

Discussion Paper
Review of Regulations under
Executive Order 14276 Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness
May 29, 2025

Abstract: To assist with implementing Executive Order 14276, this document serves as a broad regulatory review and provides suggestions that may improve domestic fishing operations for fisheries in the EEZ off Alaska under the authority of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council). Building upon previous efforts, NMFS Alaska Region outlines possible changes to reduce regulatory burdens and optimize seafood production while continuing to promote sustainability. The report identifies current initiatives, such as modifications to Maximum Retainable Amount regulations and expansions in electronic monitoring, provides recommendations from NMFS such as modernizing recordkeeping and reporting regulations, and describes other possible actions the Council could consider for recommendation to NMFS to implement.

Prepared by NMFS Alaska Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division

Accessibility of this Document: Effort has been made to make this document accessible to individuals with disabilities and compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The complexity of this document may make access difficult for some. If you encounter information that you cannot access or use, please call us at [907-586-7228](tel:907-586-7228) so that we may assist you.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1 NMFS's Request for Council Review	4
1.1 Regulations under the Authority of the Council	5
1.2 Existing Processes for Review of Regulations	6
1.2.1 The Council Process	6
1.2.2 Catch Share Program Reviews	6
1.2.3 NMFS's Ongoing Reviews of Regulations	8
2 Considerations in Making and Prioritizing Recommendations	10
3 Actions in Process that Reduce Regulatory Burden	11
3.1 Actions currently under Council development	11
3.1.1 Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition: Initial review/Final action in June scheduled	11
3.1.2 Maximum Retainable Amounts (MRA): Final action in October scheduled	11
3.1.3 CR Program Revisions	12
3.1.4 Economic Data Reports (2025 analysis)	13
3.1.5 Cost Recovery Process Streamlining: Discussion Paper	13
3.1.6 Pot gear regulation consistency: Discussion Paper	14
3.1.7 IFQ transfer and beneficiary changes: Discussion Paper	14
3.1.8 Allow the Use of NMFS-Approved Scales in the Sablefish Fishery: Discussion Paper	15
4 Actions that Reduce Regulatory Burden in the NMFS Rulemaking Process	16
5 NMFS's Recommendations for New Actions that Reduce Regulatory Burden	17
5.1 Streamlining and expanding the use of Electronic Monitoring	17
5.1.1 Rockfish Program Electronic Monitoring (EM)	17
5.1.2 Consolidation of EM Regulations	17
5.2 Remove regulations for Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs) in the North Pacific	17
5.3 Modernize and streamline recordkeeping and reporting regulations	18
5.3.1 Removing unnecessary documentation for the Application for Annual Crab Harvesting Cooperative IFQ Permit	18
5.3.2 Remove shoreside processor check in / check out reports	18
5.3.3 Modernize electronic logbook (eLogbook) regulations	18
5.3.4 Reduce regulatory burden on vessels that catch small amounts of groundfish	19
5.3.5 Daily cumulative production logbook (DCPL) adjustments	19
5.3.6 Remove requirements to print documents	20
5.3.7 Scale and video streamlining	20

5.4	Remove unused regulations or consolidate similar regulations to improve clarity	21
5.4.1	Streamlining and consolidation opportunities	21
5.5	Housekeeping improvements	22
6	Additional Ideas for Consideration	24
6.1	Modify the framework for LAPP use caps	24
6.2	Revisit sideboards	24
6.3	Streamline processes for unharvested CR Program stocks	25
6.4	Remove CMP requirement for Registered Crab Receiver (RCR) holders	25
6.5	Streamline the BSAI Pacific Cod reallocation process	25
6.6	Provide additional flexibility for allocations that commonly go unused	26
6.7	Increase usability of Aleutian Islands allocations	26
6.8	Remove stationary floating processor single geographic restriction requirements and clarify mothership definition	27
6.9	Raise the partial coverage length overall (LOA)	27
6.10	Process Improvements	28
6.10.1	Clarify when MSA 305(d) rulemaking authority is appropriate	28
6.10.2	Catch share program reviews	28
6.10.3	Charter halibut management measures timing	29
7	Implemented Deregulatory Revisions Resulting from Past Recommendations	30
7.1	American Fisheries Act	30
7.2	Halibut and Sablefish IFQ Program	30
7.3	Rockfish Program	30
7.4	Vessel Monitoring Systems	31
7.5	Revisions to Economic Data Reports (2018 recommendation)	31
7.6	Recordkeeping and Reporting, General	31

