

**North Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**Advisory Panel Minutes**  
 Benson Hotel, Portland, Oregon  
 June 7-12, 2004

The following members were present for all or part of the meeting:

Al Burch	Teresa Kandianis
Cora Crome	Mitch Kilborn
Craig Cross	Kent Leslie
Tom Enlow	John Moller
Dan Falvey	Kris Norosz
Lance Farr	Eric Olson
Dave Fraser	Jim Preston
Jan Jacobs	Michelle Ridgway
Bob Jacobson	Jeff Stephan

*Duncan Fields and John Bruce were not in attendance.*

*The AP unanimously approved the minutes from the previous meeting.*

### **C-1 BSAI Crab Rationalization EIS**

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 3 from the Crab EIS as the Crab Rationalization program for final action. *Motion passed 10/7.*

In the event the Council does not adopt Alternative 3, the AP would like to recommend the following from Alternative 2: *Motion carries 12/3/2.*

- Recommend accepting NOAA Fisheries' proposed changes to the binding arbitration system. *Motion passed 18/0.*
- Recommend accepting NOAA Fisheries' changes on sideboards to cod. *Motion passed 18/0.*
- Recommend the Council delete the 90/10 A/B share split to C shares following three years of program implementation. *Motion passed 18/0.*
- Recommend the Council request NOAA Fisheries' develop regulations to consider possible circumstances of QS holders with limited processor affiliation and consider potential mechanisms to permit participation of these QS holders in the arbitration program, including the use of confidentially agreements and operating agreements to prevent potential antitrust violations. Notwithstanding this request, all participation must be in compliance with antitrust law. *Motion passed 18/0*
- Recommend for excessive shares, the Council set processor ownership cap of harvester shares equal to individual harvester caps. *Motion passed 15/3.*

**C-2 PGSEIS**

The AP developed a workplan of the PGSEIS general priorities as follows and detailed in the attached motions.

1. Reduce and avoid impacts to habitat
2. Manage incidental catch and reduce bycatch and waste
3. Maintain or adjust current protection measures as appropriate to avoid jeopardy to ESA listed Steller Sea lions.
4. Prevent overfishing
5. Preserve food web
6. Improve data quality monitoring and enforcement

*Motion passed 16/2*

The following series of motions sets the specific priorities within the above list of general priorities.

**1. Protection of Habitat**

- A. Complete EFH action as scheduled
- B. Recommend to NOAA Fisheries increased mapping of benthic environment
- C. Develop and adopt definitions of MPA, marine reserves, etc.
- D. Review all existing closures to see if these areas qualify for MPAs under established criteria
- E. Evaluate effectiveness of existing closures

*Motion passed 17/0*

**2. Bycatch Reduction**

- A. Complete rationalization of GOA fisheries
- B. Complete rationalization of BSAI non-pollock fisheries
- C. Explore incentive-based bycatch reduction programs
- D. Explore mortality rate-based approach to setting PSC limits

*Motion passed 18/0*

**3. Protection of Steller Sea Lions**

- A. Continue to participate in development of mitigation measures to protect SSL including development of an EIS and participation in the ESA jeopardy consultation process
- B. Recommend to NOAA Fisheries and participate in reconsideration of SSL critical habitat

*Motion passed 17/0*

**4. Prevent Overfishing**

- A. Continue to participate in the development of “lumping and splitting” criteria
- B. Consider new harvest strategies for rockfish
- C. Set TAC at or < ABC

*Motion passed 18/0*

**5. Ecosystem Management**

- A. Revisit the calculation of OY caps
- B. Recommend to NOAA Fisheries and participate in the development and implementation of ecosystem indicators as part of stock assessment process

*Motion passed 18/0*

## **6. Improve Data Quality and Management**

- A. Expand or modify observer coverage and sampling methods based on scientific data and compliance needs
- B. Develop programs for economic data collection that aggregate data
- C. Modify VMS to incorporate new technology and system providers

*Motion passed 18/0*

### **C-2 (b) Groundfish FMP Revisions**

The AP recommends the Council update the current FMP drafts for review over the summer and final action in October. *Motion passed 16/0.*

The AP recommends the Council adopt changes 1-11 to the BSAI FMP, as suggested by staff. Motion passed 14/0. Additionally, the AP recommends the Council incorporate the recommended changes 1-8 to the GOA FMP, as suggested by staff. *Motion passed 16/0.*

Further, the AP recommends the Council adopt changes recommended by staff on the BSAI Management Approach in the FMP as noted in Item C-2 (b)4. *Motion passed 16/0.*

The AP recommends the Council adopt draft language for section 6.2.1 for the BSAI and GOA FMPs. *Motion passed 16/0.*

### **C-3 HAPC**

**Action 1: Seamounts.** The AP recommends the Council forward for review all three alternatives under Action 1 for analysis. Additionally, the AP recommends staff evaluates the brown king crab effort on Patton and other GOA seamounts and add a suboption to exempt brown king crab fishing within the seamount HAPCs. *Motion passed 18/0.*

#### **Action 2: GOA Corals.**

The AP recommends the Council accept the following Alternatives for analysis. A subset of the boundaries with specific management measures are detailed as follows:

Alternative 1; Status Quo

Alternative 2 with an option as follows:

Close sites with bottom trawling for 5 years. During the five years, these sites would be prioritized for undersea mapping to identify the portion of the three sites (Sanak, Albatross, and Middleton) that are high-relief deep-water corals. The portion of these sites that are in fact high-relief coral sites should remain closed to bottom trawling after the five years and the portion of the areas that are not high relief coral sites should re-open to trawling after the five years.

Alternative 3 utilizing the technical committee's recommendations at Cape Ommaney, Fairweather grounds NW, and Fairweather grounds SW.

Alternative 4, that would encompass the above Alternatives 2 & 3 as modified.

*Motion passed 18/0.*

**Action 3: AI Corals.**

The AP recommends the Council accept the four hybrid boundaries and management measures as modified below. These would be the only boundaries and management options for each Alternative that would be carried forward for the analysis.

**Alternative 2 Adopt the six coral garden sites within the Aleutian Islands as HAPC.**

1. Adak Canyon: Accept the bottom contact gear closure as defined in the hybrid, increase the designation only portion boundary to include the entire AMCC and MCA proposals *Motion passed 9/6*
2. Cape Moffett: Modify the hybrid proposal boundaries for the no bottom contact gear as follows: The square would be split into two triangles using the diagonal of the MCA area that crosses the box, the right (SE/S) side of the square would be open to fishing, the other side (NW) would be closed to bottom contact gear. The designation only areas of the hybrid would remain the same. *Motion passed 15/1/2*
3. Bobrof Island: Utilize the boundaries of the original NMFS proposal, adjusted on the northern extent of the island (per public comment in notebooks) to define the no bottom contact gear area. The designation only area of the hybrid would remain the same. *Motion passed 17/0*
4. Semisopochnoi Island: Utilize the original NMFS proposal and management measures of no bottom contact gear for analysis. The designation only area from the hybrid proposal would remain the same. *Motion passed 17/0*
5. Great Sitkin: Utilize the boundaries of the NMFS proposal and management measures of no bottom contact gear for analysis. The designation area would be from the hybrid proposal. *Motion passed 17/0*
6. Ulak Island: Utilize the boundaries of the NMFS proposal and management measures of no bottom contact gear for analysis. The designation area would be from the hybrid proposal. *Motion passed 17/0*

**Alternative 3** Adopt the hybrid area for Bowers Ridge with management measures of no bottom trawling as clarified by staff. *Motion passed 17/0.*

**Alternative 4** Adopt 4 sites as HAPCs in the Aleutian Islands ( South Amila/ Atka, Kanaga Volcano, and Kanaga and Tanaga Islands. These would be designation only.

Add a second management measure as an option:

Close sites with bottom trawling for 5 years. During the five years, these sites would be prioritized for undersea mapping to identify the portion of the four sites (South Amila/Atka, Kanaga Volcano and Kanaga) that are high-relief deep-water corals. The portion of these sites that are in fact high-relief coral sites should remain closed to bottom trawling after the five years and the portion of the sites that are not high relief coral sites should re-open to trawling after the five years. With this addition, there will be two management sub-options for Alternative 4. *Motion passed 17/0*

**Alternative 5: Adopt Alternatives 2,3,4 four in conjunction with the same boundaries, and management measures.**

**C-3 (c) (i) Analytical Approach**

The AP recommends Council accept staff's recommended analytical approach. *Motion passed 17/0.*

**EFH EIS :**

Additionally, the AP recommends the Council request staff to modify EFH Alternative 5B as follows:

1. Make spatial changes recommended in the April 29<sup>th</sup> Oceana letter
2. Remove TAC reduction for any species in 5B.
3. Strike coral bycatch cap option in Alternative 5B.

Further, the AP requests Council

- Plot the 5B closures on a 1:300,000 navigational chart
- Overlay 91-03 observer data on the same charts.

The AP reaffirms its support of HAPC Alternative 3, sitebased, as its preliminary preferred alternative, (*Motion passed 16/1*) and that new HAPCs, modifications to existing HAPC boundaries, or modifications to management measures within existing boundaries be considered by the Council during the three-year HAPC proposal cycle described in Appendix J of the draft EFH EIS. *Motion passed 16/1.*

**C-4 Aleutian Islands Pollock**

## Allocation

Starting in 2005, the annual AI pollock TAC will be the lesser of 75% of the ABC or 20,000 mt. The annual AI TAC cap (20,000 mt) will be increased 30 % in each of the two following years (26,000 mt in 2006 and 33,800 mt in 2007) but will be set no more than 75 % of the ABC. The AI annual TAC in the 2008 and beyond will be equal to no more than 33,800 mt or 75 % of the ABC, whichever is less.

The A season DPF will be 40 % of the ABC or equal to the annual TAC, whichever is less. The total harvest in the A season ( DPF and ICA) will not exceed 40 % of the ABC.

The ICA will be deducted from the annual TAC.

The B season DPF will equal the annual TAC minus the A season DPF and minus the ICA.

## Allocation Mechanism

- 2.2 The pollock allocation to the AI fishery will be funded by a reduction in the EBS pollock TAC. Any unused pollock TAC from the AI fishery will be rolled back to the EBS pollock TAC. This will occur at the earliest time possible in the calendar year. Before making the apportionment as described here, the AI pollock DFA is to be funded from the difference between the sum of all BSAI groundfish fishery TACS and the BSAI 2 million mt OY cap, unless the difference is not large enough to do so.

## Monitoring Vessel Activity

- 3.2 “Increased monitoring” alternative. This alternative would have several components (not options). These include:
  1. The Aleut Corporation must notify the NMFS Alaska Region with a list of which vessels are authorized by it to fish in the Aleutians; notification must be at least 14 days prior to the anticipated start of fishing. The NMFS RAM Division will verify each vessel’s eligibility (FFP, ADF&G number, USCG fishery endorsement, length, or AFA status) and provide to the Aleut Corporation a list of qualified vessels and the date fishing may commence. These vessels must carry documentation showing they have RAM approval and Aleut Corporation permission;

2. Catcher vessels are prohibited from fishing for pollock in the Aleutian Islands if pollock harvested in the Bering Sea or GOA are on board. Also, catcher vessels are prohibited from fishing for pollock in the Bering Sea or GOA if Aleutian Islands pollock are on board;
3. AFA requirements extend to catcher-processors and motherships (this extends AFA level observer and scale requirements to CPs under 60 feet and to unlisted AFA vessels);
4. AI pollock may only be delivered to a shoreside processor or stationary processor which has an approved Catch Monitoring Control Plan; Clarify to include CPs.
5. The Aleut Corporation will be responsible for keeping its harvests and its agents' harvests within the AI pollock directed fishing allowance. The Aleut Corporation shall be responsible for designating a person as a quota manager for pollock catch accounting; this person shall report to NMFS Sustainable Fisheries Division with weekly pollock catch summaries.
6. Vessels  $\leq$  60 feet shall take a Cadre observer if provided by NMFS.

#### Small Vessels

- 4.1 No action. Take no steps to delay ability of Aleut Corporation to introduce to the fishery vessels under 60 feet LOA.

#### Economic Development Report

- 5.2 Require an annual report to the Council, similar to the AFA coop reports. A draft report will be due in December and a final report will be due in February.
- 5.4 At its June 2006 meeting, the Council shall review the AI pollock fishery performance, including information on harvest success, chinook salmon bycatch, development of a small vessel fleet, and progress toward completion of pollock processing capacity to determine if further adjustments to the AI pollock TAC may be appropriate, in light of Section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 and Senator Stevens' floor language.

#### Chinook Savings

- 6.2 Chinook salmon bycatch in the AI pollock fishery would not count against the BSAI Chinook salmon bycatch caps.

*Motion passed 14/2.*

*The above motion with clarifications was included in the minutes after the original motion, which passed 17/0, was reconsidered.*

### **C-5 GOA Rockfish Pilot Program**

The AP recommends the Council accept staff's changes as noted with the following exceptions:

- 1.2 Allocations shall be apportioned between trawl and non-trawl gear (instead of fixed and mobile)

*Motion passed 16/0.*

- 1.2 Prosecution of the entry level general allocations of PSC to the gear type not allocated under 3.3.1.2 And the general allocations of secondary species not allocated under 3.3.1.2 *Motion passed 16/0.*

1.2 Add a suboption rollover from non-trawl to trawl will occur at the end of the third quarter. *Motion passed 16/0.*

2.4 Entry level fishery management  
Add a Suboption: Limited access competitive fishery *Motion passed 13/0*

3.3.1.1 Add new language: History will be allocated to each sector for POP, Northern rockfish and PSR caught in CGOA based on retained catch during the open season. *Motion passed 16/0*

5.4 Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. Add an option: When owner and operator are not affiliated, the license will be issued to the owner and operator, but the operator will receive the right to vessel coop linkages. (Add options similar to GOA Groundfish rationalization) *Motion passed 9/6.*

#### 5.4 Alternative 3

A harvester is eligible to join a cooperative in association with the processing facility to which the harvester delivered the most pounds of the three rockfish species combined during the year's

Option 1. 1996 – 2000 drop 1 year (processor chooses the year to drop, same year for all LLPs)

Option 2. 1996 – 2001 drop 1 year (processor chooses the year to drop, same year for all LLPs)

*Motion passed 14/0*

Harvesters may elect not to join a co-op, and continue to fish in an LLP/Open Access fishery. Those LLPs that opt out of the cooperative portion of the pilot program will be penalized 0 to 20% of their historical share (**annual allocation**). The penalty share will be left with the LLP's associated cooperative. The LLP's remaining share will be fished in a competitive fishery open to rockfish qualified vessels who are not members of a coop and must be delivered to one of the qualified processors. *Motion passed 15/0.*

5.6 Change word "right" to "privilege" *Motion passed 15/0.*

The eligibility for entry into the program is one targeted landing and \_\_\_X\_\_\_ retained catch during the open season. *Motion passed 15/0.*

The CP catch history will be based on WPR data. *Motion passed 14/0.*

The AP requests the Council encourage the CP fleet to work with NMFS and NPFMC staff to develop a data format using confidentiality waivers to analyze sideboards. Additionally, include participation data broken out by the three rockfish species based on WPR. *Motion passed 15/0.*

*A motion to allocate p.cod as a secondary species at the following rates of secondary species harvest history failed 4-12. 100%, 90%, 80%, 70%*

#### **Minority Reports:**

*Rockfish trawlers who qualify for the CGOA Pilot Rockfish Program need an incidental catch allocation of p.cod as a secondary species sufficient enough to reasonably prosecute this fishery. Nevertheless, an allocation of 100% of the entire historical p.cod bycatch history is not necessary. Top – off targeting of CGOA p.cod in conjunction with the CGOA trawl rockfish fishery resulted in historical rates of p.cod bycatch that exceeded the natural bycatch rate that otherwise could have been realized in this fishery, that otherwise would reasonably permit this fishery to proceed in the future and that maximized the economic benefit provided by MRAs extant for the CGOA trawl rockfish fishery.*

*The CGOA Pilot Rockfish Program should not be used to rationalize only a segment of the CGOA p.cod users absent the many other diverse considerations that should otherwise be considered when rationalizing the entire CGOA p.cod fishery for all other CGOA p.cod users. Rationalization of the CGOA trawl rockfish fleet should permit this fleet to prosecute this fishery, at a reasonable rate of p.cod bycatch, but not at 100% of historical performance that reflects top-off targeting of CGOA p.cod bycatch. Other decision points should be provided for analysis. Signed, Jeff Stephan, Jim Preston, Dan Falvey, and Bob Jacobson.*

*We, the minority, oppose the inclusion of multiple issuance of processing licenses to facilities. Within the pilot program, awarding facility based processing licenses accomplishes community and processor protection. Proliferation of pricessing licenses will diminish that protection. When reviewing the problem statement, the goals of both stabilization of the processing workforce and jeopardizing historical groundfish community stability may be compromised. The Council has gone to great lengths to award only one history for vessels; this approach is totally contrary to that policy choice for processing history. The entity that took the financial risk of the business should be the one recognized, not the landlord of a building. The congressional rider language recognized historical fish processors, owning a facility does not equate to fish processing. Signed: Teresa Kandianis, John Moller, Al Burch, Tom Enlow, Kent Leslie, and Mitch Kilborn.*

**C-6 IRIU**

The AP recommends the Council add the following changes to the Elements and Options:

**Issue 4 Eligibility to Participate in a Sector**

Add qualifying years through 2004: *Motion passed 14/3.* Change Exclude to Exempt, and add new suboption 11.7.1 and 11.7.2. *Motion passed 17/0*

In Component 11:

Option 11.7 For <60' H&L/Pot CV sector

- a) 1996-~~2004~~
- b) 1997-~~2004~~
- c) 1998-~~2004~~
- d) 1999-~~2004~~
- e) 2000-~~2004~~
- f) 2001-~~2004~~
- g) 2002-~~2004~~

**Suboption 11.7.1** ~~Exclude~~ **Exempt jig vessels and <60' fixed gear catcher vessels from qualifying years.**

**Suboption 11.7.2** ~~Exclude~~ **Exempt jig vessels**

In Component 12:

Suboption 12.7.1 ~~Exclude~~ **Exempt jig vessels and <60' fixed gear catcher vessels from minimum landings requirements.**

Suboption 12.7.2 ~~Exclude~~ **Exempt jig vessels**

Additionally, the AP recommends the analysis include a discussion of the effects the IRIU amendment has on non-LLP endorsed vessels participaing in the fisheries affected by the IRIU program. *Motion passed 16/0.*

The AP recommends the Council request staff to draft a discussion paper to determine if a new category of LLP will be needed for boats less than 60' in the AI trawl fisheries. *Motion passed 16/1.* Additionally, the AP would like the discussion paper to include:

- catch history of boats in the less than 60' sector in the parallel fishery
- distribution of endorsements for all gear types, including trawl
- possibilities for reclassifying endorsements of LLP licenses to be used in the AI <60' trawl fishery. *Motion passed 17/0*

The AP recommends the Council include recommendations from the IRIU Technical Committee contained in sections 1 and 2 of their minutes. *Motion passed 17/0.*

The AP recommends staff initiate an EA/RIR that analyzes subdividing TACs. The analysis should consider TAC divisions both independent of and in conjunction with amendments 80A and 80B. Sector splits for analysis of option 1 should be 02-03 and 95-02. *Motion passed 17/0.*

The AP does not believe that retention pools as a management tool , or multiple cooperatives, are effective options and encourages the Council to discontinue further development of those options. *Motion passed 18/0.*

### **C-7 Observer Program**

The AP recommends the Council add the two fee collection suboptions for analysis. *Motion passed 15/0.*

Additionally, the AP endorses analyzing Suboption 2, a provision allowing the Council to apply a daily observer fee, under Alternatives 2-5 (to select sectors with less than 100% coverage). The AP endorses the addition of suboption 1 and 2 to Alternative 6 and 7. *Motion passed 16/0.*

### **C-8 CDQ Changes**

The AP recommends the Council release the regulatory amendment to modify the management of the CDQ groundfish reserves with the following changes:

Add an alternative 2A that would allow the Council to define the species that are allocated to the CDQ program. Once established, this list will stand until the Council is petitioned (through the normal spec process) to make a change in allocations. It is the intent that this determination will not be done through a regulatory amendment. *Motion passed 17/0.*

### **C-9 Steller Sea Lions**

The AP recommends the Council approve for final action Alternative 2 including options 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5. *Motion passed 15/1.* Additionally, the AP recommends the Council encourage the SSL Committee to continue its work, and specifically they be tasked with working on problems identified with VMS regulations. *Motion passed 16/0.*

### D-1 Scallop FMP

The AP recommends the Council release the EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendment 10 to the Scallop FMP for public review with the following additions:

- Update break-even analysis from the 1998 analysis included in that amendment
- Include a table showing harvests and GHL for the scallop fishery from the beginning of the fishery to the most current year.
- Include a discussion of sea scallop price trends during the recent fishery period
- Update tables 1-10 to include the 2003/2004 season
- Include history of license transfers and it's effects on consolidation
- Review the definition of small entity, particularly as it relates to coops, for consistency with other analyses.
- Include summary tables that show total number of vessels

*Motion passes 18/0.*

### D-2 Non-Target Species

The AP recommends the Council draft a letter to the NMFS Alaska region supporting a request from the AFSC to the Region regarding estimation of groundfish catch. The AFSC is requesting estimates of: 1) catch for multiple categories of non-target species, 2) total catch [for target and non-target speices] from both CDQ and non-CDQ fisheries combined, and 3) methods for catch estimate calculations. *Motion passed 16/0.*

### D-3 Staff Tasking

#### Halibut Subsistence

The AP recommends the Council move the halibut subsistence III package forward for analysis and schedule it for initial review in October 2004 and final action in December 2004 with the following changes: *Motion passed 15/0.*

Action 1: Create a halibut subsistence possession limit

**Problem Statement: The current halibut subsistence regulations do not include a possession limit. As a result, enforcement officers are unable to verify compliance with daily catch limits. A possession limit would enhance enforcement of daily bag limits.**

Alternative 1: No action.

Alternative 2: Create a halibut subsistence possession limit **for areas 2C, 3A, and 3B.**

Option 1: Possession limit is equal to two daily bag limits (40 fish)

**Option 2: Possession limit is equal to one daily bag limit (20 fish)**

**Sub-option: Create a community harvest permit system for areas 3A and 3B.**

*Motion passed 15/0*

Action 2: Revise the definition of charter vessels

Problem Statement: The prohibition on the use of charter vessels for hire for subsistence halibut fishing is difficult to enforce under the current regulations.

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Allow the use of charter boats for subsistence halibut fishing

Alternative 3: Adopt the State of Alaska definition of charter vessels to redefine a charter boat vessel as state licensed, and restrict their use in the subsistence fishery to the owner and identified immediate family members (father, mother, brother, sister, children, legally adopted children).

*Motion passed 15/0*

Action 3: Revise the \$400 customary trade limit for subsistence halibut by IPHC regulatory area

Problem Statement: The identification of a dollar amount for the allowance of customary trade in the regulations has resulted in some subsistence users “selling” halibut to other subsistence users outside of customary and traditional practices. NOAA enforcement also reports that subsistence halibut is illegally entering into the commercial market.

Alternative 1: No action

**Alternative 2: Develop recordkeeping requirements for trade involving cash.**

**Alternative 3: Limit cash trades to only:**

**Option 1: Between members of an Alaska Tribe**

**Option 2: With Alaska rural residents**

**Option 3: With any Alaska resident**

**Option 4: Under the terms of a community harvest permit**

Alternative 4: Eliminate the customary trade limit (\$0)

*Motion passed 15/0*

Action 4: Allow subsistence halibut fishing in non-subsistence areas under special permits.

Problem Statement: There is no provision for subsistence halibut fishing by anyone in non-subsistence areas. If a resident of an urban area qualifies because he or she is a member of an Alaska Native Tribe with customary and traditional use of halibut, that fisher must still travel outside of the four non-subsistence areas. Similarly, an eligible subsistence user must harvest subsistence halibut outside a non-subsistence use area even if the area was traditionally fished for halibut by subsistence users.

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Allow the use of community harvest permits, educational permits, and ceremonial permits in non-**subsistence** use areas by tribes whose traditional fishing grounds are located within these areas, with a 20 fish per day bag limit **applicable under all three kinds of permits.**

*Motion passed 14/0*

Action 5: Revise the list of eligible subsistence halibut communities.

Problem Statement: In adopting the subsistence halibut program, the Council recognized that rural communities may have been left off its list of eligible communities inadvertently. The Council required that communities which seek to be included in this program in the future first seek approval for any claim to rural status and halibut C&T use by either the Board of Fisheries or Federal Subsistence Board before petitioning the Council.

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Add to the list of eligible communities:

Option 1: Naukati

Option 2: Port Tongass Village

*Motion passed 14/0*

Action 6: Revise subsistence halibut gear and annual limits

Problem Statement: Subsistence halibut regulations do not address concerns raised by the Alaska Board of Fisheries regarding local depletion of rockfish and ling cod as a result of their catch in the subsistence halibut fishery in local areas.

Alternative 1: No action (30 hooks per person/vessel, no stacking limits, no annual limit)

Alternative 2: Change gear and annual limits in local areas

(a)in Kodiak road zone and Chiniak Bay

Issue 1: Gear limit

Option 1: 5 hooks

Option 2: 10 hooks

Issue 2: Limit stacking on a single on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1: one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2: two times the hook limit

Option 3: three times the hook limit

## (b) In Prince William Sound

Issue 1: Gear and annual limit:

Option 1: 5 hooks and 30 fish annual limit.

Option 2: 10 hooks and 30 fish annual limit.

**Option 3: 15 hooks and 30 fish annual limit.**

Issue 2: Limit stacking on a single on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1: one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2: two times the hook limit

Option 3: three times the hook limit

## (c) In Cook Inlet

Issue 1: Gear limit

Option 1: 5 hooks

Option 2: 10 hooks

**Option 3: 15 hooks**

Issue 2: Limit stacking on a single on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1: one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2: two times the hook limit

Option 3: three times the hook limit

## (d) In Sitka Sound LAMP

Issue 1: Seasonal gear and vessel limits

During September 1 to May 31

30 hooks per vessel, power hauling allowed and 10 halibut per day/vessel

During June 1 to August 31

15 hooks per vessel, no power hauling and 5 halibut per day/vessel

Issue 2: Limit stacking on a single on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1: one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2: two times the hook limit

Option 3: three times the hook limit

Option: Apply (d) to all of Area 2C

Option: Require mandatory retention of rockfish. A fisherman would be required to stop subsistence halibut fishing for that day if the legal limit of rockfish allowed under state regulations were caught.

**Clarification added that this applies to the current state limits for rockfish (not lingcod) and that subsistence users would not be restricted below current bag limits.**

*Motion passed 15/0*

**Action 7: Develop a community harvest permit system for tribes as an alternative to the SHARC registration system. These CHPs could be implemented through cooperative agreements with the tribes.** *Motion passed 15/0*

**Action 8: Allow Area 4C fishermen to retain halibut under 32 inches which are caught while commercial fishing.** *Motion passed 15/0*

**IFQ Amendments**

The AP recommends the Council send Actions 1, 2, 3, and 4 forward as an analytical package scheduled for initial review in October 2004 and final action in December 2004 with the following changes:

*Motion passed 16/0*

Action 1: Medical Transfers

**Problem Statement: The IFQ program does not have medical transfer provisions. Quota share holders who experience a legitimate medical emergency that prevents them from fishing their quota**

**are left without the ability to temporarily transfer quota shares. In light of loan repayment obligations and financial dependence on quota shares, fishermen who do not have the ability to hire a skipper are left with no option but to divest themselves of quota shares.**

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Allow medical transfers. **The process for medical transfers shall be as described in the box on pages 8 and 9 of the discussion paper with the following addition to the limitations section:**

**An individual halibut or sablefish quota share holder will not be granted an emergency medical transfer if the individual has been granted an emergency medical transfer in three of the previous six years.**

Action 2: Tighten QS use rights/hired skipper provisions for the 20 percent ownership requirement.

Problem Statement: A key element of the IFQ program is the requirement for catcher vessel QS holders to be on board the vessel during harvest and offloading of IFQ species. The Council intended this requirement to assure that catcher vessel QS would continue to be held by professional fishermen after the initial allocation process instead of being acquired by investment speculators. While sole proprietor commercial fishing businesses were unlikely to have difficulty complying with this restriction, the Council recognized that many fishing firms may use hired masters to operate their vessels. The Council did not wish to constrain this option for small businesses and therefore created an exception (codified at 50 CFR 679.42(i) and (j)) for individuals who received initial allocations of catcher vessel QS, provided that such an individual (a) owns the vessel on which the IFQ halibut or sablefish are harvested and (b) is represented on the vessel by a master in his employment. The Council continues to be concerned about alleged abuses of the regulatory provision that allows vessel owners who received QS at initial allocation to hire skippers to harvest their IFQs without having to be onboard the vessel.

Alternative 1: No action

**Alternative 2: To use the hired skipper exception, a QS holder must demonstrate at least a 20% vessel owner interest in the vessel to be used and have continuously owned the vessel as documented by the contemporary abstract of title for the previous:**

- a. 6 months
- b. 12 months
- c. 24 months
- d. year to date plus previous calendar year

Action 3: Amend check-in/check-out and/or VMS requirements to the BS and AI sablefish regulations.

Problem Statement: **Due to killer whale depredation, increased costs, and relatively low catch rates, the sablefish fisheries in the BSAI offer unique challenges to harvesters. Due to concerns over harvest occurring in other regulatory areas, options to verify fishing locations need to be developed.**

Alternative 1: No Action

Alternative 2: Add check-in/check-out and/or VMS requirements to the BS and AI sablefish regulations.

Option 1: Add check-in/check-out for the AI and BS sablefish fishery (e.g. in Dutch Harbor, Adak, St. Paul, St. George)

Option 2: Require VMS when fishing in the AI and BS sablefish fishery

Action 4: Change product recovery rate for bled sablefish

Problem Statement: **Inaccurate product recovery rate provisions may be a disincentive for fishermen to bleed fish thereby reducing the quality of fish delivered and accurate catch reporting may be compromised under the current application of the product recovery rate for bled sablefish.**

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Change product recovery rate from .98 to 1.0 for bled sablefish.

The AP recommends that the Council “fast-track” the analysis of Action 5, but that it not be considered a higher priority than other CDQ actions. *Motion passed 12/3*

Action 5: Amend halibut regulations to allow Area 4C fishermen to harvest Area 4C IFQ and CDQ in area 4D.

**Problem Statement:** During the 2003 fishing season, Area 4C fishermen landed just 42% of their IFQ halibut allocation compared to a statewide average of 97%. Only 45% of area 4C CDQ halibut was landed. Loss of potential income was significant. This proposed change is intended to allow additional harvesting opportunities for the small board halibut CDQ fishery in St. Paul and St. George to travel to Area 4D to harvest Area 4C quota.

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: **Allow Area 4C IFQ and CDQ holders to harvest such IFQ/CDQ in area 4D**

**Option: Area 4D IFQ and CDQ holders to harvest such IFQ/CDQ in area 4C**

**Option: Allow 4D IFQ holders to harvest such IFQ in area 4E**

Alternative 3: **Combine areas 4 C, D, and E into one management area.**

The AP recommends the Council send Action 6, 7, and 8 forward as an analytical package scheduled for initial review in October 2004 and final action in December 2004. *Motion passed 15/0*

Action 6: Amend halibut block program in Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D.

**Problem Statement: The halibut vessel size classes and block plan were designed to maintain a diverse, owner-operated fleet and provide an entry-level opportunity in the IFQ fisheries.**

**However, many QS holders have indicated that the existing block and sweep up restrictions are cumbersome when arranging changes in fishing operations and that increased flexibility may be desirable. Large quota increases, consolidation, and changing use patterns within the fleet suggest that the block and sweep-up provisions should be reviewed to determine if changes are necessary.**

*Motion passed 15/0*

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Increase block limits to 3 or 4

Alternative 3: Unblock all QS blocks that yield more than 20,000 lbs.

Alternative 4: Allow blocked QS greater than 20,000 lbs to be divided into smaller blocks.

Alternative 5: Increase the Area 2C and 3A halibut sweep up level to the 5,000 lb equivalent in 1996 QS units.

**Note: Alternatives 2-5 are not mutually exclusive.**

Action 7: Amend Area 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D halibut QS categories.

**Problem Statement: The halibut vessel size classes and block plan were designed to maintain a diverse, owner-operated fleet and provide an entry-level opportunity in the IFQ fisheries. Halibut fishermen in western Alaska have identified significant safety concerns when fishing in those areas on small vessels. Therefore vessel size class restrictions in those areas should be reconsidered.**

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Allow IFQ derived from D category QS to be fished on C category vessels

Alternative 3: Allow IFQ derived from D category QS to be fished on C or B category vessels

Alternative 4: Combine C and D category QS. This alternative would eliminate D class QS in these areas.

Action 8: Amend fish-down regulations for halibut Area 2C and SE sablefish.

**Problem Statement: In 1996 the Council adopted a regulatory change that allow B class quota share to be fished on vessel under 60 feet. At that time, certain quota share in the SE sablefish and 2C halibut fisheries were identified as not being eligible for "fish down." This was an attempt to ensure B class quota share was available to vessels over 60 feet. Recently, this prohibition has been identified as unnecessary by some fishermen and therefore should be reexamined.**

Alternative 1: No action

Alternative 2: Eliminate the exception to the fish down regulations for Area 2C halibut and SE sablefish.  
*Motion passed 16/0*

*A motion to add Action 9, allowing pot fishing for sablefish in the Bering Sea during the month of June, failed 7-8-1.*

The AP recommends Council allocate time for staff to re-calculate the denominator for calculating QS in the Crab Rationalization post buyback and estimate other fishing history retired with the buyback.  
*Motion passed 16/0*

#### **D-4(e) Seabird EFP report**

The AP recommends the Council approve the request from the Washington Sea Grant program for an Exempted Fishing Permit to test weighted groundlines as seabird avoidance measures and provide comments to NMFS as appropriate. *Motion passed 17/0.*

## AP Prioritization of Objectives

### #1. Reduce and Avoid Impacts to Habitat: ( Protection of Habitat)

27. Identify and designate EFH and HAPC, pursuant to Magnuson-Stevens Act rules, and mitigate fishery impacts as necessary and practicable to continue the sustainability of managed species.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Identify and designate EFH and HAPC	1A	- Identify and designate EFH and HAPC	1A
		- Determine extent of adverse effects from fishing, if any. Implement mitigation measures, if necessary.	1A
		- Establish Aleutian Island management area to protect coral/live bottom habitats	

29. Encourage development of a research program to identify regional baseline habitat information and mapping, subject to funding and staff availability. 1B

28. Develop a Marine Protected Area policy in coordination with national and state policies.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Executive Order 13158: Initiative establishes MPA Advisory Committee, MPA Center, MPA website, agency tasks and list of existing US MPAs			
- Development and adoption of definitions of MPAs, marine reserves, marine fishery reserves, protected marine habitats etc.	1C		
- Develop MPA efficacy methodology including program goals, objectives, and criteria, for establishing MPAs			

26. Review and evaluate efficacy of existing habitat protection measures for managed species.

PA.1		PA.2	
		- Review all existing closures to see if these areas qualify for MPAs under established criteria. MPAs could include no-take reserves or have restrictions of specific gear types or specific fisheries or specific time periods	1D
		- Evaluate effectiveness of existing closures.	1E
		- Develop appropriate inseason closure areas in GOA to address bycatch of halibut, salmon, and/or crab when PSC cap is reached for that species	
		- Determine extent of adverse effects from fishing, if any. Implement mitigation measures, if necessary.	

30. Develop goals, objectives and criteria to evaluate the efficacy and suitable design of marine protected areas and no-take marine reserves as tools to maintain abundance, diversity, and productivity. Implement marine protected areas if and where appropriate.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Develop MPA efficacy methodology including program goals, objectives, and criteria, for establishing MPAs	1E	- Consider adopting 0-20% of BS, AI, GOA as MPAs and no-take marine reserves (e.g., 5% = no take, 15% = MPA) across a range of habitat types	
		- Establish Aleutian Island management area to protect coral/live bottom habitats	

**#2. Manage Incidental Catch and Reduce Bycatch and Waste:** (Bycatch Reduction)

17. Continue program to reduce discards by developing management measures that encourage the use of gear and fishing techniques that reduce bycatch which includes economic discards.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Review effectiveness of coop managed PSC reduction			
- BSAI: Consider reducing PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut, and salmon to the extent practicable (0-10%) (for purposes of analysis will use 10%)	2B	- BSAI: Reduce PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut and salmon to the extent practicable (0-20% for analytical purposes)	
- GOA: Establish PSC limits on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data	2A	- GOA: Establish PSC limits on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data	2A
		- GOA: consider reducing all PSC by 0-10%	
- IR/IU for Pollock and P. cod, yellowfin and rocksole (BSAI only), shallow water flatfish (GOA only)	2B	- Extend to other species as appropriate	

20. Control the bycatch of prohibited species through PSC limits or other appropriate measures.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Maintain existing inseason bycatch closures		- Evaluate effectiveness of existing closures.	
- Develop appropriate inseason closure areas in GOA to address bycatch of halibut, salmon, and/or crab when PSC cap is reached for that species			
- Maintain PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut, and salmon in BSAI; maintain PSC limit for halibut in GOA			
- BSAI: Consider reducing PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut, and salmon to the extent practicable (0-10%) (for purposes of analysis will use 10%)	2A	- BSAI: Reduce PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut and salmon to the extent practicable (0-20% for analytical purposes) <i>Motion passed 18/0</i>	2B
- GOA: Identify salmon savings areas and establish PSC limits to manage	2B		
- GOA: Establish PSC limits or other appropriate measures on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits or other appropriate measures on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data	2A	- GOA: Establish PSC limits on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data	
		- GOA: consider reducing PSC by 0-10%	
- For those PSC species where annual population estimates exist, explore a mortality rate based approach to setting limits	2D	- BSAI/GOA: For those PSC species where annual population estimates exist, explore a mortality rate-based and abundance based approach to setting limits	

32. Maintain LLP program and modify as necessary and further decrease excess fishing capacity and overcapitalization by eliminating latent licences and extending programs such as community or rights-based management to some or all groundfish fisheries.

PA.1		PA.2	
- Maintain existing restricted access programs (LLP and moratorium, AFA, IFQ sablefish, etc.)			
- Continue development of rights-based mgmt, on a fishery by fishery basis as needed including: (a) IFQs (b) Coops (i) community-based (ii) sector-based (c) CDQs (d) Other community-based programs (e.g., halibut community share program as applied to other species)	2A 2B	- Rationalize all fisheries (all GOA, BSAI non-pollock/sablefish)  - Ensure CDQ program maximizes benefits in rural communities	2A 2B

21. Reduce waste to biologically and socially acceptable levels.

PA.1		PA.2	
- BSAI: Consider reducing PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut, and salmon to the extent practicable (0-10%) (for purposes of analysis will use 10%)  - GOA: Establish PSC limits or other appropriate measures on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits or other appropriate measures on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data		- BSAI: Reduce PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut and salmon to the extent practicable (0-20% for analytical purposes)  - GOA: Establish PSC limits on salmon (for example, NTE a 25,000 fish cap for Chinook and a 20,500 fish cap for 'other salmon'); establish PSC limits on crab and herring based on biomass or other fishery data  - GOA: consider reducing PSC by 0-10%	
- IR/IU for Pollock and P. cod, yellowfin and rocksole (BSAI only), shallow water flatfish (GOA only)	2B	- Extend to other species as appropriate	

15. Develop incentive programs for bycatch reduction including the development of mechanisms to facilitate the formation of bycatch pools, VBAs, or other bycatch incentive systems.

PA.1		PA.2	
		- Incentive program for incidental catch and bycatch reduction, e.g.: (a) Individual Bycatch Quota (b) Harvest Priority (10% of TAC reserved to reward clean fishing) (c) bycatch reduction standards established (d) Coop managed Harvest Priority (0-10% TAC or PSC reserved to reward clean fishing)	2C
- Maintain VIP program		- Repeal VIP program - Repeal or modify MRAs and establish a system of caps and quotas	

14. Continue and improve current incidental catch and bycatch management program.

<b>PA.1</b>		<b>PA.2</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set group TAC for "other species".</li> <li>- Maintain species categories (target, "other species", PSC and non-specified species)</li>   <li>- Maintain current closed/ restricted areas such as Walrus Island closures, RKC Savings Area, Bogoslof, Pribilof Island closures, nearshore Bristol Bay closures, Kodiak Type I-III areas, EGOA trawl closures, closures for herring and salmon, Sitka Pinnacles, etc.</li> <li>- Maintain existing inseason bycatch closures</li> <li>- Maintain PSC limits for herring, crab, halibut, and salmon in BSAI; maintain PSC limit for halibut in GOA</li> <li>- Review effectiveness of coop managed PSC reduction</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop criteria for 'splitting and lumping' of species in order to have a consistent approach over as wide a range as possible ('other species', rockfish, non-specified, etc.)</li> <li>- Consider breaking sharks and skates and additional groups out of "other species" group for TAC setting</li> <li>- Develop criteria to bring a non-specified species into a managed category</li>   <li>- Evaluate effectiveness of existing closures.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For those PSC species where annual population estimates exist, explore a mortality rate based approach to setting limits</li> </ul>	2D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BSAI/GOA: For those PSC species where annual population estimates exist, explore a mortality rate-based and abundance based approach to setting limits</li> </ul>	2D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain current bycatch and incidental catch restrictions. Full retention of DSR in SEO</li> <li>- Maintain coop managed 'hot spot' closures to control</li> <li>- Maintain VIP program</li> <li>- Maintain MRAs</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Repeal VIP program</li> <li>- Repeal or modify MRAs and establish a system of caps and quotas</li> </ul>	

**#3. Avoid Impacts to Seabirds and Marine Mammals:** (Protection of SSL)

23. Maintain or adjust current protection measures as appropriate to avoid jeopardy to ESA-listed Steller sea lions.

PA.1		PA.2	
- B <sub>20</sub> rule for prey species (pollock, P.cod, Atka mackerel)	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- No directed fishery for forage fish (forage fish ban, Amendment 36/39)	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- Species TAC distributed spatially for some BSAI and GOA species	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- Maintain current closed/ restricted areas such as Walrus Island closures, RKC Savings Area, Bogoslof, Pribilof Island closures, nearshore Bristol Bay closures, Kodiak Type I-III areas, EGOA trawl closures, closures for herring and salmon, Sitka Pinnacles, etc.	3A		
- 2002 SSL closures: no fishing in Seguam Pass; 3nm no transit zones around rookeries; trawl and fixed gear closures in nearshore and critical habitat areas	3A	- Modify 2002 SSL closures and designation of Critical Habitat as appropriate scientific information becomes available	3A 3B
- Review cumulative impacts of opening AI pollock fishery	3A	- Modify AI SSL closures and designation of Critical Habitat as appropriate scientific information becomes available	3A

25. Continue to cooperate with NMFS and USFWS to protect ESA-listed marine mammal species, and if appropriate and practicable, other marine mammal species.

PA.1		PA.2	
- B <sub>20</sub> rule for prey species (pollock, P.cod, Atka mackerel)	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- No directed fishery for forage fish (forage fish ban, Amendment 36/39)	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- Species TAC distributed spatially for some BSAI and GOA species	3A	- No change from PA.1	3A
- Maintain current closed/ restricted areas such as Walrus Island closures, RKC Savings Area, Bogoslof, Pribilof Island closures, nearshore Bristol Bay closures, Kodiak Type I-III areas, EGOA trawl closures, closures for herring and salmon, Sitka Pinnacles, etc.	3A		
- 2002 SSL closures: no fishing in Seguam Pass; 3nm no transit zones around rookeries; trawl and fixed gear closures in nearshore and critical habitat areas	3A	- Modify 2002 SSL closures and designation of Critical Habitat as appropriate scientific information becomes available	3A
- Review cumulative impacts of opening AI pollock fishery	3A	- Modify AI SSL closures and designation of Critical Habitat as appropriate scientific information becomes available	3A

**#4. Prevent Overfishing:** (Prevent Overfishing)

5. Continue to improve the management of species through species categories.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set group TAC for "other species".</li> <li>- Maintain species categories (target, "other species", PSC and non-specified species)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop criteria for 'splitting and lumping' of species in order to have a consistent approach over as wide a range as possible ('other species', rockfish, non-specified, etc.)</li> <li>- Consider breaking sharks and skates and additional groups out of "other species" group for TAC setting</li> <li>- Develop criteria to bring a non-specified species into a managed category</li> </ul>	4A

1. Adopt conservative harvest levels for multi-species and single species fisheries and specify optimum yield.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set ABC &lt; OFL</li> <li>- Sum of TACs has to be within OY range</li> <li>- B<sub>20</sub> rule for prey species (pollock, P.cod, Atka mackerel)</li> <li>- Specify MSSTs for Tiers 1-3</li> <li>- Continue to use and improve current harvest control rules to maintain a spawning stock biomass with the potential to produce sustained yields on a continuing basis</li> <li>- Target species closures when harvest limit is reached</li> <li>- Species TAC distributed spatially for some BSAI and GOA species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set ABC &lt; OFL</li> <li>- Set TAC =&lt; ABC for all targets and "other spp." category</li> </ul>	4C
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change from PA.1</li> <li>- Initiate analysis of MSSTs for priority stocks based on the timeframe determined by additional availability of required resources taking into account SSC comments and concerns</li> <li>- Improve collection of biological information necessary to determine spawning stock biomass estimates, particularly for species in Tier 4-5</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop appropriate harvest strategies for rockfish</li> <li>- No change from PA.1</li> <li>- No change from PA.1</li> </ul>	4B

4. Initiate a scientific review of the adequacy of F<sub>40</sub> and adopt improvements as appropriate.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conduct F<sub>40</sub> review and adopt appropriate measures as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop, implement and update as necessary, procedures to account for uncertainty in estimating ABC, species-specific production patterns, and ecosystem considerations (<i>Motion passed 16/1/1</i>)</li> </ul>	4B
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revisit the calculation of the OY caps to determine their relevancy to current environmental conditions and our knowledge of current stock levels</li> </ul>	

**#5 Ecosystem Management** (Ecosystem Management)

2. Continue to use existing optimum yield cap for BSAI (as stated in current law) and GOA groundfish fisheries.

PA.1	PA.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sum of TACs has to be within OY range</li> <li>- OY specified as range for BSAI: 1.4- 2.0 mill MT and OY specified as range for GOA: 116,000 - 800,000 MT; BSAI OY cap: if the sum of TAC &gt; 2 mill mt then TAC will be adjusted down</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revisit the calculation of the OY caps to determine their relevancy to current environmental conditions and our knowledge of current stock levels</li> </ul>
	5A

11. Improve the procedure to adjust ABCs as necessary to account for uncertainty and ecosystem factors.

PA.1	PA.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop ecosystem indicators for future use in TAC-setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop and implement, as appropriate, criteria for using key ecosystem indicators in the TAC-setting process</li> </ul>
5B	5B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to use and improve current harvest control rules to maintain a spawning stock biomass with the potential to produce sustained yields on a continuing basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop, implement and update as necessary, procedures to account for uncertainty in estimating ABC, species-specific production patterns, and ecosystem considerations</li> </ul>
5B	

4. Initiate a scientific review of the adequacy of  $F_{40}$  and adopt improvements as appropriate.

PA.1	PA.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conduct <math>F_{40}</math> review and adopt appropriate measures as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop, implement and update as necessary, procedures to account for uncertainty in estimating ABC, species-specific production patterns, and ecosystem considerations (<i>Motion passed 16/1/1</i>)</li> </ul>
	5A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revisit the calculation of the OY caps to determine their relevancy to current environmental conditions and our knowledge of current stock levels</li> </ul>

**#6 Improve Data Quality, Monitoring and Enforcement:** (Improve Data Quality and Management)

39. Improve groundfish Observer Program, and consider ways to address the disproportionate costs associated with the current funding mechanism.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue existing Observer coverage or modify based on data and compliance needs</li> <li>- Modification should be scientifically-based (e.g., random placement, flexibility, variable rate)</li> <li>- Industry pays for observer deployment related costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expand/modify observer coverage based on scientific data and compliance needs (applies to all vessels: &lt;60' and ≥ 60')</li> </ul>	6A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop and implement alternate funding mechanisms                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Federal funding</li> <li>(b) Research Plan (e.g., fee-based)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Motion passed 18/0</i></p>	6A

40. Improve community and regional economic impact costs and benefits through increased data reporting requirements.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain current reporting requirements                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) AFA requirement that all CPs and motherships to weigh all pollock catch on NMFS approved scales</li> <li>(b) CDQ requirement that all CDQ groundfish catch is to be weighed on NMFS-approved scales</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop programs for mandatory economic data collection while protecting confidential information</li> <li>- Explore programs that collect, verify, then aggregate economic data through independent third party (accounting firm/other) while protecting confidential information on an individual/firm basis</li> <li>- Collect and verify aggregate economic data through independent third party (e.g. accounting firm)</li> </ul>	6B

41. Increase the quality of monitoring and enforcement data through improved technological means.

PA.1	PA.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain mandatory VMS requirement for Atka mackerel, p.cod, and pollock fleets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Modify VMS to incorporate new technology and system providers</li> </ul>	6C