



North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Simon Kinneen, Chair | David Witherell, Executive Director
605 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone 907-271-2809 | www.npfmc.org

Final Minutes ADVISORY PANEL December 3-10, 2018 - Anchorage, AK

The Advisory Panel met Tuesday, Dec 4, through Saturday, Dec 8, 2018, at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska. The following members were present for all or part of the meetings (absent members are shown in ~~strikeout~~):

Christiansen, Ruth	Kauffman, Jeff	Stevens, Ben
Cochran, Kurt	Kwachka, Alexus	Upton, Matt (Co-Vice Chair)
Donich, Daniel	Lowenberg, Craig	Vanderhoeven, Anne
Drobnica, Angel (Co-Vice Chair)	Nichols, Carina	Weiss, Ernie (Chair)
Gruver, John	O'Donnell, Paddy	Wilt, Sinclair
Hayden, Natasha	Peterson, Joel	
Johnson, Jim	Scoblic, John	

The AP approved the minutes from the October 2018 meeting.

C1 2019 Charter Halibut Management Measures

The AP recommends the Council approve the following recommendations for the 2019 Guided Sport Halibut season in Areas 2C and 3A.

Area 2C

If the allocation is 0.81 Mlb: Status Quo. One-fish bag limit, with a reverse slot limit allowing the harvest of one fish less than or equal to 38 inches or greater than or equal to 80 inches.

If the allocation is above or below 0.81 Mlb, adjust the lower limit of the reverse slot limit up or down to keep the projected harvest within the allocation.

Area 3A

Two-fish bag limits, including one fish of any size and 28" max size limit on one fish, four fish annual limit, one trip per CHP per day, one trip per vessel per day, Wednesdays closed all year.

And adjust Tuesday closures according to Table 15 (page 36) in the ADF&G analysis of proposed harvest regulations for 2019 to bring the projected harvest within Area 3A allocation (1.76 Mlbs - 2.29 Mlbs). If the allocation is above 2.023 Mlbs, adjust the second fish up to 30 inches, to keep the charter harvest within their allocation.

Motion passed 18-0.

Rationale:

- *Area 2C representatives noted that status quo regulations project a harvest that is slightly above the 2018 projected allocation but feel that the projected overage is due to an overly optimistic estimate of angler effort and not reflective of accurate numbers.*

- *The lower than 38-inch lower reverse slot limit imposed in 2018 will result in reduced bookings in 2019. Area 2 businesses report that bookings for 2019 are already down compared to this same time last year.*
- *Restrictions on King salmon fishing, while not analyzed in the current paper, along with increased halibut harvest restrictions will further drive bookings down.*
- *Area 2C representatives feel that the status Quo management measures will keep Area 2C charter halibut sector within their allocation for 2019. Area, 2C has been below their allocation 3 of the last 5 years, which has resulted in total halibut under ages of 185,000 lbs. In 2018, the sector was 81,000 lbs. under allocation.*
- *Area 3A representatives noted that the 28% projected increase in area 3A distributed mortality may not be a realistic outcome of the January IPHC meeting. Continued large fluctuations in distributed mortality, either up or down, are not good for business planning.*
- *Area 3A representatives feel that limiting the size of the second fish may result in some fish left in the water (162,000 lbs.) under higher harvest number scenarios.*
- *Management measures requested for analysis did not include a larger second fish because the charter halibut fishery in Area 3A has been over their allocation in recent years.*
- *Minutes from the Halibut Charter Management meeting in December note that limiting the Area 3A Halibut charter catch to 2.088 Mlbs is reasonable, which represents the maximum projected catch with no closed Tuesdays and a 30-inch limit on the second fish*

C2 GOA Groundfish Specifications

AP motion #1 - GOA & BSAI Risk Matrix

The AP supports use of the Risk Matrix for all GOA and BSAI groundfish stocks for the next assessment cycle. The AP recommends the Council continue to encourage increased analysis, **consistency** and transparency in how the risk table translates to potential reductions in the max ABC to help inform the SSC in establishing the ABC. [*Bolded amendment to motion passed 17-0.*]

Motion as amended passed 17-1.

The following motion was made, amended, and following lengthy discussion, withdrawn:

*The AP supports use of the Risk Matrix for all GOA and BSAI groundfish stocks for the next assessment cycle. However, the AP recommends the Council ~~request~~ **consider a change to the Council/Plan Teams TOR such** that any specific percentage reductions from the maximum permissible ABC (as projected by the stock assessment model) be ~~made and approved~~ **recommended** by the SSC ~~and not~~ **rather than** by the individual assessment authors or the Plan Teams.*

The following rationale is applied to the final passed motion and the substitute motion.

Rationale:

- *The following rationale is applied to the final passed motion and the substitute motion.*
- *The risk matrix was developed with the intent of improving transparency in the ABC setting process. However, for a multitude of reasons (e.g., only a handful of assessment authors filled out the matrix thereby impeding adequate comparison of its use across stocks; recommended maxABC reductions inconsistent with the identified numerical level of risk) this objective was not fully achieved this year. Given that this was the first year of using the risk matrix, this motion is intended to support an iterative approach towards improving the process with the caveat that the risk matrix may not be the best long-term approach.*