1 NMFS's Request for Council Review

On April 17, 2025, the President signed [Executive Order \(EO\) 14276 Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness](#).¹ EO 14276 is similar to the previous [EO 13921 Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness and Economic Growth](#), which the fishery management councils responded to by providing a 'prioritized list of recommended actions to reduce burdens on domestic fishing and to increase production within sustainable fisheries' in November 2020. The Council's recommendation in response to EO 13921, which was made during the October 2020 meeting, can be found [here](#).²

On May 6, 2025, Mr. Eugenio Piñeiro-Soler, Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries, sent a letter to Regional Fishery Management Council Executive Directors requesting each Council's recommendations pursuant to Section 4(a)(i) of EO 14276. Comments are due by September 30, 2025. Section 4(a)(i) of EO 14276 includes the following specific language pertaining to the Regional Fishery Management Councils:

(i) The Secretary of Commerce shall request that each Regional Fishery Management Council, within 180 days of the date of this order, provide the Secretary of Commerce with updates to their recommendations submitted pursuant to Executive Order 13921, to reduce burdens on domestic fishing and to increase production. Building upon the earlier goals, identified actions should stabilize markets, improve access, enhance economic profitability, and prevent closures. The Regional Fishery Management Councils will commit to a work plan and a schedule for implementation to ensure these actions are prioritized.

This recognizes that the Council develops and recommends fishery management plans (FMPs), FMP amendments, and associated regulations for the conservation and management of the federally managed fisheries off Alaska.

Staff in the Alaska Region (AKR) of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) developed this document to assist the Council in the review of Federal regulations. This document provides information about regulations under the authority of the Council and other existing regulatory review processes, and identifies potential regulatory revisions to support the goals of EO 14276.

Other than the June 2025 meeting, the Council does not have a regularly scheduled meeting prior to the deadline for the Council to submit comments on EO 14276.

NMFS also anticipates publishing a *Federal Register* notice soliciting public comments responsive to four additional sections of EO 14276 (Section 4(a); 4(a)(ii); 4(a)(iii); and 4(c)), as described below.

¹ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/04/22/2025-07062/restoring-american-seafood-competitiveness>

² <https://meetings.npfmc.org/CommentReview/DownloadFile?p=1193c41c-c7fa-483b-955c-910318aa5be1.pdf&fileName=D2%20Motion.pdf>

(ii) The Secretary of Commerce shall solicit direct public comments, including from fishing industry members, technology experts, marine scientists, and other relevant parties, for innovative ideas to improve fisheries management and science within the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.); the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.); and other applicable laws.

Given the direct engagement with the Councils per Section 4(a)(i), NMFS will provide an update on the public comments NMFS receives to inform our collective efforts to implement EO 14276.

In addition to EO 14276, the President also signed [EO 14192 Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation](#).³ To support the administration policy of reducing regulatory burden and private expenditures required to comply with Federal regulations, this EO requires Agencies to track the incremental cost of new regulations and that the total incremental costs for all new regulations, including repealed regulations be significantly less than zero. For actions recommended by the Council and implemented by NMFS, review for consistency with the EO will occur during the rulemaking process and be accounted for at the Department of Commerce level. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provided guidance to Agencies on March 26, 2025 regarding implementation of Section 3 of EO 14192⁴. In that guidance, an EO 14192 Regulatory Action is defined as a significant regulatory action as defined in Section 3(f) of [EO 12866](#) that has been finalized and that imposes total costs greater than zero. The guidance goes on to identify an EO 14192 deregulatory action as an action that has been finalized and had total costs less than zero. To meet these requirements, NMFS is now required to complete a worksheet explaining, among other things—

- How the rulemaking will repeal or streamline regulations/reporting requirements, increase flexibility, or otherwise reduce burden on the public sector or private sector.
- Monetized cost savings, if possible.
- If the rulemaking will impose costs to the public or private sector.

