NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Angel Drobnica, Chair | David Witherell, Executive Director
1007 W. 3rd Avenue, Suite 400, Anchorage AK 99501
Phone 907-271-2809 | www.npfmc.org

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

REPORT

October 3-7, 2023 – Anchorage, AK

The Advisory Panel met Tuesday, October 3, through Saturday, October 7, 2023, at the Hilton Hotel, in Anchorage, AK. The following members were present for all or part of the meetings (absent members are ~~stricken~~):

Briggie, Tamara	~~Kavanaugh, Julie~~	Price, Landry
Edson, Jesse	Laitinen, Rick	Radell, Chelsae
Gudmundsson, Gretar	Mann, Heather	Ritchie, Brian (Chair)
~~Heuker, Tim~~	Mitchell, Lauren (Co-VC)	Upton, Matt
Johnson, Jim	O'Donnell, Paddy	Wilkins, Paul (Co-VC)
Johnson, Mellisa	O'Neil, Megan	Zagorski, Suzie

C1 BSAI Crab Specs

Motion 1

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2023 Crab SAFE Report, as well as the 2023-24 OFL and ABC as recommended by the SSC for EBS Snow Crab, Bristol Bay Red King Crab, EBS Tanner Crab and Pribilof Islands Blue King Crab.

Motion passed 15/0

Rationale in Favor of Main Motion:

- *The AP thanks the council staff and SSC for their hard work to prepare these recommendations.*
- *The AP is encouraged by the possibility of a Bristol Bay Red King Crab fishery opening for the 2023/24 season.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

C2 Observer 2024 Annual Deployment Plan

The AP acknowledges the receipt of the 2024 Draft Annual Deployment Plan including the Partial Coverage Cost Efficiencies Analysis, and the PCFMAC Committee Report and appreciates the significant amount of time and effort that has been invested into the cost efficiencies analysis in order to give us the 2024 ADP.

The AP supports the following PCFMAC recommendations for the 2024 ADP:

1. Fixed stratification by FMP area and NMFS should make a clear statement that while boats must declare in ODDS which areas their predominant catch will occur, they are allowed to continue fishing in both the BSAI and GOA on the same trip.
2. Proximity allocation scheme, unless the CWB approach is able to be revised for 2024.
3. NMFS should run the CWB allocation approach without the legacy EM hardware costs for both fixed gear and trawl EM prior to the December 2023 Council meeting.
4. Trawl EM should maintain a 33% shoreside sampling frame for 2024 since industry is obtaining outside funding that does not affect the partial coverage observer budget.

The AP supports the following PCFMAC recommendations to continue work for the 2025 ADP.

5. NMFS should further determine what specific level of biological data is needed for stock assessment to be incorporated into the 2025 ADP.
6. NMFS should further explore the appropriate time/space scale for biological samples in order to explore a revised hurdle and an analysis of how to effectively deploy days in addition to that hurdle for the 2025 ADP.
7. If unable to run CWB allocation approaches without legacy EM hardware costs for both fixed gear and trawl EM prior to the December 2023 Council meeting for incorporation into the 2024 ADP, it should be further explored for the 2025 ADP.

The AP also supports the PCFMAC's recommendations for the following proposals moving forward in the 2024 NFWF Electronic Monitoring and Reporting Grant Program:

- Real Time Data - electronic logbooks for GOA fixed gear halibut and sablefish.
- North Pacific Fisheries Association - Evaluation and testing of alternative catch handling protocols for single pot EM.
- Saltwater Inc - Proposal to test using EM to monitor sorting line for salmon and further observer tool efficiencies.
- Alaska Groundfish Data Bank's proposal to test Trawl EM for all targets and both pelagic and non-pelagic gear in the CGOA Rockfish Program.
- AGDB and Aleutians East Borough's proposal to help cover partial coverage costs for the final year of pollock trawl EM EFP.

Amendment 1
The AP supports the FVOA pilot project as a way of gaining information and PCFMAC suggestion that the proposer select a PI who could write a cooperative research grant proposal and coordinate the project
Amendment passed: 15/0

Rationale in Favor of Amendment:

- *This pilot project could potentially create both flexibility and cost savings for vessels departing from ports that are less rural and have a larger observer base that would not need to travel to join the vessel. The savings on travel and lodging would potentially greatly decrease the daily observer "at sea cost."*
- *There has been extensive public comment from FVOA regarding this option and the AP agrees that coordinating a grant proposal to move this forward is the best next step.*

Main Motion passed : 15/0

Rationale in Favor of Main Motion:

- *The fixed FMP stratification scheme provides benefits since pot and longline strata will now be combined into a single strata. This more closely aligns with how fixed gear vessels are operating and conducting trips which streamlines the strata and prevents confusion.*
- *The proximity allocation scheme provides benefits by distributing sampling across space and time, which reduces data gaps, and provides ability to detect monitoring effects.*
- *While the AP recognizes the Agency's need to include actual costs that they have paid into future cost estimates, the AP heard public testimony and there was discussion at the September PCFMAC committee meeting echoing concern for the current trawl and fixed gear cost estimates. The cost weighted boxes approach does have merits, but the AP would request further revision to the cost estimates before it is utilized in an ADP. If that can't be done for 2024, it should be included in the 2025 ADP.*
- *The AP received public comments both written and spoken, in addition to recommendations from both the PCFMAC and NMFS that Trawl EM should maintain the 33% shoreside sampling rate in 2024 since industry is seeking NFWF funding to cover costs and it will not affect the partial coverage budget for 2024.*
- *There was discussion at the PCFMAC and notes in the presentation about exploring the appropriate time/space scale for biological samples in order to explore a revised hurdle and an analysis of how to effectively deploy days in addition to that hurdle for the 2025 ADP.*
- *NMFS should further determine what specific level of biological data is needed for stock assessment to be incorporated into the 2025 ADP.*
- *Although there is no perfect monitoring scheme that will check all of the boxes,it is important to prioritize the reliability of Chinook PSC estimates and pursue allocation schemes that minimize the coefficients of variation, and thus the precision and reliability of Chinook PSC estimates, given the Council priorities of Chinook PSC accounting, as evidenced by one of the main objectives of creating the pelagic pollock Trawl EM program.*
- *Given current market conditions and extremely low ex-vessel prices, it's critical to continue to meet the observer program objectives but continue to find efficiencies that will create resilience in the face of lower partial coverage fee revenues and significantly reduced available funds in the partial coverage budget for the foreseeable future.*
- *Support was echoed for all the projects mentioned at the September PCFMAC meeting specifically applying for 2024 NFWF funds.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

C3 BSAI/GOA Groundfish Specs

Motion 1: BSAI Groundfish Specifications
The AP recommends the Council adopt the proposed 2024 and 2025 BSAI groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC and set TACs, with all proposed specifications consisting of rollovers of 2024 final specifications from 2023/2024 harvest specifications. The TACs for both BS and AI Pacific cod have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries. The TACs for sablefish have also been reduced in the BSAI by 5% to accommodate the GHL fishery.

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed flatfish ABC reserves, 2024 and 2025 annual and seasonal PSC limits and apportionments in the BSAI as provided in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. The Proposed 2024 and 2025 Prohibited Species Bycatch Allowances in Tables 10 and 11, respectively, have been adjusted to account for the Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program. Additionally, the AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed 2024 and 2025 halibut discard mortality rates (DMRs) for the BSAI as shown in Table 13.
Tables 1 and 7 - 13 can also be found in the meeting agenda under C3.

Motion passed 17/0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The AP appreciates the efforts of the Groundfish Plan Teams and the SSC in the review of survey information and of various stocks in preparation for this part of the annual specifications process.*
- *This is a standard action that occurs every October meeting to ensure that the TACs set in 2022 for 2023 and 2024 are available to be in place until NMFS can publish the final Specifications in the Federal Register.*

Motion 2: GOA Groundfish Specifications
The AP recommends the Council adopt the proposed 2024 and 2025 Gulf of Alaska groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC and set TACs as shown in Table 1, with all proposed specifications consisting of rollovers of final specifications from 2023. The TACs for both Gulf of Alaska cod and Pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries. The Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod adjustments are shown in Table 2.
The AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed 2024 and 2025 annual and seasonal Pacific halibut PSC limits and apportionments in the Gulf of Alaska as provided in Tables 9, 10, and 11 and the proposed 2024 and 2025 halibut discard mortality rates (DMRs) for the Gulf of Alaska in Table 12.

All tables are attached and shown in the GOA 2024 and 2025 proposed tables document as provided by Council staff.