- *Amendment 56 to the GOA and BSAI Groundfish FMPs, which established the Tier system and control rules, was intentionally designed to be a precautionary to management making the scientific and quantitative modeling processes critically important and fundamental to the Council's annual specifications process.*
- *Because of the precautionary nature of the management system, reductions from the maximum permissible ABC are intended to be infrequent actions to unquantified risk not accounted for in the Tier system and control rules (as noted by the SSC). Asking assessment authors to complete the risk matrix with their assessment, population, and ecosystem concerns will provide a solid foundation of detailed information for which any maxABC reductions can be made.*
- *Given the critical nature of the annual stock assessment process, the main purpose of this motion is to improve and focus communications between assessment authors, Plan Team members, fishery stakeholders, the SSC, and the Council. The ultimate goal is for any maxABC reduction to be clearly grounded in detailed information. As such, identification and development of this information should be the focus of assessment authors and the Plan Teams. Because of the compressed amount of time available for developing and analyzing this information, it would be a more valuable use of time to focus on this task at the Plan Team meetings rather than on the more subjective process of formulating a specific percentage reduction amount. It is important to note that this motion is not suggesting that assessment authors and Plan Teams be prevented from making ABC recommendations; such recommendations would naturally come from selection of the assessment model. Additionally, this motion is in no way meant to prevent an assessment author or Plan Team from stating that a maxABC reduction is warranted (based on the information contained in the risk matrix), it is simply intended to shift the final step of the process (identification of the percentage reduction amount) to the SSC. From a clearly articulated and transparent list of concerns, the SSC will be able to make specific maxABC reductions as deemed warranted.*
- *Some members of the AP felt strongly that the matrix may not be appropriate because we already have an analytical process and the matrix could allow for bias, while also emphasizing the need for it to be applied consistently.*
- *Members expressed appreciation for the authors' attempt to incorporate what has been considered unknown and unquantifiable risk factors into setting ABCs by assigning a level of potential risk and an associated factor of safety.*

AP motion #2 - GOA TACs

The AP recommends the Council adopt the final 2019 and 2020 Gulf of Alaska groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC and set TACs as shown in the **attached Table 1**. The TACs for both Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod and Pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHF fisheries. The Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod adjustments are shown in the C3c of the action memo.

Motion passed 18-0

Rationale:

The APs recommendations reflect the SSC recommendations for OFLs, ABCs and TACs for 2019- 2020.

AP motion #3 - GOA PSC

The AP recommends the Council set the 2019 and 2020 annual and seasonal Pacific halibut PSC limits and apportionments in the Gulf of Alaska as shown in the **attached Tables 14-16**. These tables modify

the trawl apportionments by time and between the deep and shallow water species fishery limits (from tables presented in agenda item C3d) but do not change the overall trawl halibut PSC limit.

Motion passed 18-0

Rationale:

- *Moving 50 mt of halibut PSC from shallow to deep water species and changing the season date from September 1 to August 1 would maintain the current cap while increasing flexibility for the fleet and providing a more stable flow of fish into processing plants in response to changing fishing conditions.*
- *The combination of low cod stocks and poor salmon fishing has resulted in a need to shift effort towards other target species that have different needs for PSC timing and rates. Increased flexibility under existing caps is important to maintain healthy fishing operations.*

AP motion #4 - GOA Halibut DMRs

The AP recommends the Council adopt the final 2019 and 2020 halibut discard mortality rates (DMRs) for the Gulf of Alaska as shown in Table 17 of C3e of the action memo.

Motion passed 18-0

AP motion #5 - GOA SAFE

The AP recommends the Council approve the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) report.

Motion passed 18-0

Table 1. AP recommended TACs, SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for Groundfish in the Gulf of Alaska (metric tons) for 2019-2020.

Species	Area	2018			Catch 11/8/2018	2019			2020		
		OFL	ABC	TAC		OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pollock	State GHL	n/a	4,037	-		n/a	3,396	-	n/a	2,722	-
	W (610)	n/a	30,188	30,188	30,676	n/a	24,875	24,875	n/a	19,939	19,939
	C (620)	n/a	79,495	79,495	79,974	n/a	71,459	71,459	n/a	57,279	57,279
	C (630)	n/a	40,939	40,939	39,511	n/a	30,372	30,372	n/a	24,345	24,345
	WYAK	n/a	6,833	6,833	4,125	n/a	5,748	5,748	n/a	4,607	4,607
	Subtotal	187,059	161,492	157,455	154,286	194,230	135,850	132,454	148,968	108,892	106,170
	EYAK/SEO	11,697	8,773	8,773	-	11,697	8,773	8,773	11,697	8,773	8,773
Total	198,756	170,265	166,228	154,286	205,927	144,623	141,227	160,665	117,665	114,943	
Pacific Cod	W	n/a	8,082	5,657	4,374	n/a	7,633	5,343	n/a	9,695	6,786
	C	n/a	8,118	6,089	5,120	n/a	7,667	5,750	n/a	9,738	7,303
	E	n/a	1,800	1,350	101	n/a	1,700	1,275	n/a	2,159	1,619
	Total	23,565	18,000	13,096	9,595	23,669	17,000	12,368	26,078	21,592	15,708
Sablefish	W	n/a	1,544	1,544	1,351	n/a	1,581	1,581	n/a	2,105	2,105
	C	n/a	5,158	5,158	5,617	n/a	5,178	5,178	n/a	6,931	6,931
	WYAK	n/a	1,829	1,829	1,804	n/a	1,828	1,828	n/a	2,433	2,433
	SEO	n/a	2,974	2,974	2,944	n/a	2,984	2,984	n/a	3,993	3,993
	Total	22,703	11,505	11,505	11,716	25,227	11,571	11,571	34,782	15,462	15,462
Shallow-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	25,206	13,250	56	n/a	25,620	13,250	n/a	25,952	13,250
	C	n/a	25,315	25,315	2,664	n/a	25,731	25,731	n/a	26,065	26,065
	WYAK	n/a	2,242	2,242	1	n/a	2,279	2,279	n/a	2,308	2,308
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,925	1,925	1	n/a	1,957	1,957	n/a	1,983	1,983
	Total	67,240	54,688	42,732	2,722	68,309	55,587	43,217	69,167	56,308	43,606
Deep-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	413	413	3	n/a	416	416	n/a	420	420
	C	n/a	3,400	3,400	181	n/a	3,443	3,443	n/a	3,488	3,488
	WYAK	n/a	3,239	3,239	6	n/a	3,280	3,280	n/a	3,323	3,323
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,332	2,332	5	n/a	2,362	2,362	n/a	2,393	2,393
	Total	11,294	9,385	9,385	195	11,434	9,501	9,501	11,581	9,624	9,624
Rex Sole	W	n/a	3,086	3,086	83	n/a	2,951	2,951	n/a	2,956	2,956
	C	n/a	8,739	8,739	1,553	n/a	8,357	8,357	n/a	8,371	8,371
	WYAK	n/a	1,737	1,737	2	n/a	1,657	1,657	n/a	1,664	1,664
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,811	1,811	-	n/a	1,727	1,727	n/a	1,734	1,734
	Total	18,706	15,373	15,373	1,638	17,889	14,692	14,692	17,942	14,725	14,725
Arrowtooth Flounder	W	n/a	37,253	14,500	1,043	n/a	35,994	14,500	n/a	34,765	14,500
	C	n/a	73,480	48,000	16,391	n/a	70,995	70,995	n/a	68,575	68,575
	WYAK	n/a	16,468	6,900	39	n/a	15,911	6,900	n/a	15,368	6,900
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	23,744	6,900	25	n/a	22,941	6,900	n/a	22,157	6,900
	Total	180,697	150,945	76,300	17,498	174,598	145,841	99,295	168,634	140,865	96,875
Flathead Sole	W	n/a	12,690	8,650	151	n/a	13,234	8,650	n/a	13,771	8,650
	C	n/a	20,238	15,400	1,894	n/a	21,109	15,400	n/a	21,965	15,400
	WYAK	n/a	1,932	1,932	-	n/a	2,016	2,016	n/a	2,097	2,097
	S	n/a	406	406	-	n/a	423	423	n/a	440	440
	Total	43,011	35,266	26,388	2,045	44,865	36,782	26,489	46,666	38,273	26,587

2018 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2017; 2018 catches through November 8, 2018 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Table 1. AP recommended TACs, SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for Groundfish in the Gulf of Alaska (metric tons) for 2019-2020.

Species	Area	2018				2019			2020		
		OFL	ABC	TAC	Catch as of 11/8/18	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pacific ocean perch	W	n/a	3,312	3,312	3,225	n/a	3,227	3,227	n/a	3,125	3,125
	C	n/a	20,112	20,112	17,644	n/a	19,646	19,646	n/a	19,024	19,024
	WYAK	n/a	3,371	3,371	3,352	n/a	3,296	3,296	n/a	3,192	3,192
	W/C/WYAK	31,860	26,795	26,795	24,221	31,113	26,169	26,169	30,128	25,341	25,341
	SEO	2,902	2,441	2,441	0	2,838	2,386	2,386	2,748	2,311	2,311
	Total	34,762	29,236	29,236	24,221	33,951	28,555	28,555	32,876	27,652	27,652
Northern Rockfish	W	n/a	420	420	297	n/a	1,190	1,190	n/a	1,122	1,122
	C	n/a	3,261	3,261	2,047	n/a	3,338	3,338	n/a	3,147	3,147
	E	n/a	4	0	0	n/a	1	0	n/a	1	0
	Total	4,380	3,685	3,681	2,344	5,402	4,529	4,528	5,093	4,270	4,269
Shortraker Rockfish	W	n/a	44	44	38	n/a	44	44	n/a	44	44
	C	n/a	305	305	315	n/a	305	305	n/a	305	305
	E	n/a	514	514	402	n/a	514	514	n/a	514	514
	Total	1,151	863	863	755	1,151	863	863	1,151	863	863
Dusky Rockfish	W	n/a	146	146	50	n/a	781	781	n/a	774	774
	C	n/a	3,502	3,502	2,831	n/a	2,764	2,764	n/a	2,742	2,742
	WYAK	n/a	232	232	11	n/a	95	95	n/a	94	94
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	77	77	7	n/a	60	60	n/a	60	60
	Total	4,841	3,957	3,957	2,899	4,521	3,700	3,700	4,484	3,670	3,670
Roughey Blackspotted Rockfish	W	n/a	176	176	79	n/a	174	174	n/a	172	172
	C	n/a	556	556	434	n/a	550	550	n/a	545	545
	E	n/a	712	712	203	n/a	704	704	n/a	697	697
	Total	1,735	1,444	1,444	716	1,715	1,428	1,428	1,699	1,414	1,414
Demersal shelf rockfish	Total	394	250	250	133	411	261	261	411	261	261
Thornyhead Rockfish	W	n/a	344	344	160	n/a	326	326	n/a	326	326
	C	n/a	921	921	665	n/a	911	911	n/a	911	911
	E	n/a	773	773	325	n/a	779	779	n/a	779	779
	Total	2,717	2,038	2,038	1,150	2,688	2,016	2,016	2,688	2,016	2,016
Other Rockfish	W/C	n/a	1,737	1,737	1,030	n/a	1,737	1,737	n/a	1,737	1,737
	WYAK	n/a	368	368	126	n/a	368	368	n/a	368	368
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	3,489	200	51	n/a	3,489	3,489	n/a	3,489	3,489
	Total	7,356	5,594	2,305	1,207	7,356	5,594	5,594	7,356	5,594	5,594
Atka mackerel	Total	6,200	4,700	3,000	1,431	6,200	4,700	3,000	6,200	4,700	3,000
Big Skate	W	n/a	504	504	312	n/a	504	504	n/a	504	504
	C	n/a	1,774	1,774	880	n/a	1,774	1,774	n/a	1,774	1,774
	E	n/a	570	570	70	n/a	570	570	n/a	570	570
	Total	3,797	2,848	2,848	1,262	3,797	2,848	2,848	3,797	2,848	2,848
Longnose Skate	W	n/a	149	149	58	n/a	149	149	n/a	149	149
	C	n/a	2,804	2,804	553	n/a	2,804	2,804	n/a	2,804	2,804
	E	n/a	619	619	232	n/a	619	619	n/a	619	619
	Total	4,763	3,572	3,572	843	4,763	3,572	3,572	4,763	3,572	3,572
Other Skates	GOA-wide	1,845	1,384	1,384	681	1,845	1,384	1,384	1,845	1,384	1,384
Sculpins	GOA-wide	6,958	5,301	5,301	550	6,958	5,301	5,301	6,958	5,301	5,301
Sharks	GOA-wide	6,020	4,514	4,514	2,886	10,913	8,184	8,184	10,913	8,184	8,184
Squids	GOA-wide	1,516	1,137	1,137	41	0	0	0	0	0	
Octopuses	GOA-wide	1,300	975	975	139	1,300	975	975	1,300	975	975
TOTAL		655,707	536,925	427,512	240,953	664,889	509,507	430,569	627,049	487,218	408,533