1.1 Regulations under the Authority of the Council

The Council is authorized under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) to develop and recommend FMPs for the fisheries under its authority that require conservation and management. The Council also is authorized to develop and recommend amendments to those FMPs and to recommend Federal regulations to implement the FMPs.

The specific Federal regulations that implement FMPs are listed below:

- [50 CFR Part 679](#), which primarily contains regulations governing the groundfish fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) and the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI);

³ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/06/2025-02345/unleashing-prosperity-through-deregulation>

⁴ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/M-25-20-Guidance-Implementing-Section-3-of-Executive-Order-14192-Titled-Unleashing-Prosperity-Through-Deregulation.pdf>

- [50 CFR Part 679](#), which also contains regulations implemented under the FMPs for BSAI King and Tanner Crabs, the Scallop Fishery off Alaska, the Salmon Fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) off Alaska, and the Fish Resources of the Arctic Management Area; and
- [50 CFR Part 680](#), which contains the regulations governing the shellfish fisheries of the EEZ off Alaska, primarily the Crab Rationalization Program.

In addition to the regulations implementing FMPs, the Council also recommends regulations governing the Pacific halibut fisheries off Alaska under the Northern Pacific Halibut Act. These regulations are found at [50 CFR Part 300, subpart E](#), and [50 CFR Part 679](#).

1.2 Existing Processes for Review of Regulations

1.2.1 The Council Process

Through the Council process, Federal regulations implemented under the MSA and for the halibut fisheries off Alaska are continuously reviewed and revised to reflect current conservation and management needs. The Council recommends FMP and regulatory amendments to address new or changing conservation or management concerns and to improve the effectiveness of the regulations. Although not always explicitly stated, part of this review process is determining whether the benefits of the current regulations outweigh the costs.

The Council is scheduled to meet four times per year in public session to receive staff reports, advice from its committees, and public comment on fishery conservation and management issues under discussion, and to take action to make recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce for FMPs, FMP amendments, and regulatory amendments. The Council takes written and oral public comment prior to and during these meetings where members of the public, the affected industry, Tribes, and others have an opportunity to identify a problem with existing regulations and request consideration of revisions to these regulations. Additionally, NMFS may also bring recommended regulatory revisions to the Council for consideration.

The Council has the ability to initiate staff work on any potential regulatory modification within its authority. For example, in April 2025, the Council initiated action to evaluate the economic data reports (EDRs) provided by industry in American Fisheries Act (AFA), Crab Rationalization (CR), and Amendment 80 (A80) programs. Based on these types of reviews, the Council can then consider the regulatory changes to recommend to the Secretary of Commerce.

The major regulatory programs and subject areas that currently are under review by the Council, based on the [Council's 3-meeting outlook](#) updated in April 2025, are listed in Section 3.1. This information is provided primarily to indicate which areas of the regulations the Council has already identified may need revisions or additions.

1.2.2 Catch Share Program Reviews

Section 303A(c)(1)(G) and (i)(1)(B) of the MSA require the Council and NMFS to review all limited access privilege programs (LAPPs) ("catch share programs") that have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce, including those programs approved prior to the addition of this

requirement to the MSA. In addition, Section 303A(c)(1)(G) of the MSA specifies that LAPP reviews should occur 5 years after implementation and subsequent reviews should be conducted no less frequently than once every 7 years. These catch share program reviews represent one of the important ways that the Council periodically evaluates regulations under its authority and identifies needed changes. Past program reviews are available on the Council website at: <https://www.npfmc.org/allocation-and-program-review/>. **After reviewing the impacts of each program, the Council has the option of taking action, as necessary and appropriate, to recommend modifying or ending the program.**

American Fisheries Act (2025)

The Council is in the process of reviewing the AFA fishery and is scheduled to consider the review in June 2025. The 2025 AFA Program Review is available under June 2025 Agenda item D1 on the Council's website at <https://meetings.npfmc.org/Meeting/Details/3087>.

