

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dan Hull, Chairman
David Witherell, Executive Director



605 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501-2252

Telephone (907) 271-2809

Fax (907) 271-2817

Visit our website: <http://www.npfmc.org>

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES December 5–8, 2017 Anchorage, AK

The Advisory Panel met Tuesday, December 5 through Friday, December 8, 2017 at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, AK. The following members were present for all or part of the meetings (absent ~~stricken~~):

Carroll, Shannon	Gruver, John	Peterson, Joel
Christiansen, Ruth	Kauffman, Jeff	Scoblic, John
Cochran, Kurt	Kwachka, Alexis	Stephan, Jeff
Crowley, John	Lowenberg, Craig	Stevens, Ben
Downing, Jerry	McCallum, Chuck	Upton, Matt (Co-Vice Chair)
Drobnica, Angel (Co-Vice Chair)	Nichols, Carina	Weiss, Ernie (Chair)
Donich, Daniel	O'Donnell, Paddy	Wilt, Sinclair

The AP approved the minutes from the October 2017 meeting.

C1 2018 Charter Halibut Management Measures

The AP recommends the following measures for the 2018 Guided Sport Halibut season in Area 2C and 3A:

In Area 2C

- If the allocation is 0.69 Mlb: a reverse slot limit of U35:080 and no annual limit.
- If the allocation is less than 0.69 Mlb: a four-fish annual limit, a reverse slot limit of U35:080, and if necessary, a three-fish fish annual limit with a reverse slot limit of U35:080.
- If the allocation is greater than 0.69 Mlb: no annual limit, and increase the lower slot limit as allowed, to stay within allocation.

In Area 3A

- Status quo measures include a two-fish bag limit, including one fish of any size and a 28" max size limit on one fish, a four-fish annual limit, one trip per CHP per day, one trip per vessel per day, Wednesdays closed all year, and three Tuesdays closed between July 24th and August 7th.
- If the allocation is 1.70 Mlb: status quo measures plus close seven additional Tuesdays as per Table 11 (June 19-Aug 21).
- If the allocation is greater than or less than 1.70 Mlb, adjust Tuesday closures up or down to remain within the allocation.

Motion passed 16-5.

Rationale in Support:

- The management measures forwarded by the AP for the charter fleet reflect the Charter Halibut Committee recommendations and are designed to keep each regulatory area under its allocation
- While concerns regarding overages in Area 3A are noted, the sector faces many issues with changing size at age, the lack of in-season management tools, logbook timing and variability in effort, all of which pose challenges with managing the allocation with precision.

Rationale in Opposition:

- Despite best efforts, management measures identified by the committee are insufficient to constrain the charter harvest within the sector's allocation and overages will continue until additional tools are implemented. Managers should continue to investigate additional measures, including a trophy tagging program for larger fish which would put emphasis on the experience, as well as a one fish bag limit during low levels of abundance for both the unguided and charter sectors.

C2 Charter Halibut Permit – Latency & RQE discussion papers

The AP recommends that the Council move forward with an expanded discussion paper to further explore details of CHP latency, including the following:

- **Further analysis of different levels of usage among CHP holders to better understand use patterns and potential for latent effort.**
- **Consideration of an abundance trigger for latent licenses that have been frozen by this action.**
- **Consideration of ways to address recent transfers.**
[Amendment to add above 3 bullets to replace bullet below, passed 21-0.]
- ~~An examination of a more realistic description of latent effort that might enter the fishery. (Example 50 trips per year as fully utilized permit). *[amendment to delete parenthetical, passed 19-0]*~~
- Redefine "halibut trip" to include retention of a legal sized halibut within 24-hour periods.
- A discussion of how nontransferable permits affect latency (e.g., how many exist and the expected lifetime of these permits).
- Consideration of limiting angler days as effective way to manage freezing the fishing footprint.
- Consideration of four tiers of CHP limitations with an effort to optimize latency reduction.
- Further elaboration of the utilization of CHPs on a community by community level and whether rural communities would warrant distinct consideration in a future latency reduction program. Rural would need to be defined.
- CQEs and MWRs will not be included in the discussion of annual trip limits.

The AP recommends the Council move forward with an expanded discussion paper to further explore details of allowing RQE to purchase and hold more than five CHPs.

[amendment to add above; motion passed 21-0.]

Final motion as amended passed 12-9.

Rationale in Favor:

- The original halibut catch sharing plan resulted in a reduced allocation for the charter sector, which combined with declining halibut abundance has resulted in very restrictive management measures, latent CHP(s) entry into the fishery could be disruptive.
- Allowing an RQE to purchase more than the five CHPs will enable the RQE to manage the size of the charter fleet to client demand and allocation. Attaining CHPs, rather than increasing allocations to the charter sector, at the expense of the commercial fleet and through purchase of IFQ's which are in the \$60-\$73 per pound range in 2C and 3A, may be more cost effective and a better management tool for the charter fleet.
- Additional information on various participation levels of CHPs will provide a better understanding of how CHPs could be structured in the future to different levels of participation.
- The lower level of CHP utilization in rural communities reflect diverse business models that may require unique consideration and/or exemption from any future program to reduce latency.
- Structuring a latency reduction program at relatively low levels of abundance may constrain the sector's ability for future growth if/when abundance increases. The expanded discussion paper should identify options for designing a program responsive to population changes.
- Some recent entrants into the charter sector have not had enough time to establish participation reflective of what their mature businesses will eventually look like and may be unnecessarily constrained by the participation of the previous owner of the CHP.

Rationale Against:

- Taking further action on latency is premature considering the permit registration action taken by the Council will provide important data on the level of non-transferable permits that should be retired and a better understanding of the participants potentially impacted by this action.
- Other management measures that could be more effective at maintaining catch within allocations should be explored before limiting CHPs, such as, a consistent one-fish bag limit and four fish annual limit for both the guided and unguided sectors, exploring season length and ways for the sector to market an experience instead of retention.
- RQEs are not currently in existence, it would be better to see how they function before spending staff time looking at how they could use potentially more CHPs than under the status quo.

C3 Self-Guided Rental Boats

[Amendment to add bolded language before "rental boat" throughout motion passed 21-0]

The AP recommends that the Council develop an expanded discussion paper to explore a self-guided **loaner and/or** rental boat registration program.

Action Intent:

The unguided halibut **loaner and/or** rental boat industry is a growing segment of the unguided halibut sport fishing sector. This growth represents an opened ended reallocation from the directed commercial and charter fisheries to the unguided segment of the sport fishery. There is currently

no mechanism to monitor the number of participants or the spatial distribution of this commercial halibut **loaner and/or** rental boat activity.

Presently, we have no data to guide the Council on determining whether it is necessary to regulate the **loaner and/or** rental boat sector of the halibut sport fishery or what regulations might be appropriate. While there may be different types of businesses that rent boats intended for use in the halibut sport fishery, anecdotal evidence indicates that a substantial portion of growth in the **loaner and/or** rental boat industry is occurring from businesses that offer **loaner and/or** rental boats for halibut sport fishing from remote lodges and or in addition to offering guided sport halibut fishing opportunities. The Council may be able to address the data gap for **loaner and/or** rental boat activity by implementing an annual registration of unguided halibut **loaner and/or** rental boats associated with Remote Fishing Lodges and/or businesses that require annual saltwater Fishing Guide service provider or fishing guide license issued by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. This information will allow the Council to address the extent to which this sector is growing and its potential impacts on the rest of the halibut users.

The discussion paper should expand upon the following:

- Administration of the registration program (e.g., State of Alaska or NMFS)
- Which vessels would be required to register:
 - (i.e., all saltwater motor-powered boats rented for halibut fishing or all saltwater motor-powered boats rented for halibut fishing and associated with remote lodges, guide or guide service providers with an ADFG saltwater sport fishing operator license)
- What types of information would be required as part of a registration, for example:
 - Name of business or individual
 - Address and phone of business or individual
 - Location of business operation
 - Years in business at initial registration
 - Type of **loaner and/or** rental operation (i.e., business only rents boats for unguided fishing or business provides dual-purpose boats—boats used for guided and unguided fishing)

Other elements to evaluate:

- How the vessel would display the decal
- Whether the action would require a registration fee
- Potentially different registration requirements for businesses with dual purpose boats (guided and unguided **loaner and/or** rental boats)
- Catch reporting
 - Responsibility
 - Record by angler
 - Record by vessel owner or designee
 - Type of reporting
 - Logbook
 - Harvest Card
 - E report
 - SWHS
 - Federal Catch Reporting like MREP
 - Federal Catch Survey

[Amendment to add the above list to replace the list below, passed 21-0.]

~~Administration of registration program~~

- ~~• State of Alaska or NMFS~~

~~Vessels required to register~~

- ~~• All saltwater motor powered boats rented for halibut fishing~~
~~— or —~~- ~~• All saltwater motor powered boats rented for halibut fishing and associated with a remote lodges, guide or guide service providers with an ADFG saltwater sport fishing operator license~~

~~Information required to register~~

- ~~• Name of business or individual~~
- ~~• Address and phone of business or individual~~
- ~~• Location of business operation~~
- ~~• Years in business at initial registration~~
- ~~• Type of rental operation (i.e., business only rents boats for unguided fishing or business provides dual purpose boats — boats used for guided and unguided fishing)~~

~~Other elements to address:~~

- ~~• Registered vessels must display a decal to identify these vessels~~
- ~~• Registration fee~~
- ~~• Potentially different registration requirements for businesses with dual purpose boats (guided and unguided rental boats)~~

Catch reporting

Responsibility

- ~~• Record by angler~~
- ~~• Record by vessel owner or designee~~

Type of reporting

- ~~• Logbook~~
- ~~• Harvest Card~~
- ~~• E report~~
- ~~• SWHS~~
- ~~• Federal Catch Reporting like MREP~~
- ~~• Federal Catch Survey~~

Final motion as amended passed 21-0.

Rationale:

- A registration system is needed to better capture rental practices and the potential implications of shifts in effort between the guided and unguided sectors.
- The next iteration of a discussion paper should expand upon the enforcement challenges associated with any following regulatory action to manage rental operations.
- Further evaluation of a registration system should explore the potential of capturing operations that may not fit the traditional definition of a rental, including loaner boats and lodge packages.

C4 BSAI Groundfish Harvest Specifications, SAFE, Ecosystem Considerations

Harvest Specifications

The AP recommends the Council adopt, for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands groundfish, the 2018 and 2019 OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC, and TACs for groundfish as shown in the attached Table 1. *Motion passed 21-0.*

The AP recommends the Council set the flatfish flexibility rates equal to the maximum difference between ABC and TAC. *Motion passed 21-0.*

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following:

- Table 14 with adjusted PSC for herring of 1,830 mt (attached); *motion passed 21-0.*
- Table 15, reflecting the adjusted distribution of PSC for herring (attached); *motion passed 21-0.*
- Tables 16 as attached; *motion passed 21-0.*
- Table 17 as attached; *motion passed 21-0.*
- Table for Halibut DMRs as posted online; *motion passed 21-0.*
- the BSAI SAFE report; *motion passed 21-0.*

The AP received the Ecosystem Considerations report for GOA groundfish.

Rationale: The AP recommends the Council adopt the industry agreement for BSAI TACs and tables.

Northern Bering Sea Surveys

The AP supports the BSAI Plan Team recommendation on the Northern Bering Sea surveys:

“The Team recommends that more NBS surveys be conducted in the near future, as a time series of such data may be essential for understanding changes in the abundance of some individual stocks as well as the overall ecosystem. Some species, such as pollock and Pacific cod, exhibited enormous changes in NBS survey biomass between 2010 and 2017, both in absolute terms and relative to the NBS+EBS total, while others, such as Alaska plaice, exhibited very little change. The Team also recommends that assessment authors evaluate data from the NBS survey to determine if they should be included in their respective assessment models, particularly if more surveys are conducted, recognizing that it may be appropriate to include these data in some assessments but not others, and that the methods used to include these data may vary between assessments.”

Motion passed 20-0.

Rationale:

- The AP supports additional surveys and assessments in response to shifts in fishery populations due to changing environmental conditions, but feel that any new survey efforts should not come at the expense of other regions.
- Changing environmental conditions can affect the distribution of fish populations for some stocks. Large scale environmental change can potentially move distributions within a management area but outside of traditional survey or assessment areas.

C5 GOA Groundfish Harvest Specifications and SAFE Report

The AP recommends the Council adopt the final 2018 and 2019 Gulf of Alaska groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC and set TACs as shown in the attached table. The TACs for both Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod and Pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries. The Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod and Pollock adjustments are shown in **C5c** of the action memo.

Motion passed 21-0.

The AP recommends that the Council set the 2018 and 2019 annual and seasonal Pacific halibut PSC limits and apportionments in the Gulf of Alaska as provided in **C5d** of the action memo for the longline sector and the annual and seasonal Pacific halibut PSC limits as revised in the attached table for the trawl sector.

Motion passed 19-0.

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the updated DMRs for the Gulf of Alaska for 2018 and 2019 as provided in **C5e**.

Motion passed 20-0.

The AP recommends the Council adopt the GOA SAFE report.

Motion passed 20-0.

Rationale:

The GOA is facing considerable shifts in abundance of important traditional target species which will pose challenges for fleets that are dependent on those species, as well as significant and long reaching community impacts. Fleets will be required to adapt to these changes by redirecting fishing effort on other species. The industry TAC and PSC apportionment sheets forwarded by the AP reflect this shift and a unanimous recognition of the importance of maintaining economic stability for harvesters and fisheries dependent communities.

Some members of the AP felt it important to acknowledge the higher PSC rates of historically lesser targeted species, specifically arrow tooth flounder. Higher rates could lead to more halibut PSC catch which may have a negative impact on directed users, particularly since halibut catch limits are likely to decline this year.

Some AP members suggested that fleets in the GOA establish sector wide benchmarks for PSC rates and adopt best practice measures like those in the Bering Sea, and others expressed the need for increased observer coverage. Active participants in the GOA fisheries described the current use of excluders, communication amongst the fleet to avoid bycatch, limitations with the observer program and the low usage of bycatch relative to the cap. Some members reminded the group of the failure of the Council to act towards a GOA rationalization program that would have provided tools to effectively manage bycatch. Many members felt that any discussion of increased observer coverage was outside the scope of the action at hand.

There was also discussion of the connection between flatfish and salmon effort in the GOA, and assertions expressed that a shift in flatfish harvest would not displace salmon processing or

tendering capacity during high salmon run years because of the relatively higher value and priorities placed on salmon.

With the biggest drop in cod stock ever recorded, the AP slightly adjusted the halibut PSC apportionment for the trawl sector to slow the fishery down and to control PSC and fishing behavior. Increasing the chances for a longer season length will help provide stability to processing plants, the local workforce and communities. Maintaining the existing season apportionment would result in an increase for a race for fish as boats try to make as much money as they can to cover overhead costs and their yearly financial obligations before the fishery closes. Despite these changes in halibut apportionment, the AP recognized that the trawl sector may still be shut down due to salmon PSC.

C6 Small Sideboards

The AP recommends the Council release the document for public review with the staff recommendation for language changes to Alternative 2 as presented on page 10 of the document.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale:

The paper is complete and ready for public review. This action is largely viewed as a housekeeping measure that would alleviate an annual administrative burden for NMFS.

C7 Bering Sea Pacific cod Trawl CV Participation

[Amendment to add and Aleutian Islands after each reference to Bering Sea cod fishery, passed 13-8.]

The AP recommends the Council establish a control date of December 31, 2017 that may be used as a reference date for a future management action to limit access into the trawl catcher vessel and Amendment 80 mothership sectors of the directed non-CDQ Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

Recognizing the concern of historic participants, including catcher vessels, Amendment 80 motherships, inshore processors, and communities, the AP recommends the Council task staff with initiating a preliminary analysis on limiting participation and effort in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands trawl catcher vessel and Amendment 80 mothership sectors of the Pacific cod fisheries with the following recommended Purpose and Need Statement:

Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is a fully allocated resource utilized by multiple fisheries. The directed non-CDQ fishery sectors, each defined by a combination of gear type, operation type, and vessel size, are annually allocated a specific percentage of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ total allowable catch. The Amendment 80 program (2008) rationalized the BSAI yellowfin sole, rock sole, Atka mackerel, and Aleutian Islands Pacific ocean perch fisheries by allocating the right to harvest those species to the head and gut catcher processor fleet that traditionally harvested these fish. Amendment 80 catcher processors are precluded from fishing in the limited access Pacific cod fishery, however they are not precluded from acting as motherships for catcher vessels in this fishery. In recent years, the catcher vessel trawl sector has seen an increase in the number of participants, particularly with the number of vessels delivering Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Amendment 80 catcher processors acting as motherships without commonly

owned catcher vessels, resulting in a redistribution of cod processing from the inshore to the offshore processing sector.

As one of the few remaining open access fisheries, historical catcher vessel trawl participants and inshore and offshore processors are concerned with this recent increase in effort and its potential to negatively impact: 1) access to the resource; 2) the distribution of historical harvest; 3) the stability of markets; and 4) communities. These concerns are especially significant when the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands cod stock experiences periods of decline.

Recognizing historic participation and investment, limiting access and participation in the directed non-CDQ trawl catcher vessel and Amendment 80 mothership sectors for cod may help ensure that this fishery continues to provide benefits to historic participants, that the risk of exacerbating a compressed fishing season is mitigated, and that stability for both inshore and mothership processing markets is maintained.

Final motion passed 20-1.

Rationale:

- A control date and purpose and need statement are the next steps for the Council to respond to issues in the Bering Sea trawl catcher vessel fishery. In 2017, there was an increase in the number of CVs participating, a decreased TAC, a shortened season, and a shift in delivery patterns from onshore to offshore processors. For 2018, the TAC will be nearly 1/3 less than 2017 and the same level of harvesting and processing is anticipated.
- A control date is necessary because it will signal to the industry that speculative entry into the fishery, may or may not, be considered if the Council decides whether a management action is appropriate following a preliminary analysis.
- The purpose and need statement recognizes the potential need to limit access and participation in the fishery by catcher vessels and A80 catcher processors acting as motherships, while also acknowledging that historic participation, dependence, and investments need to be considered.
- Within the A80 sector, there are two distinct patterns of participation with motherships, those that have commonly owned catcher vessels and those without that must get deliveries either from CVs previously delivering to shore plants or who were not in the fishery.
- This motion is intended to be broad, recognizing the factors for consideration required under the MSA such as historic participation, investment and community dependence. This motion does not narrow the AP or the Council's scope to determine an appropriate solution, and it is anticipated that Council staff will return with a paper that provides more detailed information about the fishery and outlines the types of management tools available or those that have been used in the past to address this type of issue (e.g., recency, sideboards, set-asides) and can then determine how best to move forward. This motion is not precluding any activity up until this point and time and is intended as a limiting action, not a prohibiting action.
- During the presentation of the discussion paper the AP recommended areas where additional detail and explanation could be helpful for the next iteration including but not limited to the following:
 - Whether CVs delivering to CPs in recent years were entering the fishery, or had participated historically, and should not be described as "new" entrants.

- The number of CVs out of the 16 non-AFA vessels in Table 8 that have participated historically in the fishery.
- The opportunities of non-AFA vessels within other fisheries.
- The extent and dynamics of leasing cod sideboards within AFA coops.
- A description of CVs within the fishery including relative capacity and RSW tanks
- Pacific cod sector allocations are set on a BSAI wide level, meaning that any action that may control future effort in the Bering Sea could impact participants and effort in the Aleutian Islands. A preliminary analysis will help understand the dynamics between the BSAI moving forward to prevent a shift in effort from the BS to the AI.
- For the inshore processing sector, the increased share of deliveries going offshore to Am 80 CPs versus to historically dependent processors pose a serious concern, especially in a declining TAC scenario. Looking at mothership and shore side processor distribution of cod deliveries, between 2016 and 2017, the portion delivered to motherships increased from 3% to almost 13% with shore side seeing a reciprocal decline. The volume cod provides is critical to the financial success of the inshore processing sector, who have invested millions in infrastructure to process cod into primary and secondary products to achieve full utilization.

D1 WGOA Pacific Cod A Season Halibut PSC Rates

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

Motion passed 11-9.

Rationale in Support:

- Moving the A season start date poses numerous issues that will be exacerbated because of the reduced Pacific Cod TACs in the GOA. This action would likely allow a shift in effort between users in the BSAI and GOA, the CGOA and WGOA and the federal and state water fisheries, resulting in a concentration of fishing effort and making PSC management even more challenging.
- The pattern of higher PSC rates in the early A season is largely due to a learning curve that is unavoidable. This pattern will simply be shifted to any new start date.

Rationale in Opposition:

- An expanded discussion paper is needed to provide more information on excluder use, fleet behavior, observers and tendering. Figure 6 should be revised to provide a better representation of <58' and >58' vessel fishing activity.
- The local fleets from King Cove and Sand Point support a season date change; WGOA fishermen requested a change in 2011, which resulted in a discussion paper. Background information on this previous effort is lacking in the present paper and more historical context should be provided to help expand on user group concerns and interests in the WGOA.
- Figure 5 on page 6 supports the view that a later start date could reduce halibut PSC.

D2 WGOA Pollock C/D Season Timing Chinook PSC

The AP recommends that the Council expand the discussion paper to include CGOA. The discussion paper should examine combining the C & D season (non-roe) into one season and the A & B season (roe season) into one season.

The allocation by season should examine combining the 25% per season into:

- A. 50% for A & B season and 50% C & D season
- B. ~~33% A season; 33% B season; 33% C & D season~~ [Amendment to strike passed 17-1]

Opening dates would remain the same.

Motion passed 18-0.

Rationale:

- Combining pollock seasons into two allocations instead of four will help provide the flexibility needed during the A/B and C/D seasons to avoid fishing effort during times of high salmon PSC rates and allow continued fishing during times that are now closed between the A/B seasons when roe quality is good and fishing is cleaner.
- While SSL issues will need to be addressed, staff recognized that combining seasons may be an easier lift than some of the other GOA issues under consideration.
- An evenly split two season fishery will avoid any reallocation issues between management areas in the GOA. Table 5 on page 10 shows that changing D season allocations will take away from area 610 at the benefit of area 620.

D3 WGOA Pollock Trip Limits

The AP recommends the Council take no further action on this item. *Motion passed 18-1.*

Rationale in Support:

- The discussion paper shows that this action would likely have the effect of increasing PSC; implementing a trip limit is not an effective bycatch management tool.
- This action would result in a reallocation of fish from large to smaller vessels.
- Decreasing the trip limit will necessitate more tows and trips to plants, creating inefficiencies in the pollock fishery.
- This action could increase the risk of the pollock fishery closing on bycatch could pose a threat to communities.

Rationale in Opposition:

- The discussion paper is inconclusive as to whether PSC savings would be achieved or exasperated by lower trip limits.
- The local trawl fleet from King Cove and Sand Point support lower trip limits that would slow the fishery down and put local fishermen on a level playing field with non-local larger vessels.

D4 Stranded Cod in GOA Trawl B Season

The AP recommends the Council take no further action on this item. *Motion passed 12-4.*

Rationale:

- NMFS already has the flexibility to move fish from one sector to another.
- Stranded cod will be less of an issue under low TAC levels.
- While there is merit to reevaluating seasonal apportionments within existing sectors to more closely reflect when Pacific Cod aggregate, this should be addressed as a separate issue.
- The upcoming allocation review in 2020 will provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the current allocations should be adjusted.

D5 Fixed Gear CV Rockfish Retention

The AP agrees with the primary issues identified by the Council in considering full retention of rockfish species for fixed-gear catcher vessels. The AP recommends the Council move forward to identify a purpose and need statement and allow analysis.

The analysis should include the following:

Retention options:

- Consideration of requiring full rockfish retention, including DSR when on bycatch status
- Consideration of requiring full rockfish retention, including DSR, when on PSC status
- Area-specific full rockfish retention, including DSR, when on bycatch or PSC status – this would allow for full retention to apply to certain areas only

Utilization of the various options for overages:

- Personal consumption
- Donation by processor (foodbank)
- Adoption of similar policy to how the state manages overage (forfeiture of exvessel value of overage)

Motion passed 17-0.

Rationale:

- This action would lead to a reduction of waste and increase rockfish utilization, especially with an assumed rockfish mortality of 100%.
- Increased retention could aid in more precise management through improved data collection and catch accounting.
- PSC is currently managed so that retention of that species is prohibited when listed under that status, further analysis will help determine the appropriateness of changing rockfish management when on PSC status to still require full retention.
- Further exploration is needed on ways to encourage and incentivize processors to process fish in excess of the MRA. The replicability of current donation models such as SeaShare should be investigated, as should looking at how the state of Alaska receives forfeiture of the value of rockfish in excess of the MRA while allowing processors to retain and sell fish.

D6 Chinook Salmon Excluder EFP

The AP recommends the Council support the EFP to allow continued development and refinement of salmon excluder devices in the Bering Sea pollock fishery.

Motion passed 21-0.

Rationale: The current EFP allows for a high degree of engagement with the fleet and will result in gear modifications that are more effective and reflective of the fleets' power capabilities. The AP fully supports further development of the EFP.

E1 Staff Tasking

The AP took no action under this agenda item