C-1 Halibut/Sablefish IFQ Program
The Council last called for proposals to amend the halibut and sablefish IFQ program in 2004. One of those amendments is still in the rulemaking stage. The Council called for proposals by June 1, 2009 for additional changes to the IFQ program; the Council extended the deadline to January 15, 2010, as proposals continued to be submitted after the June 2009 deadline. Fourteen proposals were submitted in the first round. The IFQ Implementation Team convened to review and comment on the proposals on September 30, 2009; seven have been recommended to the Council for analysis. The report by Implementation Team is provided in the Council briefing book under Item C-1(a)(4). Agency staff also reviewed the proposals to advise the Council (Item C-1(a)(5)). The Team convened again on February 4, 2010 to review and comment on four additional proposals; team recommendations will be provided at the Council meeting. The proposals are provided in the Council briefing book under Items C-1(a)(1), (2), and (3).

D-3(b) Review new area closure options for chum salmon bycatch alternative
The draft alternatives for the Chum salmon bycatch measures include two different time/area closure configurations. The first was developed by staff with iterative review and modification by the Council. The second time/area closure was included by the Council in December 2009 as a request for staff to develop new candidate closures to meet the intent of the option. As noted in the Council motion, the new areas are intended to be small, discrete closure areas, each with its own separate cap whereby bycatch in that area only accrues towards that cap. State statistical areas were selected as the smallest candidate closures. Both closures are intended to be triggered time/area closures. There are currently three options for the application of the trigger. The first option would apply the trigger to all chum bycatch, the second option would apply the trigger to all chum bycatch between specific dates, and the third option would apply the trigger to all chum bycatch in a specific area. For further details on Chum salmon bycatch area closures see Issue D-3(b) in the Council briefing book.

C-6 GOA Rockfish Program
At the February 2010 Council meeting, GOA Rockfish Program is scheduled for preliminary review. A copy of the draft rockfish analysis for this meeting was mailed on January 25, 2010. Included in the entry level alternatives is an exemption from VMS requirements for the fixed gear sector. Under the pilot program, only the fixed gear vessels are exempt from VMS requirements, thus trawl participants in the entry level fishery are required to meet the VMS requirements. Vessels that can participate in the entry level fishery, under alternative 2, are those vessels that did not qualify for the CGOA rockfish cooperative program to include both trawl and fixed gear vessels. Under alternative 3, any vessel or gear type exempt from CGOA LLP requirements or any holder of a CGOA fixed gear LLP may entry a vessel in the fishery.

Historically, non-trawl vessels have very minimal participation in the CGOA target rockfish fisheries. Although the fisheries have opened to non-trawl participants on
January 1st and not opened to trawl gear until early July, non-trawl harvests never exceeded one percent of the TAC for any of the target species during the qualifying years. Since implementation of the pilot program, the fixed gear sector has shown little interest in the rockfish fisheries. In the first two years of the program, a single vessel registered for the fixed gear entry level fishery. The fixed gear entry level fishery harvested approximately 6 metric tons of its allocation of approximately 350 metric tons of pelagic shelf rockfish and northern rockfish in 2007, but did not harvest any pelagic shelf rockfish or northern rockfish in 2008. To simplify management of the entry level fixed gear allocation, all fixed gear harvests of primary rockfish species from Federal and parallel waters when the directed fishery is open are counted against the entry level allocation of that gear type. Given the relatively small harvest of primary rockfish by the fixed gear vessels, this accounting has not affected the ability of sector members to participate in the fishery. Despite the minimal historic participation, some non-trawl fishermen continue to express an interest in prosecuting the entry level fishery. Most have said that they will participate primarily in the summer months when the weather is the best, allowing the fixed gear fleet to more safely target these offshore rockfish.