2018 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2017; 2018 catches through November 8, 2018 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Table 14. Final 2019 and 2020 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	Season	Percent	Amount	Season	Amount
January 20 - April 1	30.42%	519	January 1 - June 10	86	221	January 1 - December 31	9
April 1 - July 1	19.99%	341	June 10 - September 1	2	5		
July 1 - August 1	27.08%	462	September 1 - December 31	12	31		
August 1 - October 1	7.50%	128					
October 1 - December 31	15.01%	256					
Total		1,706			257		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.

Table 15. Final 2019 and 2020 Seasonal Apportionment of the Pacific Halibut PSC Limit Apportioned Between the Trawl Gear Shallow-Water and Deep-Water Species Fisheries (Values are in metric tons.)

Season	Shallow-water	Deep-water ¹	Total
January 20 - April 1	384	135	519
April 1 - July 1	85	256	341
July 1 - August 1	121	341	462
August 1 - October 1	53	75	128
Subtotal January 20 - October 1	643	807	1,450
October 1 - December 31 ²			256
Total			1,706

¹ Vessels participating in cooperatives in the Rockfish Program will receive 191 mt of the third season (July 1 through September 1) deep-water species fishery halibut PSC apportionment.

² There is no apportionment between trawl shallow-water and deep-water species fisheries during the fifth season (October 1 through December 31).

Table 16. Final 2019 and 2020 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.)

“Other than DSR” allowance	Hook-and-line sector	Sector annual amount	Season	Seasonal percentage	Sector seasonal amount
257	Catcher Vessel	120	January 1 - June 10	86	103
			June 10 - September 1	2	2
			September 1 - December 31	12	14
	Catcher/Processor	137	January 1 - June 10	86	118
			June 10 - September 1	2	3
			September 1 - December 31	12	16

C3 BSAI Groundfish Harvest Specifications

The AP has reviewed the BSAI Ecosystem Status and SAFE reports and recommends the Council approve these reports. *Motion passed 18-0.*

The AP recommends the Council approve the specifications presented by the Industry Groundfish Coalition in the **attached Table 1**. *Motion passed 18-0.*

The AP recommends the Council set flatfish flexibility reserves in Table 13 (agenda item C3d) to maximize the ABC reserves. *Motion passed 18-0.*

The AP recommends the approval of Table 14-18 as provided in agenda item C3c-f.

Motion passed 18-0.

Rationale:

Routine passing of annual BSAI Specs and tables in response to industry agreement.

Table 1. AP recommended TACs, SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for Groundfish in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands (metric tons) for 20

Species	Area	2018				2019			2020		
		OFL	ABC	TAC	Catch as of 11/24/2018	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pollock	EBS	4,797,000	2,592,000	1,364,341	1,378,411	3,914,000	2,163,000	1,397,000	3,082,000	1,792,000	1,420,000
	AI	49,289	40,788	19,000	1,861	64,240	52,887	19,000	66,981	55,125	19,000
	Bogoslof	130,428	60,800	450	14	183,080	137,310	75	183,080	137,310	75
Pacific cod	BS	238,000	201,000	188,136	174,311	216,000	181,000	166,475	183,000	137,000	124,625
	AI	28,700	21,500	15,695	14,718	27,400	20,600	14,214	27,400	20,600	14,214
Sablefish	BS	2,887	1,464	1,464	1,580	3,221	1,489	1,489	4,441	1,994	1,994
	AI	3,917	1,988	1,988	660	4,350	2,008	2,008	5,997	2,688	2,688
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	306,700	277,500	154,000	130,502	290,000	263,200	154,000	284,000	257,800	166,425
Greenland turbot	BSAI	13,148	11,132	5,294	1,829	11,362	9,658	5,294	10,476	8,908	5,294
	BS	n/a	9,718	5,125	1,666	n/a	8,431	5,125	n/a	7,777	5,125
	AI	n/a	1,414	169	163	n/a	1,227	169	n/a	1,131	169
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	76,757	65,932	13,621	6,888	82,939	70,673	8,000	83,814	71,411	8,000
Kamchatka flounder	BSAI	11,347	9,737	5,000	3,102	10,965	9,260	5,000	11,260	9,509	5,000
Northern rock sole	BSAI	147,300	143,100	47,100	28,261	122,000	118,900	47,100	147,500	143,700	57,100
Flathead sole	BSAI	79,862	66,773	14,500	10,957	80,918	66,625	14,500	83,190	68,448	14,500
Alaska plaice	BSAI	41,170	34,590	16,100	23,281	39,880	33,600	18,000	37,860	31,900	18,000
Other flatfish	BSAI	17,591	13,193	4,000	5,980	21,824	16,368	6,500	21,824	16,368	6,500
Pacific Ocean perch	BSAI	51,675	42,509	37,361	34,748	61,067	50,594	44,069	59,396	49,211	43,625
	BS	n/a	11,861	11,861	9,633		14,675	14,675		14,274	14,274
	EAI	n/a	10,021	9,000	8,947		11,459	11,009		11,146	11,146
	CAI	n/a	7,787	7,500	7,312		8,435	8,385		8,205	8,205
	WAI	n/a	12,840	9,000	8,856		16,025	10,000		15,586	10,000
Northern rockfish	BSAI	15,888	12,975	6,100	5,765	15,507	12,664	6,500	15,180	12,396	6,500
Blackspotted/Rougheye Rockfish	BSAI	749	613	225	239	676	555	279	868	715	279
	EBS/EAI	n/a	374	75	66	n/a	351	75	n/a	448	75
	CAI/WAI	n/a	239	150	173	n/a	204	204	n/a	267	204
Shorthead rockfish	BSAI	666	499	150	250	722	541	358	722	541	358
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,816	1,362	845	986	1,793	1,344	663	1,793	1,344	663
	BS	n/a	791	275	211		956	275		956	275
	AI	n/a	571	570	775		388	388		388	388
Atka mackerel	BSAI	108,600	92,000	71,000	70,393	79,200	68,500	57,951	73,400	63,400	53,635
	EAI/BS	n/a	36,820	36,500	36,085		23,970	23,970		22,190	22,190
	CAI	n/a	32,000	21,000	20,915		14,390	14,390		13,310	13,310
	WAI	n/a	23,180	13,500	13,393		30,140	19,591		27,900	18,135
Skates	BSAI	46,668	39,082	27,000	29,445	51,152	42,714	26,000	48,944	40,813	26,000
Sculpins	BSAI	53,201	39,995	5,000	4,997	53,201	39,995	5,000	53,201	39,995	5,000
Sharks	BSAI	689	517	180	100	689	517	125	689	517	125
Squids	BSAI	6,912	5,184	1,200	1,735	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0
Octopuses	BSAI	4,769	3,576	250	279	4,769	3,576	400	4,769	3,576	400
Total	BSAI	6,235,729	3,779,809	2,000,000	1,931,292	5,340,955	3,367,578	2,000,000	4,491,785	2,967,269	2,000,000

Sources: 2017 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs and 2018 OFLs and ABCs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2016 and December 2017, respectively; catches through November 24, 2018 from AKR Catch Accounting.

C4 Bering Sea Fishery Ecosystem Plan

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the final Bering Sea Fishery Ecosystem Plan (Bering Sea FEP) and recommends the Council prioritize the Traditional/Local Knowledge and Subsistence Use Action Module, and the Climate Change Module. **The Traditional Knowledge/Local Knowledge action module team should include representatives with traditional and local knowledge expertise in that area.** [Amendment passed 17-1]

Motion as amended passed 18-0

Rationale:

- *The BS FEP is ready for adoption and represents an important step towards the establishment of Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management (EBFM) in Alaska fisheries management.*
- *The BS FEP promotes ecosystem science by providing a transparent and novel approach to incorporating ecosystem considerations into Council decisions.*
- *Comprehensive work has gone into this action-informing document by the Council staff, Ecosystem Committee, Bering Sea FEP Plan Team and stakeholders*
- *Traditional knowledge (TK) is at the forefront of this FEP, and the BS FEP and future Action Modules will improve integration of TK in Council processes*
- *The Ecosystem Committee recommended prioritization of both the Climate Change and Subsistence/Traditional Knowledge action modules. These two modules are the most fully developed, have been discussed since early on in the process, and address key gaps in the Council process.*
- *While the FEP explicitly identifies future opportunities for public involvement in the creation of teams to work on specific action modules, it is important to highlight that the TK/LK module team should include significant participation from representatives with traditional and local knowledge expertise.*

C5 Aleutian Island Pacific cod set aside adjustment

The AP recommends that the Council take final action on the Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod Harvest Set Aside Adjustment with the following preliminary preferred alternative and option identified in **bold**.

Alternative 1. No Action

Alternative 2. Amend CFR 679.20 (a)(7)(viii)(E) as follows (changes in **bold** and underlined):

(1) Language is unchanged

(2) Language is unchanged

(3) Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery. Prior to March 15, vessels otherwise authorized to directed fish for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands may directed fish for that portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance that is specified as the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(B) of this section and may deliver their catch to any eligible processor, provided directed fishing for Pacific cod by the catcher vessel trawl sector is allowed in the BS Subarea.

(4) Management of Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery. If the trawl catcher vessel sector is closed in the BS Subarea prior to March 15, only trawl catcher vessels that deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to an Aleutian Islands shoreplant for processing may directed fish for that portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance that is specified as the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(B) of this section.

(5) Minimum Aleutian Islands shoreplant landing requirement. If less than 1,000 mt of the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside is landed at Aleutian Islands shoreplants on or before February 28, then paragraphs (a)(7)(viii)(E)(1) thru (4) of this section will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.

(6) Language is unchanged

Alternative 3. If the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside is in effect, the trawl CV sector may not engage in directed fishing for cod from the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery until the earlier of March 15 or until the entire Set-Aside is landed.

This prohibition will be removed if less than 1,000 mt of the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside has not been landed by February 28.

AI Pacific Cod Harvest Set-Aside Adjustment, December 22, 2018.

Alternative 4 (PPA).

(1) Prior to March 21, the A-season trawl CV Pacific cod harvests in the Bering Sea and trawl CV Pacific cod harvests in the Aleutian Islands except harvests delivered shoreside west of 170° longitude in the AI shall be limited to an amount equal to the BSAI aggregate CV trawl sector A-season allocation minus the lesser of the AI directed Pacific cod non CDQ DFA or 5,000 mt.

Upon the closure under the above provision, directed trawl CV fishing for non CDQ BSAI Pacific cod is prohibited for all trawl CVs vessels except trawl CVs delivering shoreside west of 170° longitude in the AI prior to March 21, unless restrictions are removed earlier under 3 or 4 below.

(2) Prior to March 15 AI directed Pacific cod non CDQ harvests of any sector other than the CV sector delivering shoreside west of 170° longitude in the AI as defined in (1) are limited to the amount of the AI directed Pacific cod non CDQ DFA above minus the amount set-aside from the trawl CV BSAI allocation under (1). Catches of those other sectors under this provision are not subject to the regional delivery requirement.

(3) If less than 1,000 mt of the AI Pacific cod non CDQ TAC has been landed shoreside west of 170° longitude in the AI by February 28 the restrictions under (1) and (2) shall be suspended for the remainder of the year.

(4) If prior to November 1, neither the City of Adak nor the City of Atka have notified NMFS of the intent to process non CDQ directed AI Pacific cod in the upcoming year, the Aleutian Islands shoreside delivery requirement and restriction on the trawl CV sector allocation is suspended for the upcoming year. Cities can voluntarily provide notice prior to the selected date.

Options that apply to Alternative 4:

Option 1: Under Alternative 4, change the date for requiring shoreside deliveries to March 15.

Option 2: Keep the dates the same but allow Pacific cod harvested in the AI to be delivered either shoreside or at-sea after March 15, the BS limitation would not apply after March 21st or sooner if the AI Pacific cod TAC is achieved.

Shoreside deliveries are defined as deliveries made to a facility physically located on land.

Motion passed 13-4.

Rationale:

- *In October, the AP passed a unanimous motion to forward this action for public review, referencing the importance in fixing Am 113 so that the regulation could function as intended. The council agreed, kept this action bifurcated from the Bering Sea analysis, and scheduled it for final action at this meeting. Nothing has changed since October that would warrant delay in action at this time.*
- *The AP should not be arguing the merits of Am 113, which was heavily debated for a period of 10 years and is now an implemented rule, but to make sure that it functions as envisioned. Absent action, the Council's original intent, to protect shoreside participation for Aleutian communities in the P. cod fishery, will be greatly diminished.*
- *The default situation poses a risk that AI communities could be largely preempted from the P.cod fishery, adding another layer of vulnerability to shoreside operations and communities.*
- *Analyzing the impacts of the proposed alternatives to fix Am 113 on a future Bering Sea action to limit offshore processing capacity have been largely exhausted in this paper.*
- *Am 113 has already been analyzed comprehensively and delayed for a number of reasons over the years including to assess the impact of the action relative to SSL restrictions, the implementation of Am 85, and the BSAI TAC split.*
- *The analysis shows that Alt 4 and Option 2 best align with the original intent of Am 113.*

Minority Report:

A minority of the AP supported the substitute motion (below) and felt that it is necessary to have a holistic management approach of the BSAI cod fisheries. The piecemeal approach to the numerous actions all related to P.cod (including the BSAI trawl CV analysis and Amendment 85 review) impedes the ability to understand the collective costs and benefits each action may impose on the other actions. The actions should be combined so that appropriate management tools can be developed and analyzed to comprehensively address the multiple concerns currently facing all participants (CVs, CPs, shoreside processors) in the BSAI cod fishery. The current state of the cod fishery is outside of the scope of the original Amendment 113 analysis. At that time the fishery was characterized by high TACs in the Bering Sea and low TACs in the Aleutian Islands and the Council made its original decision determining that there was an equitable balance of trade-offs among all participants. Unfortunately, the Council did not evaluate the trade-offs among participants under much lower Bering Sea TACs and higher Aleutian Islands TACs. Further, since the October Council meeting, the BOF has taken an action that affects BSAI cod fishery participants that was not part of the original analysis. This information needs to be considered and incorporated into a more complete, overarching analysis. In asking for a postponement, stakeholders are not arguing against the merits of Amendment 113. It is understood that a technical fix is still necessary (with no proposed changes to the current suite of Alternatives) and stakeholders are not asking for the entire Amendment 113 package to be opened for consideration. If negatively affected BSAI cod fishery participants under the current fishery conditions know that a comprehensive management package is coming designed to address all the various concerns, this would actually promote continued industry goodwill to support Adak over the course of the comprehensive analytical package (as was done in 2018 and is anticipated for 2019), negating the need to take final action at this time. Finally, given that the impacts of Alternatives 3 and 4 and virtually the same given the current status of the BSAI cod fishery, it is difficult to justify choosing one Alternative over another at this time.

Signed by: Ruth Christiansen, John Gruver, Paddy O'Donnell, Anne Vanderhoeven

The following substitute motion failed 4-13:

The AP recommends the Council postpone final action and incorporate the proposed changes to Amendment 113 into the Bering Sea Pacific cod trawl CV analysis.

C6 Bering Sea Snow Crab PSC limits

The AP recommends the Council provide further clarification on the Purpose and Need Statement for this action, increase the range of alternatives to better reflect the Purpose and Need Statement, and provide further analysis to be included in the next draft for the Bering Sea Snow Crab PSC Limits.

Specifically, the AP recommends the range of alternatives be expanded to include further consideration of snow crab PSC limits that cover all ¹~~trawl bycatch of snow crab, not just bycatch~~ ²**within inside and outside** the C. Opilio Bycatch Limitation Zone (COBLZ) area. *[Amendments (1,2) above, passed 17-0]*

In addition, the AP recommends further analysis or description of:

- The trade-offs of using the stock assessment model versus the survey as the index of abundance for setting PSC limits.
- Data on size and sex composition of bycatch, as well as, amount of bycatch in weight and numbers of crab.
- Description of impacts of alternatives on the C. Opilio directed fishery.
- Description of impacts on communities and small entities.
- **³Report total bycatch in directed and ⁴trawl-groundfish fisheries in number of crabs so as to be consistent with the way that bycatch is measured.**
- **Include research on gear modifications/mortality reduction that was in the February 2016 discussion paper.**
- **Include information on temporal movement of trawl fishery relative to marine mammal interactions.**
- **Consider the chances of displacing trawl vessels into areas of higher PSC (red king crab, halibut, etc.) and to what extent it could increase that PSC.**
- **Include examples of how all bycatch removals in all fisheries, beyond non-pelagic trawl, are impacting the crab biomass and the amount available in directed fishery.**

[Amendments to add bolded bullets (3) and to strike trawl (4) passed 17-0]

Motion as amended passed 17-0

Rationale:

- *The Council is charged with managing stocks throughout their range, as directed by National Standard 3. The COBLZ area is an artificial boundary not recognized by crab. PSC is encountered outside of the COBLZ area.*
- *The CPT recommended the analysis consider the pros and cons of using total abundance as an appropriate measure to inform and index the PSC limit. Crab models are focused on estimating numbers of mature male and female crab. The NMFS survey provides a more consistent indicator of stock trends for all sizes of crab from year to year.*
- *The CPT recommended the analysis consider a PSC limit in biomass (weight). This could accommodate issues such as large numbers of incoming immature crab which would be subject to high levels of natural mortality and are not equivalent to mortality of mature crab.*

- *We should be looking to the scientists for the best index to use for the PSC limits, consistent with National Standard 2.*
- *The document describes the impacts on the trawl sectors but not the directed crab fishery.*
- *This action is responsive to CPT, SSC and public testimony comments/requests.*
- *This motions simply seeks to review crab bycatch and is not an attack on trawl participants or the Am 80 sector. The crab sector appreciates and acknowledges the progress made on trawl bycatch control measures in recent years.*

C7 GOA pollock, cod seasons/allocations

The AP recommends the Council release the analysis for public review after an expanded discussion to include:

- How vessel behaviors may change due to the changes in incentives within the fisheries due to combining A/B and C/D seasons for pollock and increasing the A season allocations by 5%, 10% or 15% for trawl cv cod allocations.
- Add more specificity regarding limitations on vessels' ability to move between areas (BS to GOA and across GOA regulatory areas).
- For the AFA vessels delineate the different ~~sideboard~~ **sideboard rules** and **sideboard rules** that apply to area 610 versus 630/620 (157 west) and the exempt and non-exempt AFA vessels.
[Amendment passed 18-0]
- For pollock, examine how the AFA vessels fishing plans might change with merging the seasons. Both the incentives of the increased quota amounts in the GOA and conflict the new seasonal structure might create for vessels fishing in the BS AFA Pollock fishery. Also include a discussion about how participation might change across GOA areas for all pollock participants (both AFA and non-AFA).
- For Pacific cod, examine how the change in the pollock A/B seasonal structure might affect vessels ability to participate in the A/B season in the GOA, both AFA and non-AFA vessels versus participation in the BS cod fishery.
- Add discussion regarding how this action could impact ability of participants to form voluntary catch shares in the GOA under a race for fish management structure for the pollock fishery.
- Add discussion of pros and cons of removing the "pause" that now occurs between the A and B seasons and C and D seasons. This break between seasons can act to slow the fishery, and allows participants time to reassess voluntary catch share, for example, if one was not formed in A season, and assess how bycatch management/PSC use could be managed for the upcoming B season.
- Should pollock and cod be split in to two actions because of sea lions.
- Look at what three seasons would look like A/B one season C/D season the same two seasons for pollock.
- **Provide data on the number of AFA vessels that could fish in the GOA that are sideboarded.** *[Amendment passed 18-0]*

Motion as amended passed 18-0.

Rationale:

- *The additional information requests are intended to help determine how changes to seasons and rollover allowances could potentially influence fishing behavior and impact current participants.*

- *Combining seasons in the pollock fishery could increase flexibility and result in PSC decreases, but because there is still a race for fish, challenges with management will persist.*
- *A better understanding on the number of AFA side-boarded vessels and other vessel limitations may help inform potential changes in behavior.*

D1 Exempted Fishing Permits for Adak pollock, A80 crab monitoring

Motion 1

The AP recommends the Council advance the Adak Pollock EFP.

Motion Passed 15-0

Rationale:

- *While it does not impact the overall support for the EFP, public testimony noted that the MRA exemption may need to be corrected given that POP is part of the 'Aggregated Rockfish' incidental catch category. The Council may want to ask NMFS to look at all anticipated rockfish bycatch while pollock fishing under the EFP to see if there are any other rockfish species of concern. The EFP should reference an exemption to the 5% Aggregated Rockfish MRA limit instead of an exemption to the 5% POP limit. POP as an incidental species is not a stand-alone category.*
- *Proving the viability of fishing for pollock in the AI under current POP levels through this effort may result in an important economic opportunity for Adak.*

Motion 2

The AP recommends the Council advance the AM80 Red King Crab EFP.

Motion Passed 17-0

Rationale:

- *In an effort to address stakeholder concerns, the EFP author coordinated with directed crab stakeholders to revise the project to include the count of crab pieces.*
- *Assessing the accuracy of PSC estimation and the potential to improve the viability of crab PSC may help inform future fisheries management.*

D2 Western GOA pollock vessel limitations

The AP recommends the Council take no further action on this agenda item.

Substitute motion passed 12-6

Rationale:

- *There are many moving parts to fisheries in the GOA, taking this piecemeal approach will likely not solve the issue. A more comprehensive approach to the GOA should be revisited.*
- *There are 20 latent vessels in the <58' fleet that pose more of a threat to the small boat fleet's future participation than the >58' boats.*
- *Looking at the composition of the small boat fleet and their residency, as well as the lack of regional delivery requirements, it is unclear what community protection measures the action is seeking to address.*

- *The >58' participants have dependency on this fishery and are comprised of vessels that are homeported in GOA communities; taking action to exclude these participants would signal that one GOA community deserves greater protection than another.*
- *There is no apparent conservation purpose to this action. Previous analyses have determined that PSC is higher in the small boat fleet.*
- *This is not the right time to impose significant area-specific limitations on fisheries. A number of fisheries have been low across the GOA including, cod, pollock and salmon. Many fisheries participants and communities are struggling throughout the GOA; this action would have a seemingly unjustifiable and disproportionate negative impact on the community of Kodiak.*
- *There is no way to sideboard the >58-foot boats without impacting other areas (620/630).*

Minority Report:

A minority of the AP felt that the additional information requested in the original motion could prove beneficial in informing future management decisions to protect historical participants in the GOA pollock fishery. The opposition to the substitute motion was not intended to signal any particular advocacy for excluding the >58-foot class of vessels with dependency on this fishery. Rather, an expanded discussion paper could provide another year of participation information to better understand the scope of the problem and preemption concerns, and allow stakeholders to better evaluate the context of community protection measures in this fishery.

Signed by: Angel Drobnica, Natasha Hayden, Jeff Kauffman, Carina Nichols, John Scoblic, Ernie Weiss

Below is the original motion that was offered and later substituted:

The AP recommends the Council expand on the current discussion paper with the following revisions:

- *The paper should include 2018 fishery harvest data for WGOA pollock harvest, and note <=58 ft and >58 ft vessel percentage of harvest.*
- *Incorporate information on how reducing trip limits may protect or harm GOA communities.*
- *Expanded examination of the impacts of restricting harvest by >58 ft vessels through caps based on historical dependence.*
- *Further examine the diversity and dependence on other fisheries by all participants.*

D3 Observer coverage on vessels delivering to tenders

The AP received the report and appreciates the update.

Motion Passed 14-0

Rationale:

The AP agrees with the observer task list.

D4 Trawl EM 2019 Cooperative Research Plan

The AP recommends that the Council approve the Trawl EM Cooperative Research Plan as presented.

Motion passed 18-0

D5 Central GOA Rockfish reauthorization

The AP recommends that the Council move forward with an analysis for initial review and adopt the following purpose and need statement and set of alternatives for the CGOA rockfish program reauthorization:

Purpose and Need: The intent of this action is to retain the conservation, management, safety, and economic gains created by the Rockfish Program to the extent practicable, while also considering the goals and limitations of the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act Limited Access Privilege Program (LAPP) provisions. The existing CGOA Rockfish Program (RP) will sunset after 2021. Consequently, if the management, economic, safety, and conservation gains enjoyed under the RP are to be continued, the Council must act to create a long term CGOA rockfish LAPP. For both the onshore and offshore sectors, the RP has improved safety at sea, controlled capacity of the fleets, improved NMFS' ability to conserve and manage the species in the program, increased vessel accountability, reduced sea floor contact, allowed full retention of allocated species and reduced halibut and Chinook salmon bycatch. In addition, the rockfish fishery dependent community in the CGOA and the shorebased processing sector have benefited from stabilization of the workforce, more shoreside deliveries of rockfish, additional non-rockfish deliveries with the RP halibut savings, and increased rockfish quality and diversity of rockfish products. Moreover, the CGOA fishermen, and the shorebased processing sector have benefited from the removal of processing conflicts with GOA salmon production. The catcher processor sector has also benefited including greater spatial and temporal flexibility in prosecuting the fishery, which result in lower bycatch, a more rational distribution of effort, and more stable markets.

Alternative 1: No action (Revert back to an LLP limited access fishery)

Alternative 2: Reauthorize the CGOA Rockfish Program with current management framework Element: Modify regulations at § 679.80(a)(2) which specify the duration of the program.

Option 1: Remove sunset date

Option 2: Replace with new sunset date (either 10 or 20 years)

If Alternative 2 is selected, consider changing the nine minor regulatory revisions that are listed on pages 6, 7 and 8 suggested by NMFS and industry.

Add an additional minor regulatory change (10) that would exempt trawl catcher vessels from stand down requirements when transiting from the BSAI to the GOA when participating in the CGOA rockfish program for a minimum of three days at a time.

Motion passed 17-0

Rationale:

The CGOA Rockfish program is working well and meets its objectives. The analysis needs to move forward in a timely manner, as the program is set to sunset on December 31, 2021.

D6 BSAI Pacific cod allocation review

The AP recommends the Council adopt the work plan as outlined by Council staff with the following additions:

1. Under section 3 of the work plan, change the bullet point reading “Prohibited species catch by sector in the directed Pacific cod fishery” to read “Prohibited species catch by sector and season in the directed Pacific cod fishery”.
2. Under section 5 of the work plan, add another bullet point that reads: “Options for BSAI trawl CV sector to achieve their allocation objective of 22.1% of the BSAI Pacific cod fishery.”

Motion passed 16-0

Rationale:

The issues identified in the AP motion were previously identified by the Council, but not clearly included in the draft work plan.

D7 Cook Inlet Salmon FMP Amendment

The AP supports the Cook Inlet Salmon Committee’s request for an additional meeting and for information related to the Status Determination Criteria be provided to the SSC for review.

Motion passed 12-0

Rationale:

The Cook Inlet Salmon Committee is the key group for providing guidance to the Council on this issue and this motion is directly responsive to the Committee’s requests for what they need at this stage in the iterative process to best complete their task(s).

D8 Social Science Planning Team

The AP received an oral report and no action was taken.

E1 Staff Tasking

No action was taken under this agenda item.