Central GOA Rockfish Program Review (2025)

The Council is in the process of reviewing the Rockfish Program in June 2025. The Council recommended reauthorizing the Rockfish Program at its February 2020 meeting and NMFS implemented the action with Amendment 111 to the GOA FMP in 2021 ([86 FR 11895](#), 03/01/2021). This action included regulatory revisions that were previously recommended by NMFS in the 2017 program review. The 2025 Rockfish Program Review is available under June 2025 Agenda item D2 on the Council's website at <https://meetings.npfmc.org/Meeting/Details/3087>.

In Section 16.1 of the program review, NMFS identified potential regulatory revisions to implement electronic monitoring onboard catcher vessels participating in the program to monitor at-sea retention and discards as potential monitoring improvement in the program. This specific recommendation is further discussed in Section 5.1.1.

Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) (2024)

The Council received its second review of the IFQ Program in December 2024. The Council accepted the review as complete after incorporation of minor revisions discussed during deliberations of the review. Through this program review, the Council identified some revisions to the IFQ Program that warrant further analysis and review.

These potential revisions include improving the process used in transfers of quota share (QS) from community quota entities (CQEs) to eligible residents and changes to the criteria to be eligible to receive QS or IFQ by transfer. The Council also asked for information on the amount of QS held by beneficiaries beyond the 3-year period during which a transfer can be approved to evaluate the survivorship transfer privilege in regulation. These and other potential program revisions will continue to be discussed by the Council's IFQ Committee, and some of these issues have been advanced for further analysis and action by the Council. The Draft program review is available under the December 2024 Agenda item D5 on the Council's website at: <https://meetings.npfmc.org/Meeting/Details/3066>.

BSAI Crab Rationalization Program Review (2024)

The Council has conducted several reviews of the CR Program since its implementation in 2005. The most recent review was accepted as final by the Council in June 2024, and the final program review document was completed in August 2024. The program review is available on the Council's website at: <https://www.npfmc.org/allocation-and-program-review/>.

After receiving this review, the Council initiated two actions to modify specific provisions of the CR Program: 1) modifications to the arbitration program (this recommendation is further discussed in Section 3.1.3), and 2) modifications to revise the eligibility requirements to receive crew quota shares by transfer, and increase crew quota share use caps.

Amendment 80 Program (In progress, 2025)

The A80 Program was implemented in 2008. The Council accepted the review in December 2024 with the request for several additions to the document, which is ongoing. However, the Council did not recommend any changes to the program. Prior to this most recent review, the Council also reviewed the program in 2014. The program review is available on the Council's website at: <https://www.npfmc.org/allocation-and-program-review/>.

BSAI Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program (2029)

The Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative (PCTC) Program was implemented in 2023 and fishing under the program began in January 2024. The first review of the program is scheduled to occur 5 years after implementation in 2029.

1.2.3 NMFS's Ongoing Reviews of Regulations

NMFS regularly reviews regulations under both the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). Several recommendations included in the 2018 Regulatory Reform Review under [EO 13921](#) were the result of PRA or RFA reviews and implemented changes are summarized in Section 7. **Table 2** identifies all the OMB approved information collections necessary to implement the Council's fishery management programs, the status of those reviews, and the specific form or information collected. This is similar to a document that NMFS produced to support the Council's previous review of regulations under [EO 13771](#) and [EO 13777](#) in April 2018.⁵

Paperwork Reduction Act:

Under the PRA, regulