounds. Poor fishery performance during those seasons resulted in annual harvests below the fishery GHL. From 1999 to 2007/08, blue king crab abundance continued to decline and the Pribilof fishery was not opened.

The economic value of the Pribilof district red king crab fishery peaked at \$13.0 million in 1993 with an ex-vessel price of \$4.98 per pound, the second highest price on record. The value of the Pribilof District blue king crab fishery peaked at \$13.6 million in 1981/82, with an ex-vessel price of \$1.50 per pound. Total value declined from \$6.8 million in 1995 to \$2.4 million in 1998.

At present, the Pribilof Islands blue king crab stock is under a rebuilding plan with no directed fishery allowed. In addition, the Pribilof Islands red king crab fishery has been closed since the 1999 season due to the imprecision of abundance estimates and concerns about bycatch of blue king crab.

As depicted in the associated EA, there does not appear to be potential for a directed fishery for Pribilof Islands blue king crab to occur, nor does it appear likely that the Pribilof Islands red king crab fishery will be opened in the foreseeable future. Thus, the PIBKC stock rebuilding plan will serve primarily to sustain the stock at levels sufficient to allow bycatch of PIBCK in the groundfish fisheries that occur around the Pribilof Islands. These groundfish fisheries are described in detail in the Programmatic Groundfish Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (NMFS, 2004) and those descriptions are incorporated by reference.

BSAI Groundfish Fisheries:

The alternatives analyzed herein have the potential to affect several of the groundfish fisheries of the BSAI. These include target fisheries for Pacific cod and the various flatfishes; however, the Council has specifically exempted any fisheries that do not meet PIBKC bycatch thresholds, including the Pollock fishery (see the discussion of the exemption in the description of the alternatives presented below). A detailed description of the potentially affected fisheries, including participation, landings, gross revenue, and market disposition can be found in the 2009 Groundfish Economic SAFE (Hiatt et al. 2009), which is incorporated here by reference. The analysis uses specific data from the 2009 Economic SAFE to estimate potential gross revenue impacts and to compare such potential impacts with total values earned within target/gear combinations as detailed in the analysis of the alternatives sections presented below.

Fisheries Dependent Communities

The 2009 Groundfish Economic SAFE (Hiatt et al. 2009 table 35, page 70) indicates that the Bering Sea Pollock processors, which include American Fisheries Act (AFA) shoreside processors operating in King Cove, Akutan, Sand Point, Dutch Harbor, and two floating processors earned nearly 84% of their all species combined gross revenue from groundfish processing in 2008. In these communities groundfish processing provides the majority of first wholesale processor gross revenue and changes in BSAI groundfish harvests and deliveries to these communities would have indirect effects on processor earnings, crew wages, municipal finance, and community structure.

In the Pribilof Islands, where a shore plant and a floating processor receive deliveries of nearly half of the Bering Sea snow crab quota, and a small share of the Bristol Bay Red King Crab quota, diversification

into groundfish processing does not exist within the community of Saint Paul. Saint Paul is heavily dependent on the Bering Sea snow crab fishery and only receives between \$1 and \$2 million worth of Halibut landings from area 4C and 4D halibut IFQ (Sholtz et.al, 2007). Actual halibut landings are confidential due to the existence of a single processing plant. The plant in Saint Paul does not process groundfish at present and would not be affected by changes in BSAI groundfish harvest and deliveries to shore plants.

Many fisheries dependent communities rely on fisheries taxes and/or sales taxes for a substantial portion of their annual operating budget. Thus, reductions in landings will result in reductions in such tax revenue although future increases in landings, as stock rebuild, will result in improved tax collections in later years of the rebuilding plan. The City of Unalaska levies a 2% raw fish tax, and a 3% sales tax, the latter of which is largely derived from fisheries related services (Kelty, Frank: Personal Communication, August 24, 2010). In contrast, Akutan and Sand Point do not levy sales or fish taxes. King Cove levies a 4% sales tax and flat rate fisheries impact tax. In addition, the Aleutians East Borough levies a 2% raw fish tax. In the Pribilof Islands, Saint Paul levies 3% sales and 3% raw fish taxes, while Saint George levies neither a sales or raw fish tax. In addition, the State of Alaska levies a Fisheries Business Tax that is shared with municipalities that demonstrate fishery related impacts.

1.3 Description of the Alternatives

1.3.1 Alternative 1: Status Quo

Alternative 1 retains the current protections for PIBKC stock. These include a directed fishery closure until the stock is completely rebuilt, and the closure to all trawl gear of the Pribilof Island Habitat Conservation Zone (PIHCZ) as shown in Figure 1 of the accompanying Environmental Assessment (EA).

1.3.2 Alternative 2: Modify the current Pribilof Island Habitat Conservation Zone (PIHCZ) to apply to: all groundfish fishing and only Pacific cod pot fishing

Under Alternative 2, the existing PIHCZ, as described in Alternative 1 would be modified to apply to additional fisheries (i.e., rather than just to the trawl fisheries as under the status quo).

There are two options under Alternative 2, for year-round closures:

Option 2a: Closure applies to all groundfish fisheries which have contributed to bycatch of PIBKC since 2003. In addition to the existing trawl closure, all fixed gear fishing would also be prohibited in this zone year-round.

Option 2b: Closure applies to all fishing for Pacific cod with pot gear. In addition to the existing trawl closure, all Pacific cod pot fishing would also be prohibited in this zone year-round

1.3.3 Alternative 3: ADF&G crab closure areas applied to select groundfish fishing, and just Pacific cod pot fishery.

Under Alternative 3, the existing Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) crab closure areas between 168° and 170° West longitude, and between 57° and 58° North latitude would be closed to additional fishing effort as described in the options below. The existing closure configuration is indicated in Figure 2 of the accompanying EA. These closures would be enacted year-round for the fisheries listed below.

There are two closure options under Alternative 3:

- Option 3a: Closure area applied to all groundfish fisheries which have contributed to bycatch of PIBKC since 2003. These fisheries include the Pacific cod fishery, combined flatfish trawl fisheries, pollock trawl fishery and Greenland turbot fishery.
- Option 3b: Closure area applied only to pot fishing for Pacific cod. Under this option no federal Pacific cod fishing with pot gear would be allowed within the confines of the closures shown in Figure 2 of the accompanying EA.

1.3.4 Alternative 4: Closure which covers the entire distribution of the Pribilof Island blue king crab stock

This alternative proposes a new closure configuration as shown in Figure 3 (a & b) of the accompanying EA. The distribution of the entire PIBKC stock is defined in two ways depending upon the data used to establish the entire distribution of the stock. Under the first option (Option 1), the closure area consists of the full distribution of the Pribilof Islands stock aggregated from 1975 to 2009 based on the NMFS Eastern Bering Sea (EBS) bottom trawl survey (Figure 3a). The smaller closure area (Option 2) consists of the full distribution of the Pribilof Islands stock aggregated from 1984 to 2009. In 1984, there was a constriction of the PIBKC distribution towards the Pribilof Islands that has persisted until 2009 (Figure 3b). It is unknown if this constriction is due to declining population abundances, fishery activities, oceanography, or shifts in production. It is plausible, however, that a rebounding PIBKC stock may only be able to inhabit the smaller area.

There are two closure options under Alternative 4:

- Option 4a: Closure area applied to all groundfish fisheries which have contributed to bycatch of PIBKC since 2003. These fisheries include the Pacific cod fishery, combined flatfish trawl fisheries, pollock trawl fishery and Greenland turbot fishery. Under this option no federal groundfish fishing for those fisheries would be allowed within the confines of the closure.
- Option 4b: Closure area applied only to pot fishing for Pacific cod. Under this option no federal Pacific cod fishing with pot gear would be allowed within the confines of the closure area.

Under either option the closure would apply year-round.

1.3.5 Alternative 5: Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) level established for PIBKC in all groundfish fisheries.

Under Alternative 5, a trigger cap would be established for all groundfish fisheries, equal to either the Over Fishing Limit (OFL) or the Allowable Biological Catch (ABC) for the crab stock. All bycatch of PIBKC in all groundfish fisheries would accrue towards this trigger cap and those groundfish fisheries which have contributed to bycatch of PIBKC since 2003 would close when the trigger is reached. These fisheries include the Pacific cod fishery, combined flatfish trawl fisheries, pollock trawl fishery and Greenland turbot fishery (see Table 12 for additional information on catch by gear and fishery since 2003). There is currently no feedback between catch of PIBKC accrual towards the OFL under the BSAI

Crab FMP and any catch restrictions in the groundfish fisheries. This alternative would provide explicit feedback by closing groundfish fisheries when the Prohibited Species Cap (PSC) for PIBKC is reached.

Two options are considered for the cap levels (labeled under each closure option as sub-option 1 and 2 considered for each closure.

Sub-option 1: PSC Cap = OFL

Here the aggregate PSC would be established at the level of the annual OFL for the PIBKC stock based on the most recent stock assessment. The OFL for PIBKC stock is 0.004 million pounds in the 2010/11 fishing year. The OFL is a total-catch OFL and is computed as the sum of catches by three different sources of removals: (1) the retained legal males in directed (pot) fishery for PIBKC; (2) discards of males and females in the directed fishery, and (3) bycatch in the groundfish pot and trawl fisheries. The directed fishery for PIBKC has been closed since 1998. Since the implementation of a total catch OFL in 2008, bycatch in crab and groundfish fisheries have been the only catch that has accrued towards the OFL. The OFL was not reached in the 2009/10 fishing year.

Currently the OFL for 2010/11 is established at 0.004 million lbs (0.0018 kt) corresponding to the five year average of bycatch in groundfish and crab fisheries from 1999/2000-2005/2006². While the PIBKC stock is in Tier 4 of the Crab OFL Tier system, it is at stock status 'c' therefore the directed fishery $F_{\text{directed}} = 0$ as $B/B_{\text{MSYprox}} < \beta$ and $F_{\text{OFL}} < F_{\text{MSY}}$ is determined by the PIBKC rebuilding plan. The OFL calculation employs a 'Tier 5' methodology of average catch in crab and groundfish fisheries to determine a bycatch- F_{OFL} . For purposes of this sub-option the cap is considered to be the bycatch component of the OFL. Currently the entire OFL is the bycatch component due to the low stock status in relation to the sloping control rule. Should the biomass of the stock increase above the beta threshold, the OFL would be determined using the true Tier 4 control rule. The stock assessment will include information on the proportion of the total catch OFL anticipated coming from bycatch. This would constitute the bycatch-OFL cap for purposes of determining the annual PSC cap. The current rebuilding plan includes a provision that the directed fishery is closed until the stock is rebuilt (second consecutive year above B_{MSY}). Once the stock is rebuilt the directed fishery could be re-opened. The PSC cap would continue to be annually estimated as the bycatch-component of the OFL. Should the crab fisheries begin to contribute to the bycatch of the stock, an estimate of the groundfish-only component of the OFL would need to be made to appropriately specific the cap level.

Sub-option 2: PSC Cap = ABC

Here the PSC cap would be established at the level of the ABC to be recommended annually by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) to the Council. The Council took final action on an Annual Catch Limit (ACL) analysis (amendment 38 to the Crab FMP) in October 2010. The Council's preferred alternative establishes an ABC control rule to be employed annually to determine the maximum permissible ABC, understanding that the SSC may recommend a lower value on an annual basis. The Council's ABC control rule would be established using a P^* approach with the recommended P^* value = 0.49. Currently for PIBKC as a Tier 4 stock, using $P^* = 0.49$ and employing only model-based (sigma-w) uncertainty this results in an ABC = 99.32% of OFL. This would result in an ABC = 3,973 lbs, or 27 lbs lower than the OFL. Given that the OFL for this stock is not truly assessed using a Tier 4 formula based upon stock status, it seems reasonable to establish an ABC using the Tier 5 ABC formula in the Council's

² This 4,000 lb OFL was based upon data available in 2008. Since that time the data have been revised slightly and would result in a lower OFL if averaged over the same time period. The OFL has remained at the 4,000 lb level in order to allow for estimated incidental catch needs in groundfish fisheries.

preferred alternative which is that ABC = 90% of OFL. This results in an ABC = 3,600 lbs (or 400 lbs less than the OFL). For analytical purposes this is the cap considered under these alternatives.

Sub-Option 3: PSC Cap = 90% of ABC

This sub-option set the cap equivalent to the 90% of ABC. Given the ABC as specified under sub-option 2 this equates to a cap of 3,240 lbs.

Sub-Option 4: PSC Cap = 75% of ABC

This sub-option set the cap equivalent to 75% of the ABC. Given the ABC as specified under sub-option 2 this equates to a cap of 2,700 lbs.

There are 4 closure options under Alternative 5:

Option 5a: The existing PIHCZ, as described in Alternative 1, would be modified to apply to additional fisheries (i.e., rather than just to the trawl fisheries as under the status quo). The fisheries to which this closure would apply are listed in Table 11-1 of the accompanying EA. The closure would be triggered by attainment of a fishery-wise cap set at the options below. Cap options are the following:

Sub-option 1:	Cap level = OFL
Sub-option 2:	Cap level = ABC
Sub-Option 3:	Cap = 90% of ABC
Sub-Option 4:	Cap = 75% of ABC

Option 5b: The existing ADF&G crab closure areas between 168° and 170° West longitude, and between 57° and 58° North latitude would be closed to additional fishing effort as indicated in Figure 2 of the accompanying EA. The fisheries to which this closure would apply are listed in Table 11-1 of the accompanying EA. The closure would be triggered by attainment of a fishery-wise cap set at the options below. Cap options are the following:

Sub-option 1:	Cap level = OFL
Sub-option 2:	Cap level = ABC
Sub-Option 3:	Cap = 90% of ABC
Sub-Option 4:	Cap = 75% of ABC

Option 5c: The closure area consists of the full distribution of the Pribilof Islands stock aggregated from 1975 to 2009 based on the NMFS EBS bottom trawl survey (EA Figure 3a) The fisheries to which this closure would apply are listed in EA Table 1. The closure would be triggered by attainment of a fishery-wise cap set at the options below. Cap options are the following:

Sub-option 1:	Cap level = OFL
Sub-option 2:	Cap level = ABC
Sub-Option 3:	Cap = 90% of ABC
Sub-Option 4:	Cap = 75% of ABC

Option 5d: The smaller closure area (Option 2) consists of the full distribution of the Pribilof Islands stock aggregated from 1984 to 2009. In 1984, there was a constriction of the PIBKC distribution towards the Pribilof Islands that has persisted until 2009 (EA Figure 3b). The closure would be triggered by attainment of a fishery-wise cap set at the options below. Cap options are the following:

Sub-option 1:	Cap level = OFL
Sub-option 2:	Cap level = ABC
Sub-Option 3:	Cap = 90% of ABC
Sub-Option 4:	Cap = 75% of ABC

Threshold Suboption:

Under Option 5d, suboptions 3 and 4, there is an additional option for allocation of the cap by gear types. This allocation is as follows:

Trawl gear:	40%
Pot gear:	40%
Hook and Line gear:	20%

1.3.6 Options for Increased Observer Coverage.

For each of the Alternatives, and the sub-option of each Alternative that is ultimately selected, apply an option to increase observer coverage requirements. This increase could be applied to all fisheries (Option 1, below) or for a specific fishery (Option 2, below) depending upon the selection of the individual application of an alternative under Alternatives 2-6.

- Option1: Apply increased observer coverage to fisheries which contributed to PIBKC bycatch since 2003 for which a cap (PSC or trigger) or closure applies;
- Option 2: Apply increased observer coverage to specific fisheries.

Sub-option (applies to both options 1 and 2): This would sunset under implementation of the restructured observer program.

Under these options, increased observer coverage would be added to fisheries which contributed to PIBKC bycatch since 2003) or to only specific fisheries³. Selection of the sub-option would indicate that any mandatory increased observer coverage on a fishery would sunset upon implementation of the observer restructuring program. The Council took final action on this analysis in October 2010. The main elements of the Council's preferred alternative as it relates to this are the ability to annually modify coverage in fleets based on fishery management monitoring needs and Council and NMFS priorities. The new program is anticipated to be implemented in 2013. The Council's motion is available at:

http://fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/current_issues/observer/ObserverMotion1010.pdf. Additional information is available in the public review draft of the analysis for this action:

http://fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/current_issues/observer/Observer_restructuring910.pdf

EA section 4.4 identifies pending issues with analysis of this option, thus, the reader is referred to that section of the EA for treatment of this topic.

1.3.1 Exempted Groundfish Fisheries

In December of 2010, the Council directed the analysts to exempt from the proposed action any target fishery which had PIBKC bycatch, during any of the years 2003-2010, of either less than 5 percent of the

³ Additional specificity would be required as to which specific fisheries this increased observer coverage would apply.

PIBKC ABC (Option a) or less than 10 percent of the PIBKC ABC (Option b). Analysis of bycatch by target fishery is presented in Section 3.2 of the accompanying EA, and a list of fisheries that would still be affected by the proposed alternative actions is included in EA Table 11-1. The result of the analysis indicate that the available do not identify and difference between the two options and the fisheries that would be exempted would be the pollock trawl fishery, the Pacific cod trawl fishery, Flathead Sole non pelagic trawl fishery, and the Greenland turbot non-pelagic trawl fisheries. Thus, the impacts of the alternatives would accrue to non-trawl Pacific cod fisheries, and the various flatfish fisheries.

1.4 Analysis of the Alternatives

This analysis addresses the potential impacts, in terms of gross revenue at risk, of each of the proposed alternatives on the Bering Sea groundfish fishery, as well as potential benefits of the PIBKC rebuilding plan in terms of its effect on stock sustainability. This introduction to the analysis discusses the analytical approach. The subsequent sections present the analysis of potential impacts of each alternative.

An Analytical Clarification

A benefit/cost framework is the appropriate way to evaluate the relative economic and socioeconomic merits of the alternatives under consideration in this RIR. When performing a benefit/cost analysis, the principal objective is to derive informed conclusions about probable net effects of each alternative under consideration (e.g., net revenue impacts). However, in the present case, necessary empirical data (e.g., operating costs, capital investment, debt service, opportunity costs) are not available to the analysts, making a quantitative net benefit analysis impossible. Furthermore, empirical studies bearing on other important aspects of these alternative actions (e.g., subsistence-use values, domestic and international seafood demand) are also unavailable, and time and resource constraints prevent their preparation for use in this analysis.

The following regulatory impact review, and initial regulatory flexibility analysis, use the best available information and quantitative data, combined with accepted economic theory and practice, to provide the fullest possible assessment (both quantitative and qualitative) of the potential economic benefits and presumptive costs attributable to each alternative action.

For clarity of presentation, a simple analytical convention is adopted for the gross revenue-at-risk assessment (presented below), in which the 2003 through 2010 fisheries are reexamined, in succession, as if each of the proposed PIBCK stock rebuilding plan alternatives had been in place in that year. This convention is adopted, in large part, to reduce the inherent risk of introducing parameter bias, associated with the analysts speculating on, for example, future catch distributions, species catch composition, ex-vessel and first wholesale prices, and costs, etc. By using this technique, the analysis can be performed using official, empirically observed and recorded, catch and value data sets. The 2003 through 2010 records are used because they represent the most recent complete data sets for the fisheries in question and cover the timeframe during which current management has been in place.

1.4.1 Economic Benefits of Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab Rebuilding.

The alternatives discussed in this analysis address concerns that ongoing bycatch of PIBKC may be adversely affecting stocks of PIBKC and the potential for subsistence, commercial, personal use, and sport fisheries that are dependent on those PIBKC stocks. In economic parlance, one might say that

ongoing PIBKC bycatch is ‘consuming’ crab that would otherwise be expected to be utilized in capture fisheries were the stock to recover sufficiently under the rebuilding plan to allow any capture fisheries.

As noted in the Council’s problem statement, the Pribilof Islands blue king crab stock remains overfished and the current rebuilding plan has not achieved adequate progress to rebuild the stock by 2014. The directed blue king crab fishery has been closed since 1999 and action has been taken to limit bycatch mortality in other crab fisheries occurring near the Pribilof Islands; however no similar action has been taken for groundfish fisheries. Recent trends in crab bycatch suggest that groundfish fisheries occurring near the Pribilof Islands have the potential to exceed the annual overfishing level and acceptable biological catch for this stock.

In order to comply with provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) an amended rebuilding plan must be implemented prior to the start of the 2011/2012 fishing season. Thus, the benefits of this action are that it will facilitate compliance with requirements of the MSA to end and prevent overfishing, rebuild overfished stocks, and achieve optimum yield. Nevertheless, while the potential impacts differ on groundfish fisheries across alternative management measures depending upon the time frame for reaching the cap and the impacts (closure of various fisheries from the specified areas) when a cap is reached, none of the alternative management measures themselves differ in their ability to rebuild the stock over the time frame of the simulation. As a result, it is not possible to identify differences in benefits between the Alternatives being considered in this action, and it is not anticipated that any of the alternatives would result in stock rebuilding sufficient to allow a target fishery for Pribilof Islands blue king crab in the reasonably foreseeable future.

1.4.2 Groundfish Fishery Gross Revenue Effects

This section examines the potential impacts on the groundfish industry’s gross revenues attributable to potential reductions in groundfish products being delivered to market due to relocation of effort outside of a closure area (gross revenue at risk)⁴. To better place these impacts in a comparable empirical context, an analytical approach is adopted here, in which the question evaluated is expressed as follows: “What would the effects of these alternatives have been, had each, in turn, been in place in 2003 through 2010?” By posing the analytical question in this way, it is possible to use actual empirical information and official data records on fleet participation, catch, first wholesale prices, bycatch quantities, and spatial and temporal distribution of effort. These estimates can provide at least a crude empirical measure of the potential economic impact of the alternatives on different fleet sectors. Moreover, if it is assumed that harvest foreclosed to a fleet sector could not have been made up elsewhere by that fleet sector, then the at-risk estimate becomes an approximation of the potential maximum forgone gross revenues directly attributable to the proposed action.

To be precise, the gross revenues at risk were estimated using information about the following:

(1) projected fleet segment harvests for the 2003 through 2010 fishing years assuming the provisions of each PIBKC bycatch minimization alternative had been in place in that year; (2) the actual proportions of harvest of different allocations, by different sectors (e.g. American Fisheries Act (AFA), Open Access (OA), Community Development Quota program (CDQ), Catcher Processor (CP), Catcher Vessel (CV)), based upon historical catch patterns in 2003 through 2010; (3) estimated product mix and first wholesale product values for groundfish products by sector, species group, and year from 2003 through 2009. The

⁴ “Gross Revenue at risk” should be regarded as an upper-bound estimate. That is, it represents a projection, based upon historical effort and landings data, of the gross value of the catch that would be forgone as a result of one or more provisions of the proposed action, assuming none of that displaced catch could be made up by shifting effort to another area. In many cases, this will not be the case. Therefore, the true impact on gross revenue is likely to be smaller than the estimated revenue at risk, although that is not assured.

years 2003 through 2009 were chosen as the base years for the analysis because they represent a consistent data series (new catch accounting began in 2003), and 2010 product value data is not yet available.

Harvest tonnages were valued using annual round weight equivalent first wholesale prices derived from the catch accounting system (Hiatt 2008, 2009, 2010). The first wholesale prices were estimated by dividing the total wholesale value of all groundfish products by estimated retained tons of groundfish, to yield a round weight per ton of catch equivalent value. First wholesale prices are the prices received by the first level of inshore processors, or by catcher-processors and motherships. They reflect the value added by the initial processor of the raw catch. They are not, therefore, equivalent to ex-vessel prices.

The first wholesale values by target species group, and processor type, used in this analysis are summarized in the table below. Also provided below are tables indicating the harvest tonnages, by target and gear, as well as the resulting estimated first wholesale value? These later tables are used to calculate impact percentages in the analysis of alternatives that follow.

Table 1-1 Round weight Equivalent First Wholesale value of Retained Groundfish by Species Group and Sector, 2004-2008 (\$/mt)

Target Species	Processor Type	Year						
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*
Pacific Cod	CP	\$828	\$1,172	\$1,388	\$1,755	\$2,044	\$2,061	\$1,252
Flatfish	CP	\$701	\$844	\$986	\$981	\$897	\$788	\$694

Source: 2008, 2009, and 2010 Economic SAFE report, Table 27, additional data from Terry Hiatt

* 2009 values are used to proxy 2010 prices due to 2010 data being presently unavailable.

Table 1-2 BASI total tonnages by target and gear from Table 2 of Econ SAFE (1000s of metric tons)

Target Species	Gear Type	Year						
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Pacific Cod	Pot	22	17	14	19	18	19	14
Pacific Cod	Hook & Line	110	111	116	99	81	94	102
Flatfish	Hook & Line	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
Flatfish	Trawl	154	170	175	184	213	266	222
Total		291	303	310	307	316	383	343
Total All Species and Gear		1,974	1,979	1,978	1,977	1,857	1,541	1,335
Percent of Total		14.74%	15.31%	15.67%	15.53%	17.02%	24.85%	25.69%

Table 1-3 BSAI total value by target and gear (\$ Millions)

Target Species	Gear Type	Year						
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Pacific Cod	Pot	\$18	\$20	\$19	\$33	\$37	\$39	\$18
Pacific Cod	Hook & Line	\$91	\$130	\$161	\$174	\$166	\$194	\$128
Flatfish	Hook & Line	\$4	\$6	\$7	\$9	\$8	\$8	\$6
Flatfish	Trawl	\$108	\$143	\$173	\$181	\$191	\$210	\$154
Total		\$221	\$299	\$360	\$396	\$402	\$451	\$306

The analysis of gross revenue impacts of the alternatives on the groundfish industry was conducted in terms of

gross revenues at risk under the PIBKC closure area options. The affected fishing fleets may or may not have been able to make up the displaced catch and the gross revenues that would have been lost because of these restrictions by fishing outside of the closure area. Because some sectors may potentially have been able to recover some or all of these gross revenues, the gross income from these catches cannot, strictly speaking, be described as lost. Instead, they have been described here as “at risk.”

Only if it is assumed that harvest foreclosed to a fleet sector in one area by could not have been made up elsewhere by that fleet sector would at-risk gross revenues be an estimate of lost gross revenues.

Accurate estimates of the abilities of fleets to make up a reduction in harvests in one area, due to closures under the Alternatives, by fishing in another area require information on the following: (1) the volume of catch (and resulting production) affected by the Alternative closure areas, (2) the extent to which each fleet sector would have redirected its operations into other fishing areas, and (3) the comparative productivity of the fleet sectors in the new areas. Currently, it is possible to quantitatively estimate only the first of these, (i.e., the volume of catch coming from areas that would no longer have been available to fishermen under each closure scenario contained within the Alternatives. However, is it possible to estimate catch that occurred outside of a closure area and use those catch records to proportionally assign catch put at risk by a closure to the area outside the closure area. This “reprojection” of catch based on recorded catch outside of the closure area is a proportionality based estimate of where catch could occur but is not a stochastic or behavioral modeling of location choice, does not have the ability to consider productivity changes and does not account for crowding effects and gear conflicts. Still, this method does shed light on the intensity and spatial dispersion of harvests within and outside of closed areas and has been used to inform this analysis. Appendix A contains a full methodology as well as a series of map reprojections of catch by alternative. These are discussed within the impact analysis by alternative. resultant changes in catch that would allow the analyst to forecast changes in catch.

Format of Impacts Tables

The tabulations presented in the tables below, are obtained by querying, from a spatial “Catch-in-areas” database, actual catch by gear, sector, target, management program, and species in the proposed closure area during 2003 through 2010. Thus, these tonnages represent actual recorded catch within the proposed closure area during the analytical timeframe.

The information presented in these tables is presented as hypothetical because, as previously discussed, this analysis relies on a retrospective hypothetical scenario of what would have occurred in the proposed closure area had the closure been in effect in the years 2003-2010.

The information presented in these tables is identified as aggregate tonnage because much of the catch data, when broken down to sector and target levels, is confidential (fewer than three vessels reporting). When breaking catch down to a species level, confidentiality severely limits presentation of information. Thus, to report as much of the catch, and gross revenue, placed at risk as possible a manual aggregation of the summarized data has been undertaken.

In the catch aggregation, the various management regimes, such as open access (OA), the American Fisheries Act (AFA) and the Community Development Quota (CDQ) programs have had, in many cases, to be combined. Similarly, CPs and CVs have often had to be combined primarily because CV data is largely confidential.

The combination of vessel types has also resulted in a compromise on estimating dollar value of these catches. First, it has become necessary to use the target species as the species group for pricing purposes. This is due to extreme confidentiality problems when breaking data out to specific species levels. Second, the combination of CPs and CVs for reporting has meant that pricing of those combined tonnages has relied on round weight equivalent first wholesale value, rather than ex-vessel values for CV and first wholesale value for CPs. This application of wholesale values necessarily overestimates CV revenue because it includes processing value added. Thus, the CV catches are evaluated as if they were processed into first wholesale goods in order to capture the value added processing that would occur at shoreside plants.

1.4.2.1 Gross revenue at Risk Under Alternative 2

Under this alternative the existing PIHCZ (status quo) would be modified to apply to additional groundfish fisheries rather than just to the trawl fisheries as under the status quo. Option 1 would apply the PIHCZ closure to Pacific Cod and flatfish (excluding flathead sole, Greenland turbot, and halibut) fishing and Option 2 would apply the PIHCZ closure to targeting Pacific cod with pot gear.

Table 1-4, below, provides a tabulation of the hypothetical aggregate tonnage of groundfish catch that would be put “at risk” by extending the PIHCZ closure to Pacific cod and flatfish fishing, represented by the total of all non-confidential catch, as well as to the Pacific cod pot fishery (black highlighted line) only. Also shown are tabulations by gear type, and target species so that one may compare effects across sectors. These tabulations show that the effect of Option 2 (Pacific cod pot only) would have ranged from slightly more than 390 tons of Pacific cod catch, put at risk, to as much as 2,769 tons.

Table 1-5 provides the dollar value, in round weight equivalent first wholesale value, of this catch. Option 2 would have placed between \$.3 million and \$4.4 million of gross revenue “at risk” of being foregone in the Pacific cod pot fishery.

Option 1 of this alternative applies to all groundfish fisheries that occurred in the PIHCZ area. The tabulations of Table 1-4 and Table 1-5 show that catch in this area was primarily in the Pacific cod target fishery, hook and line gear type. Both CDQ and OA fisheries would have been affected, with the OA fishery having the greatest potential impact of between approximately 1,305 tons (2008) and 4,927 tons (2005) being placed “at risk” In gross revenue terms, the OA impacts would be between \$2.7 million and \$6.8 million, while the greatest CDQ impacts would have been approximately \$1.5 million in 2005. Overall, these impacts range from a low of \$1.1 million, in 2009, to a high of \$12.2 million, in 2005.

Table 1-6 provides impact estimates in terms of percentages of target and total gross revenue put “At Risk” in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area. Combining the gross revenue at risk estimates for all potentially affected fisheries and comparing those impacts with the total gross revenue earned in those potentially affected fisheries (from table 3 above) reveals that a period high of 6.77 percent of total gross revenue would have been put at risk in 2005, and a period low of 1.33 percent would have been put at risk in 2009. In all remaining years, total impacts would have been between 1.4 percent and about 5 percent. The Pacific cod pot fishery had impacts ranging from as high as 19.78 percent in 2005 to a low of 0.89 percent in 2010. The remaining Pacific cod fisheries, combined, had impacts ranging from as high as 5.21 percent in 2005 to a low of 1.22 percent in 2009.

1.4.2.2 Reprojection of Catch Under Alternative 2

Figure A16 and in A17 in the accompanying Appendix A provides the results of the spatial/temporal reprojection, to remaining open areas, of catch that occurred within the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) annual closure areas by year from 2003 through 2010. As discussed in section A1 of the appendix, this

reprojection utilizes a stepwise matching algorithm to reproject catch to open areas where catch was observed to have occurred in the same week, and/or month, and within the same target fishery, gear type, and, to the extent possible, to the same vessel type (see methodology discussion in Appendix section A1).

Figure A16 shows the annual reprojection of catch in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery from 2003-2010 under Alternative 2. This reprojection shows considerable inter-annual variability in both the locations and the relative intensity of catch that occurred within the closure area. In general, years with a few locations accounting for a majority of the catch within the closure area also reproject to a similar number of locations with similar catch intensity. In instances where catch within the closure area is more dispersed, the reprojection outside the closure area is similarly more dispersed. Thus, it is difficult to discern a consistent pattern that would suggest operational impacts due to reprojection of catch via effort relocation.

Figure A17 shows the annual reprojection of catch in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery from 2003-2010 under Alternative 2. This reprojection shows a consistent pattern of reprojection to immediately adjacent areas with high intensity of catch; however, there is also a considerable reprojection of relatively small amounts of catch in a widely dispersed pattern in all years. This suggests that fairly high catches occurring in discrete locations within the closure area will be made up, to some extent by similarly large catches near the boundary of the closure but that remaining catch will have to be made up in multiple areas with history of smaller catches in a widely dispersed pattern. This could mean additional sets, greater searching behavior, and generally increased costs to harvest the catch put at risk by the closure.

1.4.2.3 Gross revenue at Risk under Alternative 3

Under this alternative existing ADF&G crab closure areas, between 168 and 170 W long., and between 57 and 58 N lat., would be closed to additional fishing effort as defined in EA Figure 10. These closures would apply year-round. There are two closure options under this alternative: Option A could apply the closure to Pacific Cod and flatfish (excluding flathead sole, Greenland turbot, and halibut) fishing, while Option B would apply it to Pacific cod pot fishing only.

Table 1-7 and Table 1-8 provide the tabulations of tonnage and gross revenue placed “at risk” by these options. Unfortunately, the Pacific cod pot fishery in this area is prosecuted by too few vessels to allow reporting in most years. The one year when confidentiality (fewer than three vessels) was not a restriction was 2005, when 1,578 tons of catch occurred in the Pacific cod pot fishery in the ADF&G area. That translated into approximately \$2.2 million in first wholesale gross revenue placed “at risk” under Option B in the one year for which data can be reported.

Option A would include the Pacific cod pot fishery impacts as well as impacts to the hook and line fishery for Pacific cod, the non-pelagic trawl fishery for flatfish (excluding flathead sole, Greenland Turbot, and halibut), and in the all trawl category for pollock. The impacts shown vary by year and gear type; however, overall combined impacts range from 337 tons, in 2009, to a high of 7,963 tons in 2008. These tonnages represent between \$.4 million (2009) and a high of \$8.2 (2005) million in total first wholesale value.

Table 1-9 provides estimates of gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area. Combining the gross revenue at risk estimates for all potentially affected fisheries and comparing those impacts with the total gross revenue earned in those potentially affected fisheries (from table 3 above) reveals that a period high of .233 percent of total gross revenue would have been put at risk in 2005, and a period low of .14 percent would have been put at risk in 2009. The Pacific cod hook and line fisheries had impacts ranging from as high as 3.07 percent in

2005 to a low of .32 percent in 2009. The Pacific cod pot fishery would have had impacts of about 11.2 percent in 2005; however, in all other years the impact estimate is confidential. The flatfish trawl fisheries would have had smaller impacts with percentages of total fishery gross revenue put at risk of between .01 percent and 2.8 percent.

1.4.2.4 Reprojection of Catch under Alternative 3

Figure A-18 through A20, in the accompanying Appendix A, provide the results of the spatial/temporal reprojection to remaining open areas of catch that occurred within the Alternative 3 annual closure areas from 2003 through 2010. As discussed in section A1 of the appendix, this reprojection utilizes a stepwise matching algorithm to reproject catch to open areas where catch was observed to have occurred in the same week, and/or month, and within the same target fishery, gear type, and, to the extent possible, to the same vessel type (see methodology discussion in Appendix section A1).

Figure A18 shows the annual reprojection of catch in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery under the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) area. This is shown only for 2005 due to confidentiality of the catch data in all other years. This reprojection shows a small number of catch locations with high intensity would reproject to a similar number of locations with similar catch intensity immediately outside the boundary of the closure area and very close to the original catch locations. Ignoring the potential for crowding and/or gear conflicts, it does not appear that this closure would have resulted in substantial increases on operating costs in the single year that can be displayed.

Figure A19 shows the annual reprojection of catch in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery under the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) area from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that a small number of catch locations, with high catch intensity, would reproject to in a widely dispersed pattern across the South and West portions of the reprojection area. This pattern is consistent across all years and suggests that the closure would cause relocation of effort in a dispersed way leading to more sets, greater search time, and generally higher operating costs.

Figure A20 shows the annual reprojection of catch in the Flatfish non-pelagic trawl fishery under the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) area from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that when there are high intensity catch locations inside the closure area there are also fairly high intensity catch locations immediately outside of the closure area; however, catch is not fully made up in those immediately adjacent areas. Thus results in additional catch reprojected in a fairly widely dispersed pattern likely leading to more tows, greater search time, and generally higher operating costs.

1.4.2.5 Gross revenue at Risk under Alternative 4

Option 1 of alternative 4 proposes a closure of the range of full distribution of the PIBKC stock aggregated from 1975 to 2009 based on the NMFS EBS bottom trawl survey. Option 2 proposes a closure of the range of full distribution of the PIBKC stock aggregated 1984-2009.

Table 1-10 and Table 1-11 provide the tabulations of tonnage and gross revenue placed “at risk” by the Option 1 of alternative 4. Due to the relatively large size of this proposed closure area, many more vessels have recorded catch in the area. Thus confidentiality was not as great an issue; however, it did necessitate combining CVs with CPs due to the small number of CVs observed in the area.

As can be seen in Table 1-10, considerable tonnages of several target species have been reported in the proposed closure area under this alternative and option. Most notably affected are the flatfish non-pelagic trawl fishery and the Pacific cod hook and line fishery. In all, 96,299 metric tons of catch occurred in this area in 2005, while the 2009 retained catches recorded at a period low of 31,738 metric tons. These tonnages at risk represent annual totals that peaked in 2005, at \$105.7 million, but have been considerably lower in recent years as exemplified by the period low of \$28.1 million occurring in 2009.

Table 1-12 provides estimates of gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 1 (1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area. Combining the gross revenue at risk estimates for all potentially affected fisheries and comparing those impacts with the total gross revenue earned in those potentially affected fisheries (from table 3 above) reveals that a period high of 29.37 percent of total gross revenue would have been put at risk in 2005, and a period low of 9.2 percent would have been put at risk in 2009. In all remaining years, total impacts would have been between 11.29 percent and 19.44 percent. These combined impacts somewhat mask much higher impacts, in percentage terms, in some of the individual target fisheries. The flatfish trawl fisheries, for example, would have had impacts ranging from as high as 39.74 percent in 2005 to a low of 9.39 percent in 2009 with impacts near or exceeding 15 percent in all but one of the remaining years in the analysis. Similarly, the Pacific cod pot fishery would have had just over 22 percent of its gross revenue at risk in 2005 and 2008, and between 11.71 and 17.54 percent at risk in each of the years of 2004, 2006, and 2009. The Pacific cod hook and line fishery would have had more than 20 percent of its gross revenue put at risk in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Table 1-13 and Table 1-14 provide similar treatment for Option 2 of alternative 4, which is the smaller closure area represented by the range of PIBKC stock distribution from 1984 to 2009. As would be expected, this smaller area results in smaller catch amounts occurring within the closure area. However, the most heavily impacted sectors are still flatfish trawl, and Pacific cod hook and line. The total tonnage occurring in this area has ranged from a high of 62,078 (2005) tons to the 2010 period low of 9,762.

Table 1-14 shows that these tons at risk range between \$8.7 million (2010) and \$68.4 million (2005) in potential gross revenue impacts. The greatest impacts would have occurred in the flatfish fisheries with \$43.6 million of gross revenue at risk in 2005 followed by Pacific cod hook and line fisheries that would have had about \$20.5 million in gross revenue at risk in the high year of 2005. Of note; however, is that those values fall considerably in more recent years and the 2010 values would have been \$4.4 million and \$3.8 million for the flatfish and Pacific cod hook and line fisheries, respectively. The Pacific cod pot fishery would have had a range of between \$4.3 million (2005) and \$0.6 million (2003) in gross revenue at risk during the 2003-2009 timeframe with the 2009 value at \$0.9 million.

Table 1-15 provides estimates of gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area. Combining the gross revenue at risk estimates for all potentially affected fisheries and comparing those impacts with the total gross revenue earned in those potentially affected fisheries (from table 3 above) reveals that a period high of 19.38 percent of total gross revenue would have been put at risk in 2005, and a period low of 2.91 percent would have been put at risk in 2010. These combined impacts somewhat mask much higher impacts, in percentage terms, in some of the individual target fisheries. The flatfish fisheries, for example, had impacts ranging from as high as 25.26 percent in 2005 to as low as 2.71 percent in 2009. Similarly, the Pacific cod pot fishery would have had just over 22 percent of its gross revenue at risk in 2005 and between 11 and 14.75 percent at risk in each of the years of 2004 and 2006 through 2008. The Pacific cod hook and line fishery would have had 12.75 percent of its gross revenue put at risk in 2005, and between 5 percent and 11 percent put at risk in each of the years of 2004 and 2006 through 2008.

1.4.2.6 Reprojection of Catch Under Alternative 4

Figure A21 through A26, in the accompanying Appendix A, provides the results of the spatial/temporal reprojection to remaining open areas of catch that occurred within the Alternative annual closure areas by year from 2003 through 2010. As discussed in section A1 of the appendix, this reprojection utilizes a stepwise matching algorithm to reproject catch to open areas where catch was observed to have occurred in the same week, and/or month, and within the same target fishery, gear type, and, to the extent possible, to the same vessel type (see methodology discussion in Appendix section A1).

Figure A21 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1975-09 (Alt. 4, Option 1) area in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery annually from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch tended to occur in several distinct locations within the closure area; however, reprojection of that catch occurs in a much more dispersed pattern that varies as to its direction from the closure boundary in various years. While the pattern is not consistent from year to year it does appear that the greater dispersion of the catch outside the closure area can be expected to increase operating costs via additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, possibly increased running time could increase costs.

Figure A22 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1975-09 (Alt. 4, Option 1) area in the Pacific Cod Pot Hook and Line fishery annually from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch was highly concentrated along the Southern boundary of the closure area and reprojection of that catch was highly dispersed around the outside of the closure area. Thus, it appears that the greater dispersion of the catch outside the closure area can be expected to increase operating costs via additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, and possibly increased running time.

Figure A23 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1975-09 (Alt. 4, Option 1) area in the flatfish non-pelagic trawl fishery annually from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch was concentrated along the edge of the PIHCZ with the greatest concentrations to the Northwest corner of the area. Catch rejections, while showing some high intensity locations near the North boundary of the closure areas are generally reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern around the edge of the closure area with much of the reprojection appearing to the East. Thus, it appears that the greater dispersion of the catch outside the closure area can be expected to increase operating costs via additional tows, greater searching behavior, and possibly increased running time.

Figure A24 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1984-09 (Alt. 4 Option 2) area in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch tends to occur in a small number of locations within the closure area and when reprojected a majority of the catch would occur in a similarly few discrete areas at the South edge of the closure area and fairly close to many of the catch locations within the closure. Also shown; however, is relatively small amounts of catch being reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern further to the Southeast as well as to the distant Western edge of the closure area. Thus, while it appears that the majority of catch put at risk by the closure could be made up nearby with little impact to operating costs, some additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, possibly increased running time could increase costs.

Figure A25 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1984-09 (Alt. 4 Option 2) area in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch tends to occur in with high intensity along the Southern edge of the closure areas and would be reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern further to the South and West extending out the edge of the

50nm reprojection area. Thus, it is likely that this degree of catch dispersion will result in additional operating costs, via more sets, greater searching behavior, and possibly increased running time.

Figure A26 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1984-09 (Alt. 4, Option 2) area in the flatfish non-pelagic trawl fishery annually from 2003-2010. This reprojection shows that catch was concentrated along the edge of the PIHCZ with the greatest concentrations to either the Northwest corner of the area or near the East boundary depending on the year. Catch reprojections, while showing some high intensity locations near the North boundary of the closure areas are generally reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern around the edge of the closure area with much of the reprojection appearing to the West and the East. Thus, it appears that the greater dispersion of the catch outside the closure area can be expected to increase operating costs via additional tows, greater searching behavior, and possibly increased running time.

Table 1-4: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	390.33	2,414.65	2,769.01	1,644.14	2,155.53	1,388.53	306.31	125.23
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	0.00	50.04	1,110.83	192.91	196.95	129.31	349.92	223.21
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	3,406.46	3,994.91	4,927.49	3,352.41	2,055.74	1,304.80	892.20	1,314.79
Total All Non-Confidential Catch				3,796.78	6,459.61	8,807.33	5,189.45	4,408.23	2,822.63	1,548.42	1,663.23

Table 1-5: Hypothetical Aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” in round weight equivalent first wholesale value (\$ millions) based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	\$0.3	\$2.8	\$3.8	\$2.9	\$4.4	\$2.9	\$0.4	\$0.2
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$1.5	\$0.3	\$0.4	\$0.3	\$0.4	\$0.3
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	\$2.8	\$4.7	\$6.8	\$5.9	\$4.2	\$2.7	\$1.1	\$1.6
Total				\$3.1	\$7.6	\$12.2	\$9.1	\$9.0	\$5.8	\$1.9	\$2.1

Table 1-6: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 2 (PIHCZ) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	1.77%	14.20%	19.78%	8.65%	11.98%	7.31%	2.19%	0.89%
Pacific Cod	All	CP + CV	All-non pot	3.10%	3.64%	5.21%	3.58%	2.78%	1.53%	1.22%	1.51%
Percent Revenue of Affected Fisheries				2.88%	5.05%	6.77%	4.40%	4.45%	2.50%	1.33%	1.43%

Table1-7: Hypothetical Aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	"c"	"c"	1,578.30	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
Pacific Cod	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	1,134.59	786.33	3,558.27	2,053.12	1,832.77	522.64	321.70	348.00
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	2,722.22	47.77	1,119.79	30.15	4,580.60	7,441.31	15.37	33.00
Total All Non-Confidential Catch				3,856.81	834.10	6,256.36	2,083.26	6,413.37	7,963.95	337.07	381.00

Table1-8: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (\$ millions) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	"c"	"c"	\$2.2	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
Pacific Cod	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$4.9	\$3.6	\$3.7	\$1.1	\$0.4	\$0.4
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	\$1.9	\$0.1	\$1.1	\$0.0	\$4.2	\$5.9	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total				\$2.8	\$1.0	\$8.2	\$3.6	\$7.9	\$6.9	\$0.4	\$0.5

Table1-9: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 3 (ADF&G) closure area, 2003-2010. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	"c"	"c"	11.27%	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
Pacific Cod	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	1.03%	0.71%	3.07%	2.07%	2.26%	0.56%	0.32%	0.34%
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	1.77%	0.08%	0.64%	0.02%	2.19%	2.80%	0.01%	0.01%

Percent Revenue of Affected Fisheries	1.31%	0.33%	2.33%	0.94%	2.00%	1.57%	0.14%	0.15%
--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Table1-10: Hypothetical aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	1,153	2,566	3,089	2,784	3,156	4,212	1,639	979
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	0	1,134	2,085	906	849	495	1,182	901
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	18,793	21,601	21,573	20,509	11,353	10,281	8,071	17,117
Flatfish	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	6	"c"	0	0	4	0	0	0
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP	NP Trawl	29,115	26,281	69,552	35,253	48,455	25,381	20,846	31,579
Total All Non-Confidential Catch				49,067	51,582	96,299	59,452	63,817	40,369	31,738	50,576

Table 1-11: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (\$ millions) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	\$1.0	\$3.0	\$4.3	\$4.9	\$6.5	\$8.7	\$2.1	\$1.2
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	\$0.0	\$1.3	\$2.9	\$1.6	\$1.7	\$1.0	\$1.5	\$1.1
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	\$15.6	\$25.3	\$29.9	\$36.0	\$23.2	\$21.2	\$10.1	\$21.4
Flatfish	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	\$0.0	"c"	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP	NP Trawl	\$20.4	\$22.2	\$68.6	\$34.6	\$43.5	\$20.0	\$14.5	\$21.9
Total				\$36.9	\$51.8	\$105.7	\$77.1	\$74.9	\$50.9	\$28.1	\$45.7

Table 1-12: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	5.24%	15.10%	22.06%	14.65%	17.54%	22.17%	11.71%	6.99%
Pacific Cod	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	17.08%	20.48%	20.40%	21.63%	15.06%	11.46%	9.07%	17.66%
Flatfish	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	0.10%	"c"	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP	NP Trawl	18.91%	15.46%	39.74%	19.16%	22.75%	9.54%	9.39%	14.22%
Percent Revenue of Affected Fisheries				16.68%	17.32%	29.37%	19.44%	18.64%	11.29%	9.20%	15.87%

Table 1-13: Hypothetical aggregate “Tonnage At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	735	2,508	3,081	2,132	2,622	2,105	681	454
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	0	243	1,500	556	380	297	655	382
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	9,081	9,797	13,291	10,408	6,328	4,518	2,520	2,610
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	22,135	14,497	44,206	15,020	14,975	22,391	6,006	6,316
Total All Non-Confidential Catch				31,951	27,046	62,078	28,116	24,306	29,311	9,862	9,762

Table 1-14: Hypothetical aggregate “Gross revenue At Risk” (dollars) in round weight equivalent first wholesale value based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	\$0.6	\$2.9	\$4.3	\$3.7	\$5.4	\$4.3	\$0.9	\$0.6
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	\$0.0	\$0.3	\$2.1	\$1.0	\$0.8	\$0.6	\$0.8	\$0.5
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	\$7.5	\$11.5	\$18.4	\$18.3	\$12.9	\$9.3	\$3.2	\$3.3
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	\$15.5	\$12.2	\$43.6	\$14.7	\$13.4	\$17.6	\$4.2	\$4.4
Total				\$23.6	\$26.9	\$68.4	\$37.7	\$32.5	\$31.9	\$9.0	\$8.7

Table 1-15: Gross revenue, as a percent of target and total gross revenue, put “At Risk” in the Alternative 4 Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) closure area, 2003-2010.

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	Year							
				2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	3.34%	14.75%	22.01%	11.22%	14.57%	11.08%	4.86%	3.24%
Pacific Cod	All	CP + CV	Hook & Line	8.26%	9.05%	12.75%	11.07%	8.28%	5.12%	3.11%	2.93%
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	14.37%	8.53%	25.26%	8.16%	7.03%	8.42%	2.71%	2.85%
Percent Revenue of Affected Fisheries				10.88%	9.18%	19.38%	9.73%	8.26%	7.21%	3.01%	2.91%

1.4.2.1 Gross revenue at Risk under Alternatives 5

Four cap levels are considered under this alternative. As detailed in section 2.5 and table 2.1 of the accompanying EA Alternative 5 PSC caps, under the four options, would be set at either the OFL (currently 4,000 lbs) or the ABC (estimated at 3,600 lbs) as well as caps set at 90 percent of ABC (3,240 lbs), and 75% of ABC (2,700 lbs.). In analyzing the impacts of closing groundfish fisheries, consideration was given to when the cap itself is reached thereby triggering area closures as defined in Alternative 5. The only year that the cap was reached, historically, was 2007. In 2007 the OFL would have been exceeded the week of September 22nd. Likewise the ABC level, 90% of the ABC, and 75% of the ABC would all have been exceeded in the same week, specifically on week ending date of September 22nd. Thus, it is not possible to differentiate between the Alternative 5 cap level options in this impact analysis as they were all historically exceeded within the same week and only in 2007. Thus for analytical purposes the cap options of Alternative 5 are considered to be equivalent⁵.

Table 1-16 tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of triggered closure of the PIHCZ area (As defined in Alternative 2) in the weeks following September 22, 2007. Triggered closure of this area in 2007 would have placed about 658 tons of harvest, and about \$134 million in gross revenues, at risk. These impacts would have occurred in the open access Pacific cod pot, and hook and line, fisheries; however, some confidential data cannot be reported in the CDQ hook and line fishery for Pacific cod. In percentage terms, the tonnage and gross revenue totals represent just under 15 percent of the total catch taken from the PIHCZ area in 2007, and about 15 percent of the gross revenue from that area. In comparison to the total BSAI gross revenue earned within these target fisheries, the impacts of the triggered closure of the PIHCZ, in 2007, would have represented about 1.5 percent of the value of the Pacific cod Pot fishery, less than half of a percent of the value of the BSAI Pacific cod open access hook and line fishery, and the total gross revenue at risk would have been approximately .06 percent of the estimated total gross revenue of these fisheries BSAI wide.

⁵ The OFL here is 4,000lbs while under the Tier 5 assumption the ACL is considered to be 3,600lbs, a difference of only 400 lbs. This difference would be even smaller under a 'true' Tier 4 ACL determination using the P* approach of 0.49 established under the Council's preferred alternative.

Table1-17 tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of triggered closure of the ADF&G area (As defined in Alternative 3) in the weeks following September 22, 2007. Triggered closure of this area in 2007 would have placed about 143 tons of harvest, and about \$.3 million in gross revenues, at risk. These impacts would have occurred in the Pacific cod hook and line, fisheries; however, some confidential data cannot be reported in the Pacific cod pot fishery and the flatfish trawl fishery. In percentage terms, the tonnage and gross revenue totals represent 2.2 percent of the total catch taken from the ADF&G area in 2007, and about 3.7 percent of the gross revenue from that area. In comparison to the total BSAI gross revenue earned within these target fisheries, the impacts of the triggered closure of the ADF&G area, in 2007, would have represented about .18 percent of the value of the Pacific cod hook and line fishery, and the total gross revenue at risk would have been approximately .01 percent of the estimated total gross revenue of these fisheries BSAI wide.

Table1-18 tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of triggered closure of area associated with the PIBKC stock distribution from 1975 to 2009 (As defined in Alternative 4, option 1) in the weeks following September 22, 2007. Triggered closure of this area in 2007 would have placed about 2.414 tons of harvest, and about \$3 million in gross revenues, at risk. These impacts would have occurred in the open access Pacific cod pot and hook and line fisheries, and in the CDQ Pacific cod hook and line fishery; however, some confidential data cannot be reported in the CDQ and open access flatfish fisheries. In percentage terms, the tonnage and gross revenue totals represent 3.2 percent of the total catch taken from the area in 2007, and about 3.5 percent of the gross revenue from that area. In comparison to the total BSAI gross revenue earned within these target fisheries, the impacts of the triggered closure of the area, in 2007, would have represented about 1.7 percent of the value of the Pacific cod Pot fishery, less than half of a percent of the value of the CDQ Pacific cod hook and line fishery, about 1 percent of the value of the Pacific cod open access hook and line fishery. The total gross revenue at risk would have been approximately .75 percent of the estimated total gross revenue of these fisheries BSAI wide.

Table 1-19 tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of triggered closure of area associated with the PIBKC stock distribution from 1984 to 2009 (As defined in Alternative 4, option 2) in the weeks following September 22, 2007. Triggered closure of this area, in 2007, would have placed about 1,182 tons of harvest, and about \$2.4 million in gross revenues, at risk. These impacts would have occurred in the open access Pacific cod pot and hook and line fisheries, and in the CDQ Pacific cod hook and line fishery; however, some confidential data cannot be reported in the CDQ and open access flatfish fisheries. In percentage terms, the tonnage and gross revenue totals represent 3.8 percent of the total catch taken from the area in 2007, and 6.26 percent of the gross revenue from that area. In comparison to the total BSAI gross revenue earned within these target fisheries, the impacts of the triggered closure of the area, in 2007, would have represented about 1.7 percent of the value of the Pacific cod Pot fishery, .26 of a percent of the value of the CDQ Pacific cod hook and line fishery, and .81 percent of the value of the Pacific cod open access hook and line fishery. The total gross revenue at risk would have been approximately .6 percent of the estimated total gross revenue of these fisheries BSAI wide.

Table 1-16: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the PIHCZ area, 2003-2009. Option A is all groundfish catch in the PIHCZ area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	2007 Post 9/22 Catch	Gross revenue at Risk	Revenue as percent of Annual Total*
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	272.38	\$0.56	1.51%
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	"c"	\$0.00	
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	385.55	\$0.79	0.48%
Total				657.93	\$1.34	0.33%
Percent of PIBKC Area Total				14.93%	14.93%	

* Gross revenue as percent of annual total is expressed as percentage of the annual total for the Species/Gear group and is not broken down by management program

Table1-17: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the ADF&G area, 2003-2008. Option A is all groundfish catch in the ADF&G area and Option B is Pot Pacific Cod only (black highlighted line) ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	2007 Post 9/22 Catch	Gross revenue at Risk	Gross revenue as percent of Annual Total*
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	"c"	"c"	0.18%
Pacific Cod	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	142.88	\$0.29	
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	"c"	"c"	
Total				142.88	\$0.29	0.07%
Percent of ADF&G Area Total				2.23%	3.72%	

* Gross revenue as percent of annual total is expressed as percentage of the annual total for the Species/Gear group and is not broken down by management program

Table1-18: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue (\$ millions) “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the Option 1(1975-2009 PIBKC distribution) area, 2003-2008. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	2007 Post 9/22 Catch	Gross revenue at Risk	Gross revenue as percent of Annual Total*
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	495.20	\$0.62	1.69%
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	607.27	\$0.76	0.46%
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	1,311.79	\$1.64	0.99%
Flatfish	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	"c"	"c"	
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP	NP Trawl	"c"	"c"	
Total				2,414.26	\$3.02	0.75%
Percent of PIBKC75 Area Total				3.78%	4.04%	

Table 1-19: Hypothetical aggregate tonnage and gross revenue “At Risk” based on retained tons of groundfish caught in the Alternative 5 triggered closure of the Option 2 (1984-2009 PIBKC distribution) area, 2003-2008. ("c" Indicates that data is confidential)

Target Species	Mgmt.	Vessel Type	Gear Type	2007 Post 9/22 Catch	Gross revenue at Risk	Gross revenue as percent of Annual Total
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Pot	312.77	\$0.64	1.74%
Pacific Cod	CDQ	CP	Hook & Line	212.53	\$0.43	0.26%
Pacific Cod	OA	CP + CV	Hook & Line	656.37	\$1.34	0.81%
Flatfish	CDQ + OA	CP + CV	NP Trawl	"c"	"c"	
Total				1,181.67	\$2.42	0.6%
Percent of PIBKC84 Area Total				4.86%	7.43%	

1.4.2.2 Reprojection of Catch Under Alternative 5

Figure A7 through A15, in the accompanying Appendix A provides the results of the spatial/temporal reprojection to remaining open areas of catch that occurred within the Alternative 5a,b,c, and d, triggered closure areas after the closure was triggered post September 22nd of 2007. As discussed in section A1 of the appendix, this reprojection utilizes a stepwise matching algorithm to reproject catch to open areas where catch was observed to have occurred in the same week, and/or month, and within the same target fishery, gear type, and, to the extent possible, to the same vessel type (see methodology discussion in Appendix section A1).

Figure A3 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIHCZ area (Alt. 5a) in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery in 2007. This reprojection shows that catch occurred in two distinct locations within the PIHCZ area; however, catch is reprojected, based on observed catch outside the closure area, in a highly dispersed pattern. This suggests that fairly high catches occurring in discrete locations within the closure area will have to be made up in multiple areas with history of smaller catches. This could mean additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, and generally increased costs to harvest the catch put at risk by the closure.

Figure A8 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the PIHCZ area (Alt. 5a) in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery in 2007. This reprojection shows that catch occurred in several fairly distinct locations within the PIHCZ area; however, catch is reprojected, based on observed catch outside the closure area, with somewhat more dispersed pattern. This suggests that fairly high catches occurring in discrete locations within the closure area will have to be made up in multiple areas with history of smaller catches. Similar to the result for the Pacific Cod pot fishery, this could mean additional sets, greater searching behavior, and generally increased costs to harvest the catch put at risk by the closure.

Figure A9 shows the reprojection of catch that would have been closed out of the ADF&G area (Alt. 5b) in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery in 2007. This reprojection shows that nearly all catch occurred in a single distinct location within the ADF&G area; however, catch is reprojected, based on observed catch outside the closure area, with a considerably more dispersed pattern and at the far edge of the 50nm reprojection limit. This suggests that very high catches occurring in a single discrete location within the

closure area will have to be made up in multiple areas with history of smaller catches and at a considerable distance from the closure area. The greater dispersion of the reprojected catch, relative to catch within the closure area, and the considerable distance away from the closure area to which catch is reprojected suggests the need for additional sets, greater searching behavior, longer running time to the reprojected area, and generally increased costs to harvest the catch put at risk by the closure.

Figure A10 shows the reprojected catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1975-09 (Alt. 5c) area in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery beginning on September 22nd in 2007. This reprojected catch shows that catch occurred in several distinct locations within the closure area and when reprojected a majority of the catch would occur in a similarly few discrete areas at the Southeast edge of the closure area and very close to many of the catch locations within the closure. Also shown; however, is relatively small amounts of catch being reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern further to the Southeast as well as to the distant Western edge of the closure area. Thus, while it appears that the majority of catch put at risk by the closure could be made up nearby with little impact to operating costs, some additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, possibly increased running time could increase costs.

Figure A11 shows the reprojected catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1975-09 (Alt. 5c) area in the Pacific Cod Hook and Line CDQ fishery beginning on September 22nd in 2007. This reprojected catch shows that catch within the closure was concentrated in multiple grid cells along the Southwest edge of the closure area. Reprojection of this catch occurs to a large extent immediately adjacent to the catch within the closure area; however, there are reprojected catch of substantial proportions of the overall catch at the edge of the 50nm reprojected zone to the Southeast as well as dispersed reprojected catch of small amounts of catch elsewhere. This suggests that much of the catch could be made up in the area immediately adjacent to the closure boundary; however, some may also have to be made up in more distant locations resulting in the potential for increased operating costs. Figure A12 provides the similar reprojected catch for the open access portion of this fishery with similar results.

Figure A13 shows the reprojected catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1984-09 (Alt. 5d) area in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery beginning on September 22nd in 2007. This reprojected catch shows that catch occurred in two distinct locations within the closure area and when reprojected a majority of the catch would occur in a similarly few discrete areas at the South edge of the closure area and fairly close to many of the catch locations within the closure. Also shown; however, is relatively small amounts of catch being reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern further to the Southeast as well as to the distant Western edge of the closure area. Thus, while it appears that the majority of catch put at risk by the closure could be made up nearby with little impact to operating costs, some additional pot lifts, greater searching behavior, possibly increased running time could increase costs.

Figure A14 shows the reprojected catch that would have been closed out of the PIBKC 1984-09 (Alt. 5d) area in the Pacific Cod CDQ Hook and Line fishery beginning on September 22nd in 2007. This reprojected catch shows that catch occurred in several locations within the closure area and when reprojected a majority of the catch would occur in a similar number of areas at the Southwest edge of the closure area and fairly close to many of the catch locations within the closure. Also shown; however, is relatively small amounts of catch being reprojected in a widely dispersed pattern further to the Southeast. Thus, while it appears that the majority of catch put at risk by the closure could be made up nearby with little impact to operating costs, some additional sets, greater searching behavior, and possibly increased running time could increase costs. Figure A15 provides a similar result for the open access portion of this fishery.

1.4.2.3 Gross revenue At Risk Under Alternative 5d Threshold Based Trigger Closures

Table 1-20 tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of threshold based triggered closure of the area associated with the PIBKC stock distribution from 1984 to 2009 (As defined in Alternative 5d option 4) in the weeks following triggering of the closure in affected fisheries. Under the 20 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery closures would have been triggered in 2004 and 2006 in the first week of September (4th and 2nd respectively). These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,547 and 1,909 tons at risk, with associated gross revenue at risk of \$4.2 million and \$3.3 million, which would have represented 3.2 percent and 1.9 percent of annual gross revenue. The impacts would have accrued to both the open access and CDQ Pacific Cod hook and line fisheries and upon both CVs and CPs.

Under the 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery closures would have been triggered in 2005 and 2007 in the week ending February 12th and September 22nd respectively. These triggered closures would have respectively put 2,238 and 254 tons at risk, with associated gross revenue at risk of \$3 million and \$.5 million, which would have represented 16 percent and 1.4 percent of annual gross revenue. The impacts would have accrued in the open access Pacific Cod Pot fishery and upon both CVs and CPs.

Under the 40 percent trawl threshold in the yellowfin sole fishery closures would have been triggered in 2003 and 2006 in the week ending August 19th and April 15th, respectively. These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,465 and 4,500 tons at risk, with associated gross revenue at risk of \$2.4 million and \$4.4 million, which would have represented 2.3 percent and 2.4 percent of annual gross revenue in the yellowfin sole trawl fishery. The impacts would have accrued in the open access yellowfin sole trawl fishery and upon both CVs and CPs.

Table 1-20: Alternative 5d Threshold Analysis Fishery Impacts: Potentially Foregone Catch, Gross revenue, and Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue

Threshold	Year Threshold Exceeded	Post Week Ending Date	Target Fishery	Mgmt. and Vessel Type	Potentially Forgone Catch	Gross revenue At Risk (\$millions)	Percent of Annual Target Fishery Gross revenue
20 % Hook and Line	2004	Sept. 4th	P. COD	CDQ+OA CP+CV	3547	\$4.157	3.20%
	2006	Sept. 2nd	P. COD	CDQ CP	18	\$0.032	0.02%
				OA CP	1891	\$3.319	1.91%
40% Pot	2005	Feb. 12th	P. COD	OA CP	1648	\$2.287	11.77%
				OA CV	590	\$0.820	4.22%
	2007	Sept. 22nd	P. COD	OA CP+CV	254	\$0.520	1.41%
40% Trawl	2003*	Aug. 19th	Y.SOLE	OA CP	3465	\$2.429	2.25%
	2006	April 15th	Y. SOLE	OA CP	4475	\$4.390	2.43%
				OA CV	25	\$0.024	0.01%

* only applies under the 75% of ABC CAP, suboption 4 of Alternative 5d,

1.4.2.4 Reprojection of Catch Under Alternative 5D Threshold Based Triggered Closures

Figure A1 through A6, in the accompanying Appendix A provides the results of the spatial/temporal reprojection to remaining open areas of catch that occurred within the Alternative 5d closure area (PIBKC 1984-09 Area) after the closure was triggered. As discussed in section A1 of the appendix, this reprojection utilizes a stepwise matching algorithm to reproject catch to open areas where catch was observed to have occurred in the same week, and/or month, and within the same target fishery, gear type, and, to the extent possible, to the same vessel type (see methodology discussion in Appendix section A1).

In the 2004 closure of the Pacific Cod Hook and Line fishery (Figure A-1), based on the 20 percent threshold trigger, catch reprojection is widely dispersed around the South and West boundaries of the closure area, which suggests that the catch within the closure area occurred at a higher intensity than when reprojected to the open area. As a result, it is likely that such a closure would tend to increase the time needed for vessels to harvest the TAC available to them. This would tend to increase operating costs, although to what extent is unknown. It also appears that there is considerable opportunity for the fleet to make up catch, and gross revenue, put at risk because Pacific Cod catch is broadly distributed throughout the remaining open area as opposed to in only a few discrete locations. This suggests less likelihood for gear conflicts and/or localized intra-season depletion. Figure A2 presents a similar reprojection picture for the 2006 closure within this fishery.

The reprojection of catch due to a 2005 40 percent threshold trigger closure in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery is shown in Figure A3. In this case, catch is highly concentrated, within the closure area, to the East of the Pribilof Islands and is associated with bathymetric features. Also important to note is that unlike any of the other threshold based triggered closures, which all had 100 percent matching of catch within the closed area to the open area within target, gear, and vessel type, this particular closure scenario resulted in only 36 percent catch matching. This means that even with the final matching step of relaxing the week ending date constraint and allowing any match within the month, 74 percent of the catch that occurred within the closed area could not be match to harvest activity outside of the closed area. This is simply because there was very little catch recorded outside the closure area by Pacific Cod Pot vessels from February 12th through the end of the year and this fact suggests that the closure area was highly important to the Pacific Cod Pot fishery, at least in 2005. In contrast, reprojection of catch in the second year of a closure under this threshold (2007) did match at 100 percent and shows much more dispersed effort outside the closure area in that year. Thus, it is apparent that there is considerable inter-annual variability in effort and catch location within this fishery,

Figure A5 shows the reprojection of catch due to the 40 percent threshold trigger in the yellowfin sole trawl fishery in August of 2003. Immediately apparent is that the trawl effort within the closure area is concentrated along the East and North edge of the existing Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone, which has been in place as a trawl closure since 1995. For an overlay of the PIHCZ area with the 1984-2009 PIBKC area please see figure 10-5 in the accompanying EA. Reprojection of catch put at risk under this threshold based trigger closure is dispersed to the East and to the small square indentation in the closure area to the North. This suggests that yellowfin sole is widely dispersed outside the closure area but more concentrated just inside the boundary and in the open square to the north. Thus, the trawl fleet may have greater operating time, and thereby costs, needed to harvest the same quantity of fish due to its greater dispersal. Figure A6 provides a similar reprojection for a closure under this threshold beginning in April of 2006. In this case, catch is reprojected in a fairly concentrated way to the East of the closure area. This could suggest the potential for crowding on the grounds; however, it is not presently possible to make a definitive determination of what effect the reprojection of effort, and thereby catch, would have on an operator's site choice in the presence of crowding.

1.4.3 Comparison of Impacts by Alternative

Table 1-21 through Table 1-23 provide a comparison of the potential impacts, in terms of tons and gross revenue at risk, of each of the Proposed closure areas (Alt. 2, 3, and 4) on the Pacific Cod pot gear fishery. As one would expect, the tons at risk increase with the size of the closure area and that finding is consistent across all years. Non-confidential tonnage put at risk ranges from 125 metric tons (Alt. 2, 2010) to as much as 4,212 metric tons (Alt. 4-1, 2008). Gross revenue effects range from near zero to \$9 million and the range of impacts in terms of percent of total gross revenue earned in the BSAI Pacific Cod pot fishery is from .89 percent to more than 22 percent (Alt. 4-1, 2008) of total fishery gross revenue. These values are also depicted graphically in Figure 1.

Table 1-21: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Tons at Risk.

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	390	2,415	2,769	1,644	2,156	1,389	306	125
A3 ADF&G	"c"	"c"	1,578	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
A4-2 PIBK84	735	2,508	3,081	2,132	2,622	2,105	681	454
A4-1 PIBK75	1,153	2,566	3,089	2,784	3,156	4,212	1,639	979

Table 1-22: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk.

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	\$0	\$3	\$4	\$3	\$4	\$3	\$0	\$0
A3 ADF&G	"c"	"c"	\$2	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
A4-2 PIBK84	\$1	\$3	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$4	\$1	\$1
A4-1 PIBK75	\$1	\$3	\$4	\$5	\$6	\$9	\$2	\$1

Table 1-23: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk as percent of Target Fishery Total Gross revenue.

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	1.77%	14.20%	19.78%	8.65%	11.98%	7.31%	2.19%	0.89%
A3 ADF&G	"c"	"c"	11.27%	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"	"c"
A4-2 PIBK84	3.34%	14.75%	22.01%	11.22%	14.57%	11.08%	4.86%	3.24%
A4-1 PIBK75	5.24%	15.10%	22.06%	14.65%	17.54%	22.17%	11.71%	6.99%

Figure 1: Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Effects




Table 1-24 through Table 1-26 provide a comparison of the potential impacts, in terms of tons and gross revenue at risk, of each of the Proposed closure areas on the all groundfish fisheries combined. In contrast to the Pacific cod pot fishery, the distribution of groundfish effort in the flatfish fisheries within the ADF&G area results in larger tons at risk tabulations in the Alternative 3 ADF&G areas than occurs in the Alternative 1 PIHCZ area in several, but not all, years. Though there are a few exceptions, tons at risk tend to increase with the size of the closure area and that finding is consistent across all years. Non-confidential tonnage put at risk ranges from 337 metric tons (Alt. 3, 2009) to more than 96,000 metric tons (Alt. 4-1, 2005). Gross revenue effects range from near zero to \$106 million and the range of impacts in terms of percent of total gross revenue earned in the BSAI Pacific Cod and flatfish fisheries is from .14 percent to approximately 29.4 percent (Alt. 4-1, 2005) of total fishery gross revenue. These values are also depicted graphically in Figure 2.

Table 1-24: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Tons at Risk

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	3,797	6,460	8,807	5,189	4,408	2,823	1,548	1,663
A3 ADF&G	3,857	834	6,256	2,083	6,413	7,964	337	381
A4-2 PIBK84	31,951	27,046	62,078	28,116	24,306	29,311	9,862	9,762
A4-1 PIBK75	49,067	51,582	96,299	59,452	63,817	40,369	31,738	50,576

Table 1-25: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	\$3	\$8	\$12	\$9	\$9	\$6	\$2	\$2
A3 ADF&G	\$3	\$1	\$8	\$4	\$8	\$7	\$0	\$1
A4-2 PIBK84	\$24	\$27	\$68	\$38	\$33	\$32	\$9	\$9
A4-1 PIBK75	\$37	\$52	\$106	\$77	\$75	\$51	\$28	\$46

Table 1-26: All Fishery Impacts by Alternative: Gross revenue at Risk as percent of Target Fishery Total Gross revenue.

Alternative Area	Year							
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A2 PIHCZ	2.88%	5.05%	6.77%	4.40%	4.45%	2.50%	1.33%	1.43%
A3 ADF&G	1.31%	0.33%	2.33%	0.94%	2.00%	1.57%	0.14%	0.15%
A4-2 PIBK84	10.88%	9.18%	19.38%	9.73%	8.26%	7.21%	3.01%	2.91%
A4-1 PIBK75	16.68%	17.32%	29.37%	19.44%	18.64%	11.29%	9.20%	15.87%

Figure 2 All Fisheries Combined, Effects of Alternatives




Table 1-27 through 1-29 and Figure 3 through

Figure 5 provide comparisons of the effect of the various options of Alternative 5 triggered area closures on potentially affected fisheries. Unfortunately, all impacts associated with the flatfish fisheries are confidential and cannot be divulged. In the Pacific cod fishery, the greatest impacts of the triggered closure would have occurred in the hook and line combined CP+CV grouping where 1,312 tons are put at risk were a closure in the largest stock distribution area (A5c) and this option would also result in the largest total impacts of 2,414 metric tons across all of the Pacific cod fisheries potentially affected. The Alternative 5d option, which is the second largest triggered closure area under consideration, would have had the second highest total impact of 1,182 tons, most of which comes from the hook and line CP+CV grouping. Due to confidentiality, only a combined Pacific cod hook and line group could be reported, with 143 metric tons put at risk. Extending the existing trawl closure in the PIHCZ to all groundfish fisheries, as a triggered closure, would have put 271 and 386 tons (658 total) at risk in the Pacific cod pot CP+CV group and the Pacific cod hook and line CP+CV group, respectively. These tonnages, when converted to gross revenue at risk, result in total potential impacts ranging from \$0.292 million (ADF&G area) up to just over \$3 million (PIBKC75 area). Most of the potential impact estimates, in specific gear and target fisheries, approach or exceed a half a million dollars, while the largest potential gross revenue at risk impacts exceed \$1.6 million in the Pacific cod hook and line CP+CV grouping.

In percentage terms, these potential impacts are, with the exception of the Pacific cod pot fishery, all less than one percent of the overall target fishery level and the Pacific cod pot fishery impacts are less than two percent of target fishery gross revenue in all areas. However, it is important to recognize that while these values are small, in percentage of overall target fishery gross revenue and aggregate total gross revenue, the potential impacts may be concentrated in a small number of operators.

Table 1-27: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Tons at Risk

Alternative Area	Pacific Cod			Flatfish		Total
	Pot CP+CV	H&L CDQ CP	H&L CP+CV	H&L CP+CV	NP Trawl	
A5a PIHCZ	272	"c"	386			658
A5b ADF&G	"c"		143		"c"	143
A5c PIBK75	495	607	1,312	"c"	"c"	2,414
A5d PIBK84	313	213	656		"c"	1,182

Figure 3: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Options; Tons at Risk




Table 1-28: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Gross revenue at Risk

Alternative Area	Pacific Cod			Flatfish		Total
	Pot CP + CV	H&L CDQ CP	H&L CP+CV	H&L CP+CV	NP Trawl	
A5a PIHCZ	\$0.557	"c"	\$0.788			\$1.345
A5b ADF&G	"c"		\$0.292		"c"	\$0.292
A5c PIBK75	\$0.620	\$0.760	\$1.642	"c"	"c"	\$3.023
A5d PIBK84	\$0.639	\$0.434	\$1.342		"c"	\$2.415

Figure 4: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Options; Gross revenue at Risk




Table 1-29: Alternative 5 Triggered Closure Fishery Impacts: Gross revenue at Risk as a Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue

Alternative Area	Pacific Cod			Flatfish	
	Pot CP+CV	H&L CDQ CP	H&L CP+CV	H&L CP+CV	NP Trawl
A5a PIHCZ	1.51%	"c"	0.48%		
A5b ADF&G	"c"		0.18%		"c"
A5c PIBK75	1.69%	0.46%	0.99%	"c"	"c"
A5d PIBK84	1.74%	0.26%	0.81%		"c"

Figure 5: Effects of Alternative 5 Triggered Closures; Percent of Total Target Fishery Gross revenue





Figure 6 provide comparisons of the effect of the various options of Alternative 5d, threshold based triggered area closures on potentially affected fisheries. This graphical comparison is based on the information provided in Table 1-20, above, which tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of threshold based triggered closures of the area associated with the PIBKC stock distribution from 1984 to 2009 (As defined in Alternative 5d option 4) in the weeks following triggering of the closure in affected fisheries.

Under the 20 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery closures would have been triggered in 2004 and 2006. These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,547 and 1,909 tons at risk. The 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery would have been triggered in 2005 and 2007 and would have put 2,238 and 254 tons at risk, respectively. The 40 percent trawl threshold in the yellowfin sole fishery closures would have been triggered in 2003 and 2006. These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,465 and 4,500 tons at risk,

In terms of gross revenue, the 20 percent threshold closures in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery would have has associated gross revenue at risk of \$4.2 million and \$3.3 million. The 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery closures would have had associated gross revenue at risk of \$3 million and \$.5 million, while the 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery closures would have had associated gross revenue at risk of \$3 million and \$.5 million

In percentage terms, the gross revenue at risk associated with the 20 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery would have represented 3.2 percent and 1.9 percent of annual gross revenue. The gross revenue at risk in the 40 percent threshold closures in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery would have represented 16 percent and 1.4 percent of annual gross revenue, and the gross revenue at risk associated with the 40 percent trawl closures would have represented 2.3 percent and 2.4 percent of annual gross revenue in the yellowfin sole trawl fishery.

Figure 6: Effects of Alternative 5 Threshold Trigger Closures



1.4.4 Potential Impacts on Fishing Operations, Fishery Dependent Communities, Markets, and Consumers.

With any spatial or temporal/spatial closure it is likely that the affected operators will redeploy their fishing effort to adjacent areas where they may expect to make up catch, and gross revenue, put at risk by the closure. The catch reprojection analysis contained in Appendix A attempts to identify where catch may be made up, at what comparative level of intensity, at what dispersion pattern relative to catch within the closure area. That analysis, as discussed above for each alternative has found that there are cases where wide dispersal of the catch reprojection may lead to increased operating costs due to the need to make additional sets, lifts, or tows, as well as increased searching behavior and running time. That analysis has not, however, found a case where it is clear that catch may actually be forgone resulting in reduced landings at ports and reduced fish projects available to markets and consumers. What is more likely is that operational cost increases, especially for food bait, gear, and fuel, will result in increased vessel expenditures within fishing communities thereby generating additional tax gross revenues.

This analysis concludes that it is likely that some or all of the catch can be made up outside of the smallest proposed closure areas (e.g. PIHCZ and ADF&G areas) and under the triggered closures and/or threshold based triggered closures. The larger closure areas, based on historic stock distribution and catch reprojection analysis contained herein, would create potential impacts on catch and gross revenue of more than ten percent of total fishery gross revenue in several years and nearly 30 percent in the worst case under examination here. Redeployment to recover small amounts of catch, while potentially increasing operating cost won't have appreciable impacts on landings, fishing communities, markets, or consumers. However, as impacts increase with the size of the closure area it is less likely that all catch can be made up and, thus, there may be decreased landing and gross revenue, decreased tax revenue and vessel expenditures in fishing communities, and potentially contraction in supply to fish markets potentially affecting consumers via increased prices. A comprehensive treatment of these potential effects would require information on vessel operating costs, spatial modeling of effort location choice, vessel port expenditure information, as well as comprehensive domestic market supply and demand models. Unfortunately, these kinds of information are not available at present and, thus, this analysis has relied on analysis of gross revenue at risk as the best available proxy. Nonetheless, the potential effects of each alternative on secondary operation will scale with the potential effects, in percent of gross revenue terms, on those fishing entities directly affected by the proposed action as analyzed herein.

INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS

1.5 The Purpose of an IRFA

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), first enacted in 1980, was designed to place the burden on the government to review all regulations to ensure that, while accomplishing their intended purposes, they do not unduly inhibit the ability of small entities to compete. The RFA recognizes that the size of a business, unit of government, or nonprofit organization frequently has a bearing on its ability to comply with a Federal regulation. Major goals of the RFA are: (1) to increase agency awareness and understanding of the impact of their regulations on small business, (2) to require that agencies communicate and explain their findings to the public, and (3) to encourage agencies to use flexibility and to provide regulatory relief to small entities. The RFA emphasizes predicting impacts on small entities as a group distinct from other entities and on the consideration of alternatives that may minimize the impacts while still achieving the stated objective of the action.

On March 29, 1996, President Clinton signed the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. Among other things, the new law amended the RFA to allow judicial review of an agency's compliance with the RFA. The 1996 amendments also updated the requirements for a final regulatory flexibility analysis, including a description of the steps an agency must take to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities. Finally, the 1996 amendments expanded the authority of the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA) to file *amicus* briefs in court proceedings involving an agency's violation of the RFA.

In determining the scope, or 'universe', of the entities to be considered in an IRFA, NMFS generally includes only those entities that can reasonably be expected to be directly regulated by the proposed action. If the effects of the rule fall primarily on a distinct segment, or portion thereof, of the industry (e.g., user group, gear type, geographic area), that segment would be considered the universe for the purpose of this analysis. NMFS interprets the intent of the RFA to address negative economic impacts, not beneficial impacts, and thus such a focus exists in analyses that are designed to address RFA compliance.

Data on cost structure, affiliation, and operational procedures and strategies in the fishing sectors subject to the proposed regulatory action are insufficient, at present, to permit preparation of a "factual basis" upon which to certify that the preferred alternative does not have the potential to result in "significant adverse impacts on a substantial number of small entities" (as those terms are defined under RFA).

Because, based on all available information, it is not possible to 'certify' this outcome, should the proposed action be adopted, a formal IRFA has been prepared and is included in this package for Secretarial review.

1.6 What is required in an IRFA?

Under 5 U.S.C., Section 603(b) of the RFA, each IRFA is required to contain:

- A description of the reasons why action by the agency is being considered;

- A succinct statement of the objectives of, and the legal basis for, the proposed rule;
- A description of and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply (including a profile of the industry divided into industry segments, if appropriate);
- A description of the projected reporting, record keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities that will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record;
- An identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed rule;
- A description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rule that accomplish the stated objectives of the proposed action, consistent with applicable statutes, and that would minimize any significant economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities. Consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, the analysis shall discuss significant alternatives, such as:
 1. The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities;
 2. The clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for such small entities;
 3. The use of performance rather than design standards;
 4. An exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.

1.7 What is a small entity?

The RFA recognizes and defines three kinds of small entities: (1) small businesses, (2) small non-profit organizations, and (3) small government jurisdictions.

Small business. Section 601(3) of the RFA defines a ‘small business’ as having the same meaning as ‘small business concern’, which is defined under Section 3 of the Small Business Act. ‘Small business’ or ‘small business concern’ includes any firm that is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation. The SBA has further defined a “small business concern” as one “organized for profit, with a place of business located in the United States, and which operates primarily within the United States or which makes a significant contribution to the U.S. economy through payment of taxes or use of American products, materials or labor... A small business concern may be in the legal form of an individual proprietorship, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, joint venture, association, trust or cooperative, except that where the firm is a joint venture there can be no more than 49 percent participation by foreign business entities in the joint venture.”

The SBA has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the United States, including fish harvesting and fish processing businesses. A business involved in fish harvesting is a small business if it is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates) and if it has combined annual receipts not in excess of \$4.0 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. A seafood processor is a small business if it is independently owned and operated, not dominant in its field of operation, and employs 500 or fewer persons on a full-time, part-time, temporary, or other basis, at all its affiliated operations worldwide. A business involved in both the harvesting and processing of seafood products is a small business if it meets the \$4.0 million criterion for fish harvesting operations. Finally, a wholesale business

servicing the fishing industry is a small business if it employs 100 or fewer persons on a full-time, part-time, temporary, or other basis, at all its affiliated operations worldwide.

The SBA has established “principles of affiliation” to determine whether a business concern is “independently owned and operated.” In general, business concerns are affiliates of each other when one concern controls or has the power to control the other, or a third party controls or has the power to control both. The SBA considers factors such as ownership, management, previous relationships with or ties to another concern, and contractual relationships, in determining whether affiliation exists. Individuals or firms that have identical or substantially identical business or economic interests, such as family members, persons with common investments, or firms that are economically dependent through contractual or other relationships, are treated as one party with such interests aggregated when measuring the size of the concern in question. The SBA counts the receipts or employees of the concern whose size is at issue and those of all its domestic and foreign affiliates, regardless of whether the affiliates are organized for profit, in determining the concern’s size. However, business concerns owned and controlled by Indian Tribes, Alaska Regional or Village Corporations organized pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601), Native Hawaiian Organizations, or Community Development Corporations authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9805 are not considered affiliates of such entities, or with other concerns owned by these entities solely because of their common ownership.

Affiliation may be based on stock ownership when, (1) a person is an affiliate of a concern if the person owns or controls, or has the power to control 50 percent or more of its voting stock, or a block of stock which affords control because it is large compared to other outstanding blocks of stock, or (2) if two or more persons each owns, controls or has the power to control less than 50 percent of the voting stock of a concern, with minority holdings that are equal or approximately equal in size, but the aggregate of these minority holdings is large as compared with any other stock holding, each such person is presumed to be an affiliate of the concern.

Affiliation may be based on common management or joint venture arrangements. Affiliation arises where one or more officers, directors, or general partners, controls the board of directors and/or the management of another concern. Parties to a joint venture also may be affiliates. A contractor and subcontractor are treated as joint ventures if the ostensible subcontractor will perform primary and vital requirements of a contract or if the prime contractor is unusually reliant upon the ostensible subcontractor. All requirements of the contract are considered in reviewing such relationship, including contract management, technical responsibilities, and the percentage of subcontracted work.

Small organizations. The RFA defines “small organizations” as any not-for-profit enterprise that is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.

Small governmental jurisdictions. The RFA defines small governmental jurisdictions as governments of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of fewer than 50,000.

1.8 Reason for considering the action

The purpose of this proposed action is to reduce the risk of overfishing the Pribilof Island blue king crab stock by developing an amended rebuilding plan for this stock in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the national standard guidelines.

1.9 Objectives of, and legal basis for, the proposed action

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the United States has exclusive management authority over all living marine resources found within its EEZ. The management of marine fishery resources is vested in the Secretary of Commerce, with advice from the Regional Fishery Management Councils. The Bering Sea groundfish fishery in the EEZ off Alaska is managed under the BSAI FMP.

The legal basis for this action is contained in section 304(e)(7) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Because the Secretary determined that the current rebuilding plan has not resulted in adequate progress toward rebuilding the stock, compliance with section 304(e)(7) requires that the Council prepare and implement an amended rebuilding plan by September 24, 2011. However, the revised rebuilding plan must certainly comply with National Standard 9 in section 301 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Regulations implementing the National Standard Guidelines state that any conservation and management measure that does not give priority to bycatch avoidance “must be supported by appropriate analysis.” 50 C.F.R. 600.350(d). Further, analysis of management measures “including the status quo,” should consider the impact of minimizing bycatch and bycatch mortality. 50 C.F.R. 600.350(d)(2).

In addition, the rebuilding plan must comply with all ten National Standards established in in Sec. 600.350 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The objective of this action is to facilitate compliance with requirements of the MSA to end and prevent overfishing, rebuild overfished stocks and achieve optimum yield.

1.10 Number and description of small entities regulated by the proposed action

The proposed action(s) being considered by the Council applies to those entities that participate in the directed Pacific cod and flatfish fisheries in the Bering Sea. These entities include the Amendment 80 cooperative affiliated fleet that harvests Pacific cod and flatfish using trawl gear, vessels that target Pacific cod using pot and hook and line gear, and the six western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) organizations that presently receive CDQ allocations of BS pollock as well as some Open Access fishery participants.

The RFA requires a consideration of affiliations between entities for the purpose of assessing if an entity is small. The Amendment 80 cooperative is an important type of affiliation. Some of the entities directly affected by the proposed action are members of the Amendment 80 co-op in 2009, and therefore, are “affiliated” and are considered to be large entities for RFA purposes. While there may be other business affiliations that could result in some small entities actually qualifying as large entities, information on affiliations, other than the Amendment 80 cooperative membership, is not available. Thus, the estimates of small entities presented here ignore such affiliations due to lack of information.

The six CDQ organizations potentially directly regulated by the proposed action are considered to be small entities for RFA purposes. Depending on the Alternative and/or option chosen in this action, impacts may be felt by Pacific cod hook and line, flatfish trawl, and Pacific cod pot target fishery participants. It should be noted; however, that the action does not apply to the American Fisheries Act fleet. Further, the Amendment 80 fleet cooperative listed 16 participating vessels (http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/ram/amd80/09_A80_coop_list.htm) in 2009 and these are considered affiliated large entities. The identification of directly regulated small entities shown below removes AFA and A80 trawl vessels.

Excluding AFA and Amendment 80 vessels, in 2009 there were a total of 115 vessels that caught, or caught and processed less than \$4.0 million ex-vessel value or product value of groundfish and other species in the Bering Sea and are thereby considered small entities (Hiatt, et.al., 2010, Table 36-37, page 73-73, Personal Communication April 2011). Of these small entities, 99 were catcher vessels and 15 were catcher processors. Additionally, there were 64 large entities operating in the BSAI groundfish fisheries in 2009. Of the large entities, 3 were catcher vessels and 61 were catcher processors.

These totals can be further broken down by gear type. Within the hook and line gear sector there were 53 small entities consisting of 38 catcher vessels and 15 catcher processors. Additionally, there were 26 large catcher processors participating in the hook and line groundfish fisheries in the BSAI in 2009.

Within the pot gear sector there were 53 small entities consisting of 50 catcher vessels and 3 catcher processors. Additionally, there was one large catcher processor operating in the BSAI pot gear sector in 2009. Thus, impacts associated with action alternatives and their options that affect the pot gear sector accrue nearly entirely upon small entities.

Finally, within the trawl gear sector there were 15 small catcher vessels, 3 large catcher vessels and 34 large catcher processors operating within the BSAI groundfish trawl fisheries in 2009.

1.11 Impacts on Regulated Small Entities

Each of the action alternatives has the potential to create impacts on directly regulated small entities. The analysis of alternatives is presented in the RIR and a summary of effects is re-presented here. These effects will apply to all entities, large and small, operating in the BSAI Pacific cod and flatfish fisheries.

Alternative 1, the status quo, includes a directed Pribilof Islands blue king crab fishery closure until the stock is completely rebuilt, and the closure to all trawl gear of the Pribilof Island Habitat Conservation Zone (PIHCZ). These measures; however, have failed to rebuild the PIBKC stock sufficiently thus necessitating a new rebuilding plan, including additional PIBKC protection measures, as required under the MSA.

Table 1-21 through Table 1-23, of the RIR, provide a comparison of the potential impacts, in terms of tons and gross revenue at risk, of each of the Proposed closure areas (Alt. 2, 3, and 4) on the Pacific Cod pot gear fishery. As one would expect, the tons at risk increase with the size of the closure area and that finding is consistent across all years. Non-confidential tonnage put at risk ranges from 306 metric tons (Alt. 2, 2009) to as much as 4,212 metric tons (Alt. 4-1, 2008). Gross revenue effects range from near zero to \$9 million and the range of impacts in terms of percent of total gross revenue earned in the BSAI Pacific Cod pot fishery is from 1.77 percent to more than 22 percent (Alt. 4-1, 2008) of total fishery gross revenue. These values are also depicted graphically in Figure 1. These potential impacts would accrue, nearly entirely, upon directly regulated small entities.

Table 1-24 through Table 1-26, of the RIR, provide a comparison of the potential impacts, in terms of tons and gross revenue at risk, of each of the Proposed closure areas on the all groundfish fisheries combined. In contrast to the Pacific cod pot fishery, the distribution of groundfish effort in the flatfish fisheries within the ADF&G area results in larger tons at risk

tabulations in the Alternative 3 ADF&G areas than occurs in the Alternative 1 PIHCZ area in several, but not all, years. Though there are a few exceptions, tons at risk tend to increase with the size of the closure area and that finding is consistent across all years. Non-confidential tonnage put at risk ranges from 337 metric tons (Alt. 3, 2009) to more than 96,000 metric tons (Alt. 4-1, 2005). Gross revenue effects range from near zero to \$106 million and the range of impacts in terms of percent of total gross revenue earned in the BSAI Pacific Cod and flatfish fisheries is from .14 percent to approximately nearly 30 percent (Alt. 4-1, 2005) of total fishery gross revenue. These values are also depicted graphically in Figure 2. These impacts would accrue to both large and small entities as defined above.

Table 1-27 through 1-29, and Figure 3 through

Figure 5, of the RIR, provide comparisons of the effect of the various options of Alternative 5 (triggered area closures) on potentially affected fisheries. Unfortunately, all impacts associated with the flatfish fisheries are confidential and cannot be divulged. In the Pacific cod fishery, the greatest impacts of the triggered closure would have occurred in the hook and line combined CP+CV grouping where 1,312 tons are put at risk were a closure in the largest stock distribution area (A5c) and this option would also result in the largest total impacts of 2,414 metric tons across all of the Pacific cod fisheries potentially affected. The Alternative 5d option, which is the second largest triggered closure area under consideration, would have had the second highest total impact of 1,182 tons, most of which comes from the hook and line CP+CV grouping. Due to confidentiality, only a combined Pacific cod hook and line group could be reported, with 143 metric tons put at risk. Extending the existing trawl closure in the PIHCZ to all groundfish fisheries, as a triggered closure, would have put 271 and 386 tons (658 total) at risk in the Pacific cod pot CP+CV group and the Pacific cod hook and line CP+CV group, respectively. These tonnages, when converted to gross revenue at risk, result in total potential impacts ranging from \$0.292 million (ADF&G area) up to just over \$3 million (PIBKC75 area). Most of the potential impact estimates, in specific gear and target fisheries, approach or exceed a half a million dollars, while the largest potential gross revenue at risk impacts exceed \$1.6 million in the Pacific cod hook and line CP+CV grouping.

In percentage terms, these potential impacts of the Alternative 5 triggered closures are, with the exception of the Pacific cod pot fishery, all less than one percent of the overall target fishery level and the Pacific cod pot fishery impacts are less than two percent of target fishery gross revenue in all areas. However, it is important to recognize that while these values are small, in percentage of overall target fishery gross revenue and aggregate total gross revenue, the potential impacts may be concentrated in a small number of operators and impacts on the Pacific cod pot fishery sector accrue, almost entirely, upon directly regulated small entities. In addition, the majority hook and line and trawl gear sector entities potentially affected by the proposed action qualify, ignoring affiliations, as directly regulated small entities.

Figure 6 of the RIR provides comparisons of the effect of the various options of Alternative 5d, threshold based triggered area closures on potentially affected fisheries. This graphical comparison is based on the information provided in Table 1-20 of the RIR, which tabulates the tonnage and gross revenue effects of threshold based triggered closures of the area associated with the PIBKC stock distribution from 1984 to 2009 (As defined in Alternative 5d option 4) in the weeks following triggering of the closure in affected fisheries.

Under the 20 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery closures would have been triggered in 2004 and 2006. These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,547 and 1,909 tons at risk. The 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery would have been triggered in 2005 and 2007 and would have put 2,238 and 254 tons at risk, respectively. The 40 percent trawl threshold in the yellowfin sole fishery closures would have been triggered in 2003 and 2006. These triggered closures would have respectively put 3,465 and 4,500 tons at risk,

In terms of gross revenue, the 20 percent threshold closures in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery would have has associated gross revenue at risk of \$4.2 million and \$3.3 million. The 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery closures would have had associated gross revenue at risk of \$3 million and \$.5 million, while the 40 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery closures would have had associated gross revenue at risk of \$3 million and \$.5 million

In percentage terms, the gross revenue at risk associated with the 20 percent threshold in the Pacific Cod hook and line fishery would have represented 3.2 percent and 1.9 percent of annual gross revenue. The gross revenue at risk in the 40 percent threshold closures in the Pacific Cod Pot fishery would have represented 16 percent and 1.4 percent of annual gross revenue, and the gross revenue at risk associated with the 40 percent trawl closures would have represented 2.3 percent and 2.4 percent of annual gross revenue in the yellowfin sole trawl fishery.

Finally, the RIR includes an extensive analysis of catch reprojected from closed to open areas based on historically recorded catch quantities and locations. That analysis is documented in Appendix A, and discussed under each alternative. In general, the reprojected analysis has shown, in most cases, the ability of the fleet to harvest catch put at risk outside the closure area albeit with considerable potential for increased operating costs due to the relative dispersion of catch outside of the areas proposed for closure. This is most prevalent with the large distribution areas of Alternatives 4, options 1 and 2; however catch reprojected dispersion is identified in many cases.