Motion passed 17/0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The AP appreciates the efforts of the Groundfish Plan Teams and the SSC in the review of survey information and of various stocks in preparation for this part of the annual specifications process.*
- *This is a standard action that occurs every October meeting to ensure that the TACs set in 2022 for 2023 and 2024 are available to be in place until NMFS can publish the final Specifications in the Federal Register.*

Motion 3:
The AP recommends that the methods used to estimate halibut mortality be reviewed with a particular focus on marine mammal feeding on discards as suggested by the Interagency Halibut DMR Workgroup. **This recommendation is not specific to any one gear type or fishery.**

*Amendment passed 17/0 (amendment in **bold**)*
Amended Main Motion passed 17/0

Rational in Favor of Amendment:

- *This motion stems directly from the Interagency Halibut DMR WorkgroupRecommendations for GOA and BSAI Groundfish Fisheries in 2024 and 2025: " The Workgroup suggests that the methods used to estimate halibut mortality be reviewed with a particular focus on marine mammal feeding on discards."*
- *This motion is not intended to be specific to any gear type though the Interagency Halibut DMR Workgroup referenced this recommendation alongside issues with the decksorting program and marine mammal predation while decksorting. The AP feels it is important to review all marine mammal interactions within all fisheries and assure proper accounting of all halibut DMR's.*
- *There were multiple questions of staff by AP members and members of the public as to who is the best group to conduct this review. Staff was unsure who to appoint and the AP urges the council to direct either the Interagency Halibut DMR Workgroup or staff to move forward on a review of current halibut DMR's.*

Table 1. SSC recommended OFL, ABC and AP reccomended TACs for Groundfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (metric tons) for 2024-2025

Species	Area	2022 OFL	2022 ABC	2022 TAC	Catch as of 12/31/2022	2023 OFL	2023 ABC	2023 TAC	Catch as of 9/13/2023	SSC reccomended 2024/2025 OFL	SSC reccomended 2024/2025 ABC	AP 2024/2025 TAC
Pollock	EBS	1,469,000	1,111,000	1,111,000	1,105,677	3,381,000	1,910,000	1,300,000	1,250,856	4,639,000	2,275,000	1,302,000
	AI	61,264	50,752	19,000	3,058	52,383	43,413	19,000	2,694	52,043	43,092	19,000
	Bogoslof	113,479	85,109	250	259	115,146	86,360	300	117	115,146	86,360	300
Pacific cod	BS	183,012	153,383	136,466	120,448	172,495	144,834	127,409	82,262	166,814	140,159	123,295
	AI	27,400	20,600	13,796	6,450	18,416	13,812	8,425	2,763	18,416	13,812	8,425
Sablefish	BSAI/GOA	40,432	34,521	n/a		47,390	40,502			48,561	41,539	
	BS	n/a	5,264	5,264	5,514	n/a	8,417	7,996	4,796	n/a	10,185	9,676
	AI	n/a	6,463	6,463	2,230	n/a	8,884	8,440	1,919	n/a	10,308	9,793
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	377,071	354,014	250,000	154,253	404,882	378,499	230,000	71,967	495,155	462,890	230,656
Greenland turbot	BSAI	7,687	6,572	6,572	1,478	4,645	3,960	3,960	1,248	3,947	3,364	3,364
	BS	n/a	5,540	5,540	1,038	n/a	3,338	3,338	771	n/a	2,836	2,836
	AI	n/a	1,032	1,032	440	n/a	622	622	477	n/a	528	528
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	94,445	80,389	20,000	7,857	98,787	83,852	15,000	5,910	103,070	87,511	15,000
Kamchatka flounder	BSAI	10,903	9,214	9,214	8,369	8,946	7,579	7,579	6,753	8,776	7,435	7,435
Northern rock sole	BSAI	214,084	206,896	66,000	18,399	166,034	121,719	66,000	22,833	196,011	119,969	66,000
Flathead sole	BSAI	77,967	64,288	35,500	14,690	79,256	65,344	35,500	7,522	81,167	66,927	35,500
Alaska plaice	BSAI	39,305	32,697	29,221	11,253	40,823	33,946	17,500	9,489	43,328	36,021	18,000
Other flatfish	BSAI	22,919	17,189	10,000	2,559	22,919	17,189	4,500	2,874	22,919	17,189	4,500
Pacific Ocean perch	BSAI	42,605	35,688	35,385	34,782	50,133	42,038	37,703	29,580	49,279	41,322	38,264
	BS	n/a	10,352	10,352	10,066	n/a	11,903	11,903	8,078	n/a	11,700	11,700
	EAI	n/a	8,083	8,083	7,996	n/a	8,152	8,152	5,494	n/a	8,013	8,013
	CAI	n/a	5,950	5,950	5,837	n/a	5,648	5,648	4,792	n/a	5,551	5,551
	WAI	n/a	11,303	11,000	10,882	n/a	16,335	12,000	11,216	n/a	16,058	13,000
Northern rockfish	BSAI	23,420	19,217	17,000	7,898	22,776	18,687	11,000	9,867	22,105	18,135	11,000
Blackspotted/Rougheye Rockfish	BSAI	598	503	503	455	703	525	525	489	763	570	570
	EBS/EAI	n/a	326	326	204		359	359	190	n/a	388	388
	CAI/WAI	n/a	177	177	250		166	166	299	n/a	182	182
Shortraker rockfish	BSAI	722	541	541	284	706	530	530	199	706	530	530
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,751	1,313	1,144	1,308	1,680	1,260	1,260	1,034	1,680	1,260	1,260
	BS	n/a	919	750	651		880	880	576	n/a	880	880
	AI	n/a	394	394	657		380	380	458	n/a	380	380
Atka mackerel	BSAI	91,870	78,510	66,481	58,107	118,787	98,588	69,282	55,903	101,188	86,464	66,855
	EAI/BS	n/a	27,260	27,260	19,138	n/a	43,281	27,260	15,369	n/a	37,958	30,000
	CAI	n/a	16,880	16,880	16,761	n/a	17,351	17,351	16,601	n/a	15,218	15,218
	WAI	n/a	34,370	22,341	22,208	n/a	37,956	24,671	23,932	n/a	33,288	21,637
Skates	BSAI	47,790	39,958	30,000	29,236	46,220	38,605	27,441	20,205	44,168	36,837	27,927
Sharks	BSAI	689	517	500	127	689	450	250	307	689	450	250
Octopuses	BSAI	4,769	3,576	700	251	4,769	3,576	400	119	4,769	3,576	400
Total	BSAI	2,953,182	2,383,653	1,871,000	1,594,941	4,859,585	3,155,268	2,000,000	1,591,707	6,219,700	3,590,412	2,000,000

Sources: 2022 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs and 2023 OFLs and ABCs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2021 and December 2022 respectively; 2022 catches through December 31, and 2023 catches through September 13, 2023 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Table 7–Proposed 2024 and 2025 ABC Surplus, ABC Reserves, Community Development Quota (CDQ) ABC Reserves, and Amendment 80 ABC Reserves in the BSAI for Flathead Sole, Rock Sole, and Yellowfin Sole

[Amounts are in metric tons]			
Sector	Flathead sole	Rock sole	Yellowfin sole
ABC	66,927	119,969	462,890
TAC	35,500	66,000	230,656
ABC surplus	31,427	53,969	232,234
ABC reserve	31,427	53,969	232,234
CDQ ABC reserve	3,363	5,775	24,849
Amendment 80 ABC reserve	28,064	48,194	207,385

Table 8–Proposed 2024 and 2025 Apportionment of Prohibited Species Catch Allowances to Non-Trawl Gear, the CDQ Program, Amendment 80, and the BSAI Trawl Limited Access Sectors

PSC species and area[1]	Total PSC	Non-trawl PSC	CDQ PSQ reserve[2]	Trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ	Amendment 80 sector[3]	BSAI trawl limited access sector	BSAI PSC limits not allocated[2]
Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	3,515	710	315	n/a	1,745	745	n/a
Herring (mt) BSAI	3,444	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	97,000	n/a	10,379	86,621	43,293	26,489	16,839
C. opilio (animals) COBLZ	4,350,000	n/a	465,450	3,884,550	1,909,256	1,248,494	726,799
C. bairdi crab (animals) Zone 1	980,000	n/a	104,860	875,140	368,521	411,228	95,390
C. bairdi crab (animals) Zone 2	2,970,000	n/a	317,790	2,652,210	627,778	1,241,500	782,932

[1] Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of areas and zones.

[2] The PSQ reserve for crab species is 10.7 percent of each crab PSC limit.

[3] The Amendment 80 program reduced apportionment of the trawl PSC limits for crab below the total PSC limit. These reductions are not apportioned to other gear types or sectors.