This analysis concludes that it is likely that some or all of the catch can be made up outside of the smallest proposed closure areas (e.g. PIHCZ and ADF&G areas) and under the triggered closures and/or threshold based triggered closures. The larger closure areas, based on historic stock distribution and catch reprojected analysis contained herein, would create potential impacts on catch and gross revenue of more than ten percent of total fishery gross revenue in several years and nearly 30 percent in the worst case under examination here. Redeployment to recover small amounts of catch, while potentially increasing operating cost won't have appreciable impacts on landings, fishing communities, markets, or consumers. However, as impacts increase with the size of the closure area it is less likely that all catch can be made up and, thus, there may be decreased landing and gross revenue, decreased tax gross revenue and vessel expenditures in fishing communities, and potentially contraction in supply to fish markets potentially affecting consumers via increased prices. A comprehensive treatment of these potential effects would require information on vessel operating costs, spatial modeling of effort location choice, vessel port expenditure information, as well as comprehensive domestic market supply and demand models. Unfortunately, these kinds of information are not available at present and, thus, this

analysis has relied on analysis of gross revenue at risk as the best available proxy. Nonetheless, the potential effects of each alternative on secondary operation will scale with the potential effects, in percent of gross revenue terms, on those fishing entities directly affected by the proposed action as analyzed herein.

1.12 Recordkeeping and reporting requirements

The action alternatives involve regulatory closure areas to groundfish fishing. These closure areas would not invoke additional recordkeeping and reporting requirements as vessels operating in the groundfish fisheries presently must maintain the same catch accounting records as would be required under the action alternatives.

1.13 Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with proposed action

No Federal rules have been identified that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed action.

1.14 Description of significant alternatives to the proposed action

Chapter 2 of the associated EA describes in detail the alternative under consideration, as well as those which have been considered but eliminated. Once a preferred alternative is chosen, this section will identify and describe any significant alternatives to the proposed action that (1) meet the action objectives and (2) imposed smaller adverse economic impacts on the identified directly regulated entities.

References:

- ADF&G, 2010. Annual Management Report for the Commercial and Subsistence Shellfish Fisheries of the Aleutian Islands, Bering Sea, and the Westward Region's Shellfish Observer Program, 2008/09. Fisheries Management Report No. 10-24, ADF&G, Anchorage Alaska.
- Hiatt, T.R. et.al. 2010. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Island Area: Economic Status of the Groundfish Fisheries off Alaska, 2009. Economic and Social Sciences Research Program Alaska Fisheries Science Center National Marine Fisheries Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 7600 Sand Point Way N.E. Seattle, Washington 98115-6349 October 2010.
- Hiatt, T.R. et.al. 2009. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Island Area: Economic Status of the Groundfish Fisheries off Alaska, 2008. Economic and Social Sciences Research Program Alaska Fisheries Science Center National Marine Fisheries Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 7600 Sand Point Way N.E. Seattle, Washington 98115-6349 October 2009.
- Hiatt, T.R. et.al. 2008. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Island Area: Economic Status of the Groundfish Fisheries off Alaska, 2007. Economic and Social Sciences Research Program Alaska Fisheries Science Center National Marine Fisheries Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 7600 Sand Point Way N.E. Seattle, Washington 98115-6349 October 2008.
- Kelty, Frank. Natural Resource Analyst, City of Unalaska. Personal communication August 24, 2010.
- NMFS. 2004. Alaska Groundfish Fisheries Final Programmatic Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. June 2004. DOC, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, AK Region, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668.
<http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/seis/default.htm>
- Scholz, Astrid J., Kruse, S.A., Huntington, H., Petersen Lewis, R.S., Klain, S., Ahmann, J. 2007. Socioeconomics Baseline Information for the Pribilof Islands. NPRB Project 528, Ecotrust, Portland Oregon.

Appendix A: Reprojection of Catch

Table of Contents

Section A-1: Catch Reprojection Methodology.....	1
Section A-2: Alternative 5d, Threshold Based Trigger Closure Catch Reprojection Maps.....	4
Section A-3: Alternative 5 a, b, c, And-d Triggered Closure Maps	10
Section A4: Alternative 2 PIHCZ Catch Reprojection Maps.....	19
Section A-5: Alternative 3 ADF&G Area Catch Reprojection Maps.....	27
Section A-6: Alternative 4, Option 1, PIBKC 1975-09 Area Catch Reprojection Maps.....	36
Section A-7: Alternative 4, Option 2, PIBKC 1984-09 Area Catch Reprojection Maps.....	48

Table of Figures.

Figure A- 1: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 20 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 4 th Of 2004.	4
Figure A- 2: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 20 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 2 nd Of 2006.....	5
Figure A- 3: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on February 12 th of 2005.....	6
Figure A- 4: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on September 22 nd of 2007.	7
Figure A- 5: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Yellowfin Sole Trawl Fishery Beginning on August 19 th of 2003 (this trigger only applied under the 75% of ABC cap, suboption 4, of Alternative 5d).....	8
Figure A- 6: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Yellowfin Sole Trawl Fishery Beginning on April 15 th of 2006.	9
Figure A- 7: Alternative 5a: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The Current Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.....	10
Figure A- 8: Alternative 5a: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The Current Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.	11
Figure A- 9: Alternative 5b: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.	12
Figure A- 10: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.	13
Figure A- 11: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area In The Pacific Cod hook And Line CDQ Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.	14
Figure A- 12: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.....	15

Figure A- 13: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Pot Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007. 16

Figure A- 14: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line CDQ-CP Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007. 17

Figure A- 15: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007..... 18

Figure A- 16: Alternative 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIHCZ Area In The Pacific Cod Open Access Pot Fishery 2003-2010 in 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 19

Figure A- 17: Alternative 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIHCZ Area In The Pacific Cod Open Access and CDQ Hook And Line Pot Fishery 2003-2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 23

Figure A- 18: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod Open Access Pot Fishery 2005 (All other years are confidential)..... 27

Figure A- 19: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod CDQ and Open Access Hook And Line Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 28

Figure A- 20: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Flatfish Non Pelagic Trawl CDQ and Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below..... 32

Figure A- 21: Alternative 4, Option 1: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Pot Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 36

Figure A- 22: Alternative 4, Option 1: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area Pacific Cod Hook and Line CDQ and Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 40

Figure A- 23: Alternative 4, Option 1: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area Flatfish Trawl CDQ and Open Access Non Pelagic Trawl Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. ... 44

Figure A- 22: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Pacific Cod Pot Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 48

Figure A- 25: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Pacific Cod Hook And Line CDQ And Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 52

Figure A- 26: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Flatfish Trawl CDQ And Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below. 56

Section A-1: Catch Reprojection Methodology

This section documents the methodology that was used to reproject catch from within proposed closure areas, under the various alternatives and their options, to areas that would remain open either annually or following a trigger closure at some point in the year. This reprojection of catch is a retrospective analysis that is intended to be exemplary of where catch might have occurred had the closure been in place. This analysis utilized observed data as compiled in the VMS Enabled NOAA Fisheries Alaska Region Catch In Areas Database as developed by Steve Lewis of the Alaska Region Analytical Team. The Catch In Areas database was given favorable reviews by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee in February of 2009. This analysis utilized an algorithmic approach to reproject catch using the data, and assignment of that data to a spatial grid, contained within the Catch In Areas Database. The following maps show reprojection of historic catch that occurred within areas proposed for closure to areas that would remain open under the alternative in question. The reprojection is based on historic catch grouped by vessel, harvest sector, gear, and target. This representation is not intended to be interpreted as a predictive model of where fleets will redeploy when faced with a closure but rather is a reprojection of historical catch to locations where fishing occurred.

Catch reprojection was done within the Catch In Areas database by following a step-wise procedure of matching with proportional assignment to a fine spatial grid with aggregation to a coarse grid for display purposes. The procedures used are as follows:

Step 1: Vessel Based Match:

In the first step of the catch reprojection operation the catch of each vessel that operated in the area proposed for closure (the alternative areas) in each week of the season (using week ending date) is reprojected into grid cells (7km x 7km) occurring within 50 nautical miles of the closure boundary in the area outside of the closure area (the open area)¹. This assignment is proportional to the actual observed catch by that same vessel and within the same target fishery and gear type in each of the 7km square grids cells the vessel actually fished and in the same week of the season. In this way catch is matched first at the observed vessel level and based on that vessel's own proportion of weekly catch within a grid square. If a vessel fished in only one grid square outside the closure in a particular week when the closure would have been in place (either an annual or triggered closure) then all of the reprojected catch is assigned to that single grid square. If that vessel fished in two cells, with a 60-40 percent split then 60 percent and 40 percent of the reprojected catch is assigned to the cells respective of the proportion observed in each cell. In many cases this match reprojects most of the catch that could potentially be forgone; however, there are instances when a specific vessel fished within a closure area but not outside of it in a particular week. In such cases, a second matching step is applied to attempt to reproject vessel level unmatched catch to the open area.

¹ Please note that this data is aggregated to 20km grids for reprojection in the maps in this appendix due largely to the extreme quantities of data, (in excess of 3 terabytes per process) processing time generated for each map, and also because the vertical catch bars overlap each other excessively in the smaller grid display.

Step 2: Vessel Type/Target/Gear Based Match

In the second step, a vessel's catch that occurred inside the closure area in a week when that vessel was not observed fishing within 50km outside of the closure boundary is reprojected proportional to the catch of vessels in its sector of the fleet that had recorded catch outside of the closure area using the same gear type, in the same species target fishery, and with the same vessel type (Catcher Processor (CP) or Catcher Vessels (CV)). In this way, catch is reprojected based on recorded catch in grid cells in the open area where the same vessel type, operating in the same target fishery, and with the same gear type, had recorded catch. This second step serves to reproject catch that could not be reprojected at the individual vessel and week level proportional to catch of similar vessels. However there are some instances, particularly with the limited number of CVs potentially affected by some alternatives, when a relaxation of the vessel type is necessary to match catch to grid cells outside of a closure area, and that relaxation of the vessel type match is undertaken in the next step.

Step 3: All Vessels/Target/Gear Match

In this third matching step, the vessel type matching constraint is relaxed and the match is made proportional to all vessels, CPs and CVs combined, in a target fishery with the same gear type. This third step gathers all remaining catch and reprojects it, where possible, to grid cells proportional to the catch of all vessels within target fishery, gear type, and week of the season recorded in those grid cells. However, there are instances when no effort occurs outside of the proposed closure area by any vessel type within target, gear type, and in the specific week in question. In such cases, a final step is used, which relaxes the week of the season constraint.

Step 4: All Vessels/Target/Gear/Month Match

The final step in the reprojection algorithm relaxes the constraint of trying to match catch within the same week of the season. In this step, remaining unmatched catch is reprojected proportional to catch by any vessel type, within same target, same gear type, and within the same month of the catch that occurred within the closure area. While this last step broadens the match criteria significantly, there are nonetheless some cases where a match still cannot be made. In a couple of particular cases, to be discussed in the accompanying RIR, even this step does not provide a match. The interpretation of this finding is that the closure area was essentially the only area that had recorded catch within the target and gear combination in question and serves to highlight the importance of that area to the potentially affected fleet.

Limitations of the Reprojection Analysis:

This reprojection is entirely based on recorded historic catch within and outside the closure areas in question. Reprojection of catch in this way makes the inherent assumption that this reprojection would occur with no impact on vessels that fished within the area to which catch is reprojected to occur, with no impact on localized availability of fish stocks, and with the same catch rates (tons/week in proportionality method) as observed in the areas reprojection is made. In some cases these assumptions may all be true;

however, in others these assumptions are likely to fail, especially in cases when the reprojected into a cell is a relatively large proportion of the catch that is being reprojected and/or is larger quantity than originally caught within the cell to which reprojected occurs. Thus, this analysis is exemplary of where catch might be taken in the instance of a closure; however, the analysis is inherently static in that it does not account to the impact that such reprojected of effort, and catch, might have on fishing conditions within grid cells to which reprojected is estimated to potentially occur in this retrospective analysis.

Section A-2: Alternative 5d, Threshold Based Trigger Closure Catch Reprojection Maps.




Figure A- 1: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 20 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 4th Of 2004.




Figure A- 2: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 20 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 2nd Of 2006.




Figure A- 3: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on February 12th of 2005.




Figure A- 4: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Pacific Cod Pot Fishery Beginning on September 22nd of 2007.




Figure A- 5: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Yellowfin Sole Trawl Fishery Beginning on August 19th of 2003 (this trigger only applied under the 75% of ABC cap, suboption 4, of Alternative 5d).




Figure A- 6: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Under a 40 Percent Threshold Trigger In The Yellowfin Sole Trawl Fishery Beginning on April 15th of 2006.




Figure A- 8: Alternative 5a: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The Current Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.




Figure A- 9: Alternative 5b: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.




Figure A- 12: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.




Figure A- 13: Alternative 5d: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Pot Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.




Figure A- 14: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line CDQ-CP Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.










Figure A- 15: Alternative 5c: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area In The Pacific Cod Hook And Line Open Access Fishery Beginning on September 22 of 2007.



Section A4: Alternative 2 PIHCZ Catch Reprojection Maps



Figure A- 16: Alternative 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIHCZ Area In The Pacific Cod Open Access Pot Fishery 2003-2010 in 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.



















Section A-5: Alternative 3 ADF&G Area Catch Reprojection Maps










Figure A- 18: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod Open Access Pot Fishery 2005 (All other years are confidential).

Figure A- 19: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Pacific Cod CDQ and Open Access Hook And Line Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.





















Figure A- 20: Alternative 3: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The ADF&G Area In The Flatfish Non Pelagic Trawl CDQ and Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.

























Figure A- 22: Alternative 4, Option 1: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area Pacific Cod Hook and Line CDQ and Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.



















Figure A- 23: Alternative 4, Option 1: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1975-09 Area Flatfish Trawl CDQ and Open Access Non Pelagic Trawl Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.













Section A-7: Alternative 4, Option 2, PIBKC 1984-09 Area Catch Reprojection Maps

Figure A- 24: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Pacific Cod Pot Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.















Figure A- 25: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Pacific Cod Hook And Line CDQ And Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.











Figure A- 26: Alternative 4, Option 2: Reprojection Of Catch Due To Closure Of The PIBKC 1984-09 Area Flatfish Trawl CDQ And Open Access Fishery 2003 2010 In 4 Pages of Panels (2 years per panel) Below.