Table 9-Proposed 2024 and 2025 Herring and Red King Crab Savings Subarea Prohibited Species Catch Allowances for All Trawl Sectors

Fishery categories	Herring (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1
Yellowfin sole	200	n/a
Rock sole/flathead sole/Alaska plaice/other flatfish [1]	99	n/a
Greenland turbot/arrowtooth flounder/Kamchatka flounder/sablefish	10	n/a
Rockfish	10	n/a
Pacific cod	18	n/a
Midwater trawl pollock	3,066	n/a
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species[2,3]	41	n/a
2024 Red king crab savings subarea non-pelagic trawl gear[4]	n/a	24,250
Total trawl PSC	3,444	97,000

[1]"Other flatfish" for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), Alaska plaice, arrowtooth flounder, flathead sole, Greenland turbot, Kamchatka flounder, rock sole, and yellowfin sole.

[2]Pollock other than midwater trawl pollock, Atka mackerel, and "other species" fishery category.

[3]"Other species" for PSC monitoring includes skates, sharks, and octopuses.

[4] The Council recommended and NMFS approves that the red king crab bycatch limit for non-pelagic trawl fisheries within the RKCSS be limited to 25 percent of the red king crab PSC allowance (see § 679.21(e)(3)(ii)(B)(2)).
Note: Species apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

the Council recommended and NMFS approves that the red king crab bycatch limit for non-pelagic trawl fisheries within the RKCSS be limited to 25 percent of the red king crab PSC allowance (see § 679.21(e)(3)(ii)(B)(*2*)).

Table 10–Proposed 2024 Prohibited Species Bycatch Allowances for the BSAI Trawl Limited Access Sectors and Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program

BSAI trawl limited access sector fisheries	Prohibited species and area[1]				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	*C. opilio* (animals) COBLZ	*C. bairdi* (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	265	23,337	1,192,179	346,228	1,185,500
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish[2]	-	-	-	-	-
Greenland turbot/arrowtooth flounder/Kamchatka flounder/sablefish	-	-	-	-	-
Rockfish, April 15-December 31	5	-	1,006	-	1,000
Total Pacific cod[4]	300	2,955	50,281	60,000	50,000
AFA CP Pacific cod	6	278	4,726	5,640	4,700
PCTC Program Pacific cod, January 20-June 10	244	1,653	28,130	33,567	27,973
Trawl CV Pacific cod, June 10-November 1	15	134	2,278	2,718	2,265
PCTC Program unallocated reduction	35	890	15,147	18,075	15,062
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species[3]	175	197	5,028	5,000	5,000
Total BSAI trawl limited access sector PSC	745	26,489	1,248,494	411,228	1,241,500

[1] Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of areas and zones.

[2] "Other flatfish" for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), Alaska plaice,

[3] "Other species" for PSC monitoring includes skates, sharks, and octopuses.

[4] The Pacific cod fishery is further apportioned between the PCTC Program, the trawl catcher vessel limited access C season, and AFA catcher/processors as established at § 679.131(c) and (d).

Note: Species apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

Table 11–Proposed 2025 Prohibited Species Bycatch Allowances for the BSAI Trawl Limited Access Sectors and Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program

BSAI trawl limited access sector fisheries	Prohibited species and area[1]				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	*C. opilio* (animals) COBLZ	*C. bairdi* (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	265	23,337	1,192,179	346,228	1,185,500
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish[2]	-	-	-	-	-
Greenland turbot/arrowtooth flounder/Kamchatka flounder/sablefish	-	-	-	-	-
Rockfish April 15-December 31	5	-	1,006	-	1,000
Total Pacific cod[4]	300	2,955	50,281	60,000	50,000
AFA CP Pacific cod	6	278	4,726	5,640	4,700
PCTC Program Pacific cod, January 20-June	209	1,653	28,130	33,567	27,973
Trawl CV Pacific cod, June 10-November 1	15	134	2,278	2,718	2,265
PCTC Program unallocated reduction	70	890	15,147	18,075	15,062
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species[3]	175	197	5,028	5,000	5,000
Total BSAI trawl limited access sector PSC	745	26,489	1,248,494	411,228	1,241,500

[1] Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of areas and zones.

[2] "Other flatfish" for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), Alaska plaice,

[3] "Other species" for PSC monitoring includes skates, sharks, and octopuses.

[4] The Pacific cod fishery is further apportioned between the PCTC Program, the trawl catcher vessel limited access C season, and AFA catcher/processors as established at § 679.131(c) and (d).

Note: Species apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

Table 12–Proposed 2024 and 2025 Halibut Prohibited Species Bycatch Allowances for Non-Trawl Fisheries

Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI				
Non-trawl fisheries	Seasons	Catcher/processor	Catcher vessel	All Non-Trawl
Pacific cod	Annual Pacific cod	648	13	661
	January 1-June 10	388	9	n/a
	June 10-August 15	162	2	n/a
	August 15-December 31	98	2	n/a
Non-Pacific cod non-trawl-Total	May 1-December 31	n/a	n/a	49
Groundfish pot and jig	n/a	n/a	n/a	Exempt
Sablefish hook-and-line	n/a	n/a	n/a	Exempt
Total for all non-trawl PSC	n/a	n/a	n/a	710

Table 13–Proposed 2024 and 2025 Pacific Halibut Discard Mortality Rates (DMR) for the BSAI

Gear	Sector	Halibut discard mortality rate (percent)
Pelagic trawl	All	100
Non-pelagic trawl	Mothership and catcher/processor	85
Non-pelagic trawl	Catcher vessel	63
Hook-and-line	Catcher vessel	7
Hook-and-line	Catcher/processor	7
Pot	All	26

Table 1. SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs and AP recommended TACs for Proposed Harvest Specifications for Groundfish in the Gulf of Alaska (metric tons) for 2024 and 2

		2022			Catch	2023			Catch	Plan Team Proposed 2024/25		
Species	**Area**	**OFL**	**ABC**	**TAC**	**12/31/2022**	**OFL**	**ABC**	**TAC**	**9/14/2023**	**OFL**	**ABC**	**TAC**
Pollock	State GHL	n/a	3,327	n/a		n/a	3,723	n/a	3,261	n/a	4,027	n/a
	W (610)	n/a	23,714	23,714	23,615	n/a	26,958	26,958	6,033	n/a	29,156	29,156
	C (620)	n/a	69,250	69,250	69,341	n/a	77,005	77,005	58,327	n/a	83,283	83,283
	C (630)	n/a	30,068	30,068	30,505	n/a	33,729	33,729	13,052	n/a	36,478	36,478
	WYAK	n/a	6,722	6,722	6,441	n/a	7,523	7,523	6,888	n/a	8,136	8,136
	Subtotal	154,983	133,081	129,754	129,902	173,470	148,938	145,215	84,300	186,101	161,080	157,053
	EYAK/SEO	15,150	11,363	11,363	-	15,150	11,363	11,363	1	15,150	11,363	11,363
	Total	170,133	144,444	141,117	129,902	188,620	160,301	156,578	84,300	201,251	172,443	168,416
Pacific Cod	W	n/a	9,942	6,959	5,320	n/a	7,464	5,225	3,233	n/a	6,873	4,811
	C	n/a	19,752	14,814	13,195	n/a	14,830	11,123	8,501	n/a	13,655	10,241
	E	n/a	3,117	2,338	298	n/a	2,340	1,755	510	n/a	2,155	1,616
	Total	39,555	32,811	24,111	18,813	29,737	24,634	18,103	12,245	27,507	22,683	16,668
Sablefish	W	n/a	3,727	3,727	3,035	n/a	4,473	4,473	2,313	n/a	4,626	4,626
	C	n/a	9,965	9,965	8,189	n/a	9,921	9,921	5,456	n/a	8,819	8,819
	WYAK	n/a	3,437	3,437	2,746	n/a	3,205	3,205	2,043	n/a	2,669	2,669
	SEO	n/a	5,665	5,665	5,237	n/a	5,602	5,602	3,596	n/a	4,981	4,981
	GOA Total	n/a	22,794	22,794	19,207	n/a		23,201	13,409	n/a	n/a	21,095
Alaska-wide OFL and ABC	AK Total	40,432	34,521	n/a		47,390	40,502	n/a		48,561	41,539	n/a
Shallow-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	21,256	13,250	33	n/a	22,485	13,250	33	n/a	23,299	13,250
	C	n/a	25,305	25,305	1,264	n/a	26,769	26,769	589	n/a	27,737	27,737
	WYAK	n/a	2,531	2,531	8	n/a	2,677	2,677	6	n/a	2,774	2,774
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,518	1,518	2	n/a	1,606	1,606	1	n/a	1,664	1,664
	Total	62,273	50,610	42,604	1,307	65,736	53,537	44,302	630	68,015	55,474	45,425
Deep-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	256	256	3	n/a	256	256	11	n/a	255	255
	C	n/a	2,139	2,139	117	n/a	2,105	2,105	68	n/a	2,068	2,068
	WYAK	n/a	1,431	1,431	3	n/a	1,407	1,407	3	n/a	1,383	1,383
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,082	2,082	8	n/a	2,048	2,048	2	n/a	2,013	2,013
	Total	7,026	5,908	5,908	131	6,918	5,816	5,816	84	6,802	5,719	5,719
Rex Sole	W	n/a	2,981	2,981	40	n/a	3,236	3,236	21	n/a	3,314	3,314
	C	n/a	12,076	12,076	655	n/a	13,110	13,110	355	n/a	13,425	13,425
	WYAK	n/a	1,361	1,361	-	n/a	1,439	1,439	-	n/a	1,453	1,453
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,723	2,723	-	n/a	2,879	2,879	-	n/a	2,905	2,905
	Total	23,302	19,141	19,141	695	25,135	20,664	20,664	376	25,652	21,097	21,097
Arrowtooth Flounder	W	n/a	33,658	14,500	446	n/a	30,469	14,500	133	n/a	30,093	14,500
	C	n/a	68,394	68,394	11,092	n/a	65,000	65,000	8,102	n/a	64,200	64,200
	WYAK	n/a	6,707	6,707	38	n/a	7,886	7,886	28	n/a	7,789	7,789
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	11,020	6,900	67	n/a	16,130	6,900	25	n/a	15,932	6,900
	Total	143,100	119,779	96,501	11,643	142,749	119,485	94,286	8,287	141,008	118,014	93,389
Flathead Sole	W	n/a	14,755	8,650	43	n/a	12,793	8,650	12	n/a	13,033	8,650
	C	n/a	22,033	15,400	521	n/a	21,487	21,487	364	n/a	21,892	21,892
	WYAK	n/a	1,511	1,511	-	n/a	2,320	2,320	-	n/a	2,363	2,363
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,876	1,876	-	n/a	2,880	2,880	-	n/a	2,934	2,934
	Total	48,928	40,175	27,437	564	48,161	39,480	35,337	376	49,073	40,222	35,839
Pacific ocean perch	W	n/a	2,602	2,602	2,506	n/a	2,529	2,529	2,312	n/a	2,461	2,461
	C	n/a	30,806	30,806	25,548	n/a	29,940	29,940	23,288	n/a	29,138	29,138
	WYAK	n/a	1,409	1,409	1,398	n/a	1,370	1,370	1,366	n/a	1,333	1,333
	W/C/WYAK	41,470	34,817	34,817	29,452	40,308	33,839	33,839	26,967	39,229	32,932	32,932
	SEO	4,110	3,451	3,451	-	3,994	3,354	3,354	-	3,888	3,264	3,264
	Total	45,580	38,268	38,268	29,452	44,302	37,193	37,193	26,967	43,117	36,196	36,196

Northern Rockfish	W	n/a	1,944	1,944	474	n/a	2,614	2,614	360	n/a	2,497	2,497
	C	n/a	3,202	3,202	1,424	n/a	2,350	2,350	934	n/a	2,244	2,244
	E	n/a	-	-	-	n/a	-	-	-	n/a	-	-
	Total	6,143	5,146	5,146	1,898	5,927	4,964	4,964	1,295	5,661	4,741	4,741
Shortraker Rockfish	W	n/a	51	51	7	n/a	51	51	6	n/a	51	51
	C	n/a	280	280	294	n/a	280	280	133	n/a	280	280
	E	n/a	374	374	171	n/a	374	374	186	n/a	374	374
	Total	940	705	705	472	940	705	705	325	940	705	705
Dusky Rockfish	W	n/a	269	269	106	n/a	149	149	56	n/a	141	141
	C	n/a	4,534	4,534	2,472	n/a	7,647	7,647	3,376	n/a	7,264	7,264
	WYAK	n/a	427	427	6	n/a	90	90	1	n/a	85	85
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	142	142	-	n/a	31	31	-	n/a	30	30
	Total	8,614	5,372	5,372	2,584	9,638	7,917	7,917	3,433	9,154	7,520	7,520
Rougheye and Blackspotted Rockfish	W	n/a	184	184	95	n/a	180	180	101	n/a	180	180
	C	n/a	235	235	185	n/a	232	232	133	n/a	231	231
	E	n/a	369	369	190	n/a	363	363	148	n/a	361	361
	Total	947	788	788	470	930	775	775	381	927	772	772
Demersal shelf rockfish	Total	579	365	365	166	376	283	283	197	376	283	283
Thornyhead Rockfish	W	n/a	352	352	110	n/a	314	314	49	n/a	314	314
	C	n/a	910	910	173	n/a	693	693	87	n/a	693	693
	E	n/a	691	691	76	n/a	621	621	44	n/a	621	621
	Total	2,604	1,953	1,953	359	2,170	1,628	1,628	179	2,170	1,628	1,628
Other Rockfish	W/C	n/a	940	940	1,122	n/a	940	940	868	n/a	940	940
	WYAK	n/a	370	370	78	n/a	370	370	46	n/a	370	370
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,744	300	50	n/a	2,744	300	24	n/a	2,744	300
	Total	5,320	4,054	1,610	1,250	5,320	4,054	1,610	938	5,320	4,054	1,610
Atka mackerel	Total	6,200	4,700	3,000	880	6,200	4,700	3,000	435	6,200	4,700	3,000
Big Skate	W	n/a	591	591	174	n/a	591	591	47	n/a	591	591
	C	n/a	1,482	1,482	735	n/a	1,482	1,482	619	n/a	1,482	1,482
	E	n/a	794	794	116	n/a	794	794	117	n/a	794	794
	Total	3,822	2,867	2,867	1,025	3,822	2,867	2,867	783	3,822	2,867	2,867
Longnose Skate	W	n/a	151	151	77	n/a	151	151	58	n/a	151	151
	C	n/a	2,044	2,044	505	n/a	2,044	2,044	405	n/a	2,044	2,044
	E	n/a	517	517	409	n/a	517	517	605	n/a	517	517
	Total	3,616	2,712	2,712	991	3,616	2,712	2,712	1,068	3,616	2,712	2,712
Other Skates	GOA-wide	1,311	984	984	1,041	1,311	984	984	318	1,311	984	984
Sharks	GOA-wide	5,006	3,755	3,755	2,160	6,521	4,891	4,891	1,344	6,521	4,891	4,891
Octopuses	GOA-wide	1,307	980	980	155	1,307	980	980	139	1,307	980	980
TOTAL		**626,738**	**520,038**	**448,118**	**225,165**	**646,826**	**539,072**	**468,796**	**157,510**	**658,311**	**550,224**	**476,537**

Sources: 2022 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2021, 2022 catches through December 31, 2022, and 2023 catches through September 14, 2023 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Table 2. Proposed 2024 and 2025 Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod ABCs, TACs, and State Guideline Harvest Levels (GHLs)
[Values are rounded to the nearest metric ton]

Specifications	Western	Central	Eastern	Total
ABC	6,873	13,655	2,155	22,683
State GHL	2,062	3,414	539	6,014
(%)	30%	25%	25%	
Federal TAC	4,811	10,241	1,616	16,668

Table 9. Proposed 2024 and 2025 Pacific Halibut PSC Limits, Allowances, and Apportionments [Values are in metric tons]

Trawl gear			Hook-and-line gear[1]				
			Other than DSR			DSR	
Season	Percent	Amount[2]	Season	Percent	Amount	Season	Amount
January 20 - April 1	30.5%	520	January 1 - June 10	86%	220	January 1 - December 31	9
April 1 - July 1	20%	341	June 10 - September 1	2%	5		
July 1 - August 1	27%	460	September 1 - December 31	12%	31		
August 1 - October 1	7.5%	128					
October 1 - December 31	15%	256					
Total		1,705			256		9

[1] The Pacific halibut PSC limit for hook-and-line gear is allocated to the demersal shelf rockfish (DSR) fishery and fisheries other than DSR. The hook-and-line IFQ sablefish fishery is exempt from halibut PSC limits, as are pot and jig gear for all groundfish fisheries.

[2] PSC limits published in the Final Harvest Specifications (88 FR 13238, March 2, 2023) had rounding errors. The values presented in this table correct these rounding errors and will be published accordingly in the Proposed and Final 2024 and 2025 Harvest Specifications.

Table 10. Proposed 2024 and 2025 Apportionment of the Pacific Halibut PSC Limits Between the Trawl Gear Shallow-Water and Deep-Water Species Fishery Categories
[Values are in metric tons]

Season	Shallow-water	Deep-water[1]	Total[3]
January 20 - April 1	384	135	520
April 1 - July 1	85	256	341
July 1 - August 1	121	341	460
August 1 - October 1	53	75	128
Subtotal January 20 - October 1	643	807	1,449
October 1 - December 31[23]	n/a	n/a	256
Total	n/a	n/a	1,705

[1] The third season deep-water apportionment of 341 mt is reduced by 191.4 mt for the Rockfish Program Halibut PSC allocation.
[2] There is no apportionment between trawl shallow-water and deep-water species fisheries during the fifth season (October 1 through December 31).
[3] PSC limits published in the Final Harvest Specifications (88 FR 13238, March 2, 2023) had rounding errors. The values presented in this table correct these rounding errors and will be published accordingly in the Proposed and Final 2024 and 2025 Harvest Specifications.

Table 11. Proposed 2024 and 2025 Apportionments of the “Other Hook and Line Fisheries” Halibut PSC Allowance Between the Hook-and-Line Gear Catcher Vessel and Catcher/Processor Sectors [Values are in metric tons]

Hook-and-Line gear (Other than DSR) Annual PSC Amount	Hook-and-line Sector	Annual Amount	Season	Seasonal Percentage	Seasonal Amount
256	CV	149	A	86%	128
			B	2%	3
			C	12%	18
	CP	107	A	86%	92
			B	2%	2
			C	12%	13

Table 12. Proposed 2024 and 2025 Discard Mortality Rates for Vessels Fishing in the Gulf of Alaska
[Values are percent of halibut assumed to be dead]

Gear	Sector	Groundfish fishery	Halibut discard mortality rate (percent)
Pelagic trawl	Catcher vessel	All	100
	Catcher/processor	All	100
Non-pelagic trawl	Catcher vessel	Rockfish Program	56
	Catcher vessel	All others	69
	Mothership and catcher/processor	All	83
Hook-and-line	Catcher/processor	All	11
	Catcher vessel	All	10
Pot	Catcher vessel and catcher/processor	All	26

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

C4 Chum Salmon Bycatch

Motion 1:

The AP supports the current Purpose and Need, the full range of alternatives in the Chum Salmon Bycatch Preliminary Review and recommends the document move forward for Initial Review.

**The purpose and need and list of alternatives are unchanged from April 2023.*

[1] *Salmon are an important fishery resource throughout Alaska, and chum salmon that rear in the Bering Sea support subsistence, commercial, sport, and recreational fisheries throughout Western and Interior Alaska. Western and Interior Alaska salmon stocks are undergoing extreme crises and collapses, with long-running stock problems and consecutive years' failures to achieve escapement goals, U.S.-Canada fish passage treaty requirements, and subsistence harvest needs in the Yukon, Kuskokwim, and Norton Sound regions. These multi-salmon species declines have created adverse impacts to culture and food security and have resulted in reduced access to traditional foods and commercial salmon fisheries.*

The best available science suggests that ecosystem and climate changes are the leading causes of recent chum salmon run failures; however, non-Chinook (primarily chum) salmon are taken in the Eastern Bering Sea pollock trawl fishery which reduces the amount of salmon that return to Western and Interior Alaska rivers and subsistence fisheries. It is important to acknowledge and understand all sources of chum mortality and the cumulative impact of various fishing activities. In light of the critical importance of chum salmon to Western Alaska communities and ecosystems, the Council is considering additional measures to further minimize Western Alaskan chum bycatch in the pollock fishery.

The purpose of this proposed action is to develop actions to minimize bycatch of Western Alaska origin chum salmon in the Eastern Bering Sea pollock fishery consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, National Standards, and other applicable law. Consistent, annual genetics stock composition information indicates that the majority of non-Chinook bycatch in the pollock fishery is of Russian/Asian hatchery origin; therefore, alternatives should structure non-Chinook bycatch management measures around improving performance in avoiding Western Alaska chum salmon specifically.

The Council intends to consider establishing additional regulatory non-Chinook bycatch management measures that reduce Western Alaska chum bycatch; provide additional opportunities for the pollock trawl fleet to improve performance in avoiding non-Chinook salmon while maintaining the priority of the objectives of the Amendment 91 and Amendment 110 Chinook salmon bycatch avoidance program; meet and balance the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, particularly to minimize

salmon bycatch to the extent practicable under National Standard 9; include the best scientific information available including Local Knowledge and Traditional Knowledge as required by National Standard 2; take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities including those that are dependent on Bering Sea pollock and subsistence salmon fisheries as required under National Standard 8; and to achieve optimum yield in the BSAI groundfish fisheries on a continuing basis, in the groundfish fisheries as required under National Standard 1.

Alternative 1: Status Quo
All action alternatives apply to the entire Bering Sea pollock B season**,** the season in which chum salmon are taken as bycatch (prohibited species catch or PSC).

Alternative 2: Overall bycatch (PSC) limit for chum salmon

Option 1: Chum salmon PSC limit based on historical total bycatch numbers.

[2] ~~Option 1: PSC limit: Establish an overall PSC limit of:~~

- ~~Sub-option A: 0.~~
- ~~Sub-option B: 22,000.~~
- ~~Sub-option C: 280,000.~~

PSC limits are apportioned among CDQ, catcher processor, mothership and inshore sectors based on historical total bycatch by sector. The inshore limit is further apportioned among the inshore cooperatives. The CDQ limit is further apportioned among the CDQ groups. Reaching a limit closes the pollock fishery to which the limit applies.

Option 2: Weighted, step-down PSC limit triggered by a three-river chum index (Kwiniuk (or index developed for Norton Sound area), Yukon, Kuskokwim) that is linked to prior years' chum abundance/ANS/escapement and weighted to account for variance in stock sizes across river systems.

[2] ~~Option 2: PSC limit linked to in-river indices: Establish a PSC limit range from 0 to 280,000 that is linked to multi-region in-river indices using prior-year chum abundance and/or ANS and/or escapement goals inclusive of the Norton Sound, Yukon, and Kuskokwim regions.~~

PSC limits would be triggered and in effect when one or more Western Alaska chum index areas fails to meet index thresholds. As more areas fail to meet index thresholds, chum PSC limits would step-down and become more restrictive. PSC limits are apportioned among CDQ, catcher processor, mothership and inshore sectors. The inshore limit is further apportioned among the inshore cooperatives. The CDQ limit is further apportioned among the CDQ groups. Reaching a limit closes the pollock fishery to which the limit applies.

Alternative 3: Bycatch (PSC) limit for Western Alaska chum salmon

Option 1: Western Alaska chum salmon PSC limit based on historical total bycatch numbers.

PSC limits are apportioned among CDQ, catcher processor, mothership and inshore sectors based on historical total bycatch by sector. The inshore limit is further apportioned among the inshore cooperatives. The CDQ limit is further apportioned among the CDQ groups. Reaching a limit closes the pollock fishery to which the limit applies.

Option 2: Weighted, step-down Western Alaska chum PSC limit triggered by a three-river chum index (Kwiniuk (or index developed for Norton Sound area), Yukon, Kuskokwim) that is linked to prior years' chum abundance/ANS/escapement and weighted to account for variance in stock sizes across river systems.

PSC limits would be triggered and in effect when one or more Western Alaska chum index areas fails to meet index thresholds. As more areas fail to meet index thresholds, chum PSC limits would step-down and become more restrictive. PSC limits are apportioned among CDQ, catcher processor, mothership and inshore sectors. The inshore limit is further apportioned among the inshore cooperatives. The CDQ limit is further apportioned among the CDQ groups. Reaching a limit closes the pollock fishery to which the limit applies.

Alternative 4: Additional regulatory requirements for Incentive Plan Agreements (IPAs) to be managed by either NMFS or within the IPAs

Option 1: Require a chum salmon reduction plan agreement to prioritize avoidance in genetic cluster areas 1 and 2 for a specified amount of time based on two triggers being met: 1) an established chum salmon incidental catch rate and 2) historical genetic composition (proportion) of Western Alaska chum salmon to non-Western Alaska chum salmon.

Option 2: Additional regulatory provisions requiring Incentive Plan Agreements to utilize the most refined genetics information available to further prioritize avoidance of areas and times of highest proportion of Western Alaska and Upper/Middle Yukon chum stocks.

As part of the Initial Review analysis, the AP recommends the following suggestions, which are intended to be responsive to some of the decision points before the Council as summarized in Table ES 6 of the Preliminary Review.

1. Move the analysis of temperature data to Alternative 4 rather than linking it to a management measure in Alternative 2.

2. Rely on the SSC's recommendations for scientific responses on the inclusion of data for the potential 3-Area Index.

3. Focus on industry developed IPAs, in consultation with the Council, as the responsible management entity of measures implemented under a chum salmon Reduction Plan Agreement (RPA).

4. Have the IPAs evaluate the efficacy of potential regulatory indicators and determine trigger values. This would include supporting industry consultation with Council staff to submit a detailed proposal for analysis prior to the Initial Review for incorporation into that analysis. The following is a list of potential regulatory indicators that could be evaluated for inclusion in the industry's IPA proposal.

a. Temperature data
b. Adjusted bycatch rates
c. Adjusted base rates
d. Adjusted closure area size
e. Adjusted closure duration
f. Genetic Data
g. Genetic cluster thresholds

5. The triggers referenced in Alternative 4 could be included in the proposal, but should be assessed for Cluster 1, Cluster 2, and the combination.

The AP also recommends the following additions be included in the analysis.

· Impact analysis of proposed management measures on the WAK Chum stock.

- **[5] Information on the poor runs in the year 2000 in western Alaska rivers.**
- **[5] Information on bycatch and intercept fisheries & ocean conditions leading up to the year 2000 and record low runs.**
- **[5] Information on the declines on stocks across Canada, Japan, Russia, Korea and Pacific Northwest.**

· Tradeoffs with:

- Chinook PSC
- Herring PSC
- Other bycatch
- Current spatial and temporal closures
- **[4] Crab PSC**

· Sector and Vessel level impacts including, but not limited to:

- Ability to prosecute the pollock fishery to the annual allocation.
- Fishing behavior
- Fuel consumption and additional costs

· Consider sustainable ADF&G data that is protected from funding shortfalls (in order to ensure continued reliability of data) and have a contingency plan in place for unavailable data sources.

· Refined genetic clusters that reflect the pollock fishing grounds more accurately.

· Analysis should expand on CDQ participation in the pollock fishery and any actions' effects on the 65 Western Alaska CDQ villages.

· **[3]** Socioeconomic impacts of each alternative to **all communities** affected by ~~coastal communities, Western Alaska~~ the chum declines, and the State of Alaska.

Main motion as amended: Passed 14-3

Rationale in Favor of Main Motion:

- *The AP noted broad support for including Alternatives 2 and 3 for analysis, but aside from the options proposed in Amendment 2, the AP did not come to a resolution that resulted in recommendations for analysis.*
- *All Alternatives should be considered in an analysis. Even a Chum PSC cap should be analyzed and include a reasonable range of alternatives to assess the negative and positive effects on all user groups affected. If a large number for a cap is included in the analysis it has the potential to reveal that flexibility given to the fleet to manage chum PSC is beneficial and could result in more chum saved than a constraining cap would, while also allowing the fishery to be fully prosecuted.*
- *Ocean temperature is one way to gauge the effects of climate change. It is also easily available data and could be a good indicator of what fishing conditions to expect in the ocean for a fishing season. While this is important, the linkage is uncertain and it should be best analyzed as an indicator rather than linked with a management measure. The IPAs are responsive and likely able to use ocean temperature in combination with other time and area indicators.*
- *The 3-Area Index should be included in the Analysis, but the SSC should have weighted input on whether the data supporting the index would be reliable, as well as which data to utilize.*
- *The Preliminary Review document on page 84 "...doesn't recommend ANS or escapement goals be used in isolation because ANS and escapement goals may sometimes be influenced by factors other than chum salmon analysis in a given year or area..." This is why there should be an additional review of the ADF&G data for assurance that it is sustainable and reliable over a forward-looking timespan. Two major concerns are counts delayed by weather or abandonment of counts, and reliable funding of the programs that operate the counts on the rivers to be included.*
- *If a set of rivers are selected to inform a 3 Area Index, and that index linked with a management measure, ADF&G and/or the Council should consider a contingency plan for ensuring data availability.*
- *The AP considered it important to note that neither the Council, Agency, nor Fishery can guarantee that the chum saved in the Bering Sea will help returns to the rivers of origin.*
- *The pollock industry relies on the use of IPAs, with NMFS and Council oversight, to implement responsive, timely, and spatially explicit salmon avoidance measures. Further discussion of the IPAs, with additional analysis described in the motion, should give more clarity on possibilities for successful avoidance of Western Alaska chum salmon.*
- *There are many factors that already go into managing IPAs, and decisions on when and where to implement a RHS closure. These factors could be enhanced with new or improved data. The IPAs*

are able to make unique and responsive closures in a timely manner, compared to the notification and timing constraints of NMFS management and the need to post a notice to the Federal Register.

- *If any measures are going to be linked with a genetic cluster it would be more beneficial to in-season bycatch avoidance measures to refine the geographical bounds of the clusters to better match the fishing grounds.*
- *The pollock industry intends to be collaborative with the Council and submit a proposal with improved indicators and potential triggers for staff to analyze, according to one of the options outlined in the analysis. The proposal and triggers are expected to be just two ways to hold the industry accountable. The proposal will not be limited to just the indicators and triggers, but other potential changes to the IPAs and SSIP agreements.*
- *An impact analysis on WAK chum Stocks is important to help answer the question of whether or not any of the suggested management measures will meet the purpose and need.*
- *Based on testimony, socioeconomic impacts should be focused on and expanded for CDQ communities, coastal pollock-dependent communities, communities affected by the decline of WAK chum (especially Western Alaskan communities), and the state of Alaska as a whole.*
- *The analysis should include discussion of the multi-faceted CDQ program from both a fishery participation perspective as well as socioeconomic perspective that results from their collective investment in the AFA sector. This would help inform the tradeoffs that could come out of this action consistent with National Standard 8.*

Rationale in Opposition to Main Motion:

- *Failure of the motion to include values associated with a hard cap as outlined in Amendment 2 rendered the main motion less palatable.*

Amendment 1: Passed 17-0 (include the purpose and need statement and list of alternatives)

Rationale in Favor of Amendment 1:

- *This amendment clarifies the language in the initial first paragraph to ensure that the Council, AP, and public know that the original suite of alternatives are still moving forward as part of this review and the motion purpose is to include further information to be analyzed.*
- *It is important to be clear and transparent in motion language in order for all parties involved to understand the action at hand.*

Amendment 2: Failed 6-11 (replace option 1 and 2: failed language in strikethrough)

Rationale in Opposition to Amendment 2:

- *This amendment was a potential substantive change to Alternative 2. Since the intention of this review was to primarily flush out details and give recommendations for the Council decision points, the Council had indicated that they want the AP to provide additional specificity for the next analysis with existing alternatives in their current form.*

- *Some AP members expressed that the lack of a higher range of values for analysis made this alternative unviable. A cap of 280,000 would have shut down the pollock fishery in multiple past years.*
- *The AP heard testimony that the pollock fishery allows communities such as Unalaska to continue to be the only international exporting port in the state to Asia and economic activity from the fishing sector helps to subsidize movement of goods and fuel to Western Alaska. The potential shutdown of the pollock fishery due to reaching a hard cap could also have large impacts to the state's economy as a whole.*
- *At this time the pollock trawl fishery stabilizes the processing sector in many regions. We heard public testimony and comment at the AP that the pollock fishery allows the processing sector, especially in Unalaska, to remain open and viable. There has been a recent collapse of global markets for all seafood species and this economic downturn has already begun to have negative impacts on communities that are heavily dependent on commercial fishing. Further constraining processors with a hard cap on the pollock fishery could result in the loss of processors who support all commercial fisheries, especially those that are much smaller than the pollock fishery, which would have even further devastating effects for all Alaskans.*
- *Some AP members felt there is not enough information to inform a decision on the correct numbers to analyze for a hard cap consideration, which may demonstrate a fundamental problem with Alternative 2 – with the unknowns about hatchery fish and variability of where the Western Alaska chum are and when, it seems unlikely the council could set a cap that will deliver the results intended.*
- *Any hard cap would have to be allocated between sectors. The inshore sector delivering to Alaska communities uses the most bycatch but they also have the least ability to move to avoid chums. At low cap amounts, allocations to individual shoreside vessels could be so small as to prevent any ability to fish.*
- *A range of reasonable cap values should be included in the analysis but zero is not reasonable. Keeping zero in the analysis will complicate and lengthen the analysis and the EIS, which is already under a tight time constraint. The potential impacts of any closure of the pollock fishery could have negative effects on the local, national, and global levels.*
- *A zero level for chum bycatch has been addressed in past Council actions.*
- *Some AP members felt that the high value suggested in the amendment was not reasonable. There was no discussion during public testimony or deliberation of an actual number or numbers for a range. A low static value does not likely account for the ecological and environmental fluctuations experienced in the Bering Sea with Chum. There are too many uncontrollable factors that affect the fluctuation to support a low constraining range of values.*
- *Over the last 30 plus years of the CDQ program, CDQ groups have invested heavily in the pollock fishery. With the recent reductions in revenue from other fisheries including crab, a large portion of benefits are generated from pollock. A zero cap on chum could shut down the B-season fishery, significantly impacting the ability of CDQ groups to distribute benefits to eligible Alaska residents, many of whom live below national poverty standards.*

Rationale in Favor of Amendment 2:

- *Some AP members supported the failed Amendment 2 (which attempted to create a range of PSC limits to be reviewed, including a suboption of zero) not as an effort to shut down the pollock fishery, but as an effort to show the inverse of Alternative 1, No Action and to understand a wider range of economic impacts to the pollock fishery.*
- *Some AP members felt a cap of zero should be analyzed. This has been a consistent request to the Council from subsistence users, Tribes, and Tribal organizations for years in recognition of the severity of the crisis and the fact that it has been "practicable" to expect subsistence users to sit at zero harvest, while thousands of the same fish are utilized as PSC offshore. Many subsistence users see this as waste.*
- *Analysis of a cap of 0 additionally broadens the range of alternatives for analysis, as required under NEPA. The Council and Agency have a responsibility to transparently consider this number and make clear what values they are prioritizing.*
- *22,000 was the chum bycatch level in 2012, which represents the lowest bycatch level in the 2011-2022 time series. This is a reasonable number to include because the fleet has shown they can achieve low chum bycatch such as this; and it broadens the range of numbers for analysis.*
- *The upper end of the proposed range is 280,000, which is the average bycatch in the 2011-2022 time series. This should be the absolute upper bound for analysis, as maintaining average chum bycatch is another way of maintaining the status quo.*
- *This is responsive to public testimony as well as recent proof of the pollock industry on their ability to decrease their chum bycatch.*

Amendment 3: Passed 16-1 (clarify language about assessing socioeconomic impacts)

Rationale in Favor of Amendment 3:

- *The amendment was not intended to change the purpose of the bullet point, rather to assure the inclusion of all communities affected by the chum declines. The AP heard from multiple testifiers that there are affected interior communities along the river system that may not be considered geographically to be part of Western or coastal Alaska.*
- *It is important to break down the potential action impacts at both a statewide and community level separately as there was public testimony on the statewide impacts on the potential shut down or curtailing of the pollock industry in areas such as export, fuel prices, movement of goods/shipping, ect.*

Rationale in Opposition to Amendment 3:

- *The language is too broad.*

Amendment 4: Passed 11-6 (Add Crab PSC)

Rationale in Favor of Amendment 4:

- *Crab has consistently occupied the "other bycatch" category and in the face of the crisis many crab fisheries are experiencing today, it is important to elevate crab to a level of consideration on its own.*

Rationale in Opposition to Amendment 4:

- *The original intention of specifying Chinook PSC and Herring PSC in the bulleted list of tradeoffs that the analysis should consider was to clearly prioritize the two most constraining PSC species to the pollock fleet. Any adopted alternatives to minimize chum bycatch are most likely to impact the pollock fleet's ability to avoid chinook and herring. The analysis of tradeoffs with all other species, including crab, was intended to be included in "other bycatch"; those other bycatch species are not expected to be as constraining to the pollock fleet.*
- *There was expressed concern that the addition of crab PSC as its own bulletin could detract from the chum bycatch analysis as there are many pending issues and concerns around crab PSC being discussed at this time.*

Amendment 5: Passed 12-5 (three additional items to be included in the analysis)

Rationale in Favor of Amendment 5:

- *Page 105 of the analysis has information on a decline in chum salmon around the year 2000 that appears similar to the decline the region is experiencing now. Information to help understand what led to that decline could help inform the current action.*
- *Information on Trawl bycatch numbers during that same time period (leading up to and during the chum salmon declines of the year 2000) and also potential impacts from the area M intercept fisheries would also add helpful context.*
- *Any additional information as to the condition or causes of chum salmon declines in other regions would inform our understanding of broader chum population trends.*

Rationale in Opposition to Amendment 5:

- *There is validity in exploring all possible data that may inform understanding of current chum declines, but doing so at this stage may slow down the analysis with uncertain benefits.*
- *The Area M salmon fisheries' intercept of Western Alaska chum is being discussed extensively through the State process and it shouldn't be brought into the Federal process.*

Motion 2:

The AP recommends the Council include periodic review for any action alternative.

Motion failed: 7-10

Rationale in Opposition to the Motion:

- *Annual IPA updates and salmon genetics reports present a yearly opportunity to review performance of the pollock fishery and to determine whether or not it has been successful at bycatch avoidance. It is not necessary to initiate a periodic review framework when this capability already exists.*
- *At any Council meeting, the opportunity exists for the public to ask for a review or revision due to unintended effects of any past Council action. A planned review for each action is not necessary and may be burdensome to staff and jeopardize other high-priority concerns.*
- *Some AP members pointed out that typically the Council process only associates a regulatory review process with new Limited Access Privilege Programs or changes in gear, such as slinky pots for sablefish.*
- *Some AP members felt it is too early in the process to consider adding a periodic review.*
- *AP members felt the timeline was not specific and expressed concerns there may not be measurable metrics of success for the action and that could challenge the success or efficacy of accurate review.*

Rationale in Favor of the Motion:

- *Without a planned initial comprehensive review subsequent to potential Council action on this subject, there is concern that the opportunity to review its efficacy may be limited.*
- *The information to support the desired action outcomes identified in the Council's Purpose and Need Statement is uncertain. Moving forward with an action that has efficacy linked to unlikely scenarios is not a scientific approach and does not follow the Precautionary Principle. To meet those standards, this action would benefit from provisions for review where the council could gain insight from new and more relevant data gathered during the management paradigm and fishing environment this action may create.*
- *The impacts of Chum Salmon avoidance measures, caps, or other management strategies are not well understood and data regarding its effects on the pollock fishery and other affected fisheries may not be able to be assessed without first having an action implemented first. AP members felt that makes this action experimental in nature.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

C5 Crab Facility Use Cap

The AP selects Alternatives 2 and 3 as the preliminary preferred alternatives, and releases the analysis for public review.

Motion passes 15-0

Rationale in Favor of Main Motion:

- *This change was fully supported through written and oral public comment.*
- *There are a number of processor shares held by people that don't own processing facilities and need a processor to custom process their crab. This will mitigate the potential for stranded crab should one of the four active processors opt not to process in a season.*
- *Due to severe declines in BBRKC and snow crab, it is highly inefficient and costly to process small amounts of crab. The two action alternatives are intending to fix this situation by removing the facility use caps for two species (alt 2) and adding the last species to the custom processing exemption (Alt 3) such that custom processing of BBRKC, Snow Crab with a South region designation, and WesternAleutian Island Golden King Crab are exempt from IPQ use caps like other species.*
- *The current state of the crab industry is very challenging for all participants and this action helps to ensure healthy processing and healthy harvesting sectors. This action can benefit both by finding efficiencies of scale at lower TACs.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

D1 LKTKS Protocol

The Advisory Panel recommends that the Council adopt the LKTKS protocol and on-ramp recommendations as presented by the Taskforce at the October 2023 meeting. The AP also recommends that the Council initiate a plan with a timeline to implement all the on-ramp recommendations as presented by the Taskforce and begin work now on implementing as many of the on-ramp recommendations as possible. The Council should also consider scheduling a review in 5 years to evaluate its implementation of the protocol and on-ramps.

Motion passed 15/0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The protocol and onramps could help to improve Council analysis, decision-making, and outcomes. It could assist the Council in meeting its National Standard 2 mandate regarding the use of the best scientific information available, as well as elements of other goals and mandates such as those related to equity, environmental justice, climate change, and ecosystem-based fishery management.*
- *The work of the Taskforce was highly transparent and collaborative, and its products have been met with nearly unanimous support and praise. Its products are a unique achievement at a national level.*
- *While some of the onramps may be more difficult to implement than others in the near-term, owing to various challenges (such as capacity and working out implementation details), the Council should adopt the recommendations in their entirety. Laying out a plan with a timeline will give the Council time to address any challenges for on-ramps that may not be as easily implementable right away.*
- *Since the LKTKS onramps are a new, but important and greatly needed shift in Council policy, it is important and appropriate to recommend a five year review to ensure that all on ramps have been incorporated into the process, and are working.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

D2 Crab Review Workplan

The AP recommends that the crab program review include a Social Impact Assessment.

Motion passes 15-0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The AP heard through written comment and public testimony that the social and cultural health of crab dependent communities has been severely impacted by the current state and closures of a number of Alaskan crab fisheries. It is prudent that this information be included in the Crab Program Review.*
- *The past Crab Reviews included an SIA: 1.5 yr, 3 yr, 5 yr and 10 yr. It is sensible that it would also be included in this version.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

D2 Crab Review Workplan

The AP recommends that the crab program review include a Social Impact Assessment.

Motion passes 15-0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The AP heard through written comment and public testimony that the social and cultural health of crab dependent communities has been severely impacted by the current state and closures of a number of Alaskan crab fisheries. It is prudent that this information be included in the Crab Program Review.*
- *The past Crab Reviews included an SIA: 1.5 yr, 3 yr, 5 yr and 10 yr. It is sensible that it would also be included in this version.*
- *The state of the crab fisheries and crab dependant communities are very different than at the time of the 10 year review.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

D3 IFQ Program Review

The AP recommends that the IFQ program review be expanded to include a Social Impact Assessment.

Main Motion passed 15-0

Rational in Favor of Main Motion:

- *The AP heard in both written and public comment that there has yet to be substantive discussion of the impacts of the IFQ program on entry level opportunities, underserved communities, and the ability of residents of fishery dependent communities to reestablish participation in these fisheries.*
- *Rural communities, especially indigenous communities, have continued to see an outmigration of IFQ, for some up to 100%. "All told, between 1996-2015, villages along the Gulf coastline lost an aggregate of 54% in IFQ fisheries' earnings." Loss of access to the sablefish and halibut fishery due to low initial QS allocation or inability to buy IFQ has had serious impacts on the social and cultural health of these communities.*
- *There were concerns expressed that this review will be outsourced and prepared by an economics firm rather than Council staff who have access to a broader lens to include social scientists experienced in assessing the social and cultural impacts of this program.*
- *Under the new NOAA Environmental Economic Justice Strategy, NOAA is obligated to "assess impacts of management decisions" in a manner which "prioritizes the social, cultural and economic research and monitoring needed" to determine how its actions affect underserved communities. The current work plan for the IFQ Review did not include this information.*
- *Many aspects of the IFQ review should be displayed on a community level rather than designating effects by rural and non-rural. Some examples of community level breakdown could include:*
    - *Initial allocations and ownership*
    - *Amount of allocation and ownership*
    - *Pre IFQ participation*
    - *Processor impacts*

Amendment 1
Further, the AP recommends the SIA specifically cover the information requested in written public comments from Sealaska under this agenda item.

Amendment 1 passed 15-0

Rational in Favor of Amendment:

- *During public comment and AP deliberation, Council Staff made the suggestion to be specific in the information that should be addressed in the SIA.*
- *The comment letter and public comments from Sealaska, as well as other public comments reflected specific points of concern regarding the social and cultural health of the rural GOA villages and the AP felt that their concerns were best met through their specific outline of analysis provided in their written comment.*

Amendment 2
Address the following regulatory changes and their impacts to the IFQ Program:

- Inclusion of the IFQ directed halibut fishery into the restructured partial coverage observer program in 2013
- Full retention requirement of all species of rockfish for fixed gear catcher vessels
- Use of streamer lines for birds

Incorporate a Bycatch section in the annotated outline that includes:

- Trends of halibut bycatch (including halibut mortality in the directed fishery and halibut bycatch in the sablefish fishery)
- Fleet compliance with rockfish retention regulations by gear type (longline and pot gear)
- Interaction of longline gear with seabirds and effectiveness of streamlines

Amendment 2 passed 15-0

Rational in Favor of Amendment*:*

- *There were specific regulatory changes not mentioned in the IFQ Review Work Plan presentation including: inclusion of the IFQ directed halibut fishery into the restructured partial coverage observer program in 2013, full retention requirement of all species of rockfish for fixed gear catcher vessels, and use of streamer lines for seabird avoidance. Describing the impacts of these regulatory changes on the IFQ program should provide better data and information in other Council tasks, including cost efficiencies in the partial coverage ADP and impacts of breaking out demersal shelf rockfish from other rockfish in the C/WGOA and W Yakutat regions.*
- *Addressing bycatch is a significant public concern at this time and it is important to address bycatch in the work plan to demonstrate transparency in the Council process and show statistical changes through time in the IFQ program bycatch data.*

ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
October 3-7, 2023 - Anchorage, AK

E Staff Tasking

Motion 1:

The AP recommends Council initiate a discussion paper to address an option for sablefish A share IFQ holders to use flow or hopper scales when participating in the sablefish fishery. The paper will explore the potential operational and management impacts of utilizing the scales as an option for accounting for sablefish harvest, outline potential challenges to facilitating their use in the fishery, and consider non-regulatory options to allow for their use.

Motion passed 16-0

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *Allowances for use of flow and hopper scales for sablefish could provide flexibility for operators who already carry these scales onboard to apply the harvest accounting method that is most efficient for their respective fishing operations, without compromising catch accounting data.*
- *The motion is responsive to public testimony.*
- *The AP heard comments at the table on the importance of further exploring future non-regulatory options for incorporating the use of flow scales in fisheries. In February 2023, during the BSAI Pot CP Monitoring action, one part of that action was to allow flow scales to be utilized for cod by Pot CPs. Another sector now needing regulatory action, and Council time, to allow the use of a tool that is already in place for other major fisheries (BSAI Pollock CPs) clearly demonstrates there is a need to more broadly allow the use of flow scales for greater efficiency.*

Motion 2:

Following up on the Enforcement Committee's Performance Standard workshop, the AP recommends that the Council ask OLE / staff hold a second workshop prior to the Enforcement Committee holding their February meeting focused specifically on the Council's June motion related to the enforceability of the trawl gear performance standard. The GOA should not be included in this action and the workshop should be focused solely on Bering Sea Aleutian Islands pelagic trawl.

Prior to the workshop, the AP recommends that the Enforcement Committee, with OLE and Council staff support, release a document that lists OLE's concerns with the enforceability of the current performance standard, including analysis as to why those reasons are leading to a lack of enforcement.

Motion passed 14-2

Rationale in Favor of Motion:

- *The AP heard in public comment that it is difficult to craft new solutions when there is not broad understanding of the enforceability of the performance standard.*
- *Prior to the workshop, there was very little information or expectation provided and many participants expressed desired outcomes that may not be in line with the Council's original intent of determining how the performance standard could be enforced.*
- *Some AP members felt the workshop demonstrated little evidence that the current performance standard is not enforceable. OLE's assertion that the lack of citations demonstrates unenforceability is not a credible assumption.*
- *There is not an option for public comment in the Enforcement Committee so the option to hold another workshop prior to the next Enforcement Committee allows those impacted by any potential change in regulation to have meaningful input and conversations.*
- *Including the Gulf of Alaska in the discussion is not in line with initial intent as this is related to a Bering Sea action. Further, the Gulf has different gear rules which could confuse the discussion. The focus should be on the Bering Sea. The intent is not to censor information being shared from the GOA, but it should not be combined when presenting information to the public.*
- *The AP heard comments and public testimony that there were important pieces of data missing in the trawl gear performance standard workshop. For example: Adjustments to data could include: removing all non-AFA, GOA pollock hauls from the presented observer data, include the counts of hauls with pre-sorted crab in the observer data separately (data should not be combined with extrapolated crab numbers from species composition samples), include the total number of AFA/BSAI pollock hauls for the same time series to show the true proportion of hauls with crab for the time series.*
- *The AP also heard comments that the data and slides presented by the enforcement committee did not illustrate why observers have difficulty sampling crab and why OLE felt there should be more observer statements regarding crab. This includes difficulty obtaining crab carapace measurements and that the wording in the performance standard "at any one time" presents challenges with observers knowing what they are supposed to do when they see crab outside of a codend on gear.*
- *AP members noted that written narrative and additional data may help paint a clearer picture to stakeholders in order to ensure a second workshop is more productive and beneficial to all involved.*

Rationale in Opposition to Motion:

- *Utilization of all available information is important in the decision making process. By choosing to not include the GOA, important information on relevant fishing activity, though in a different region, is being dismissed.*
- *There are regions in the GOA that are seeing rebounds of crab stocks and information on fishing activity in relation to those rebounds could be relevant in this discussion.*

Motion 3: Approve minutes from the June 2023 meeting. ***Motion passed unanimously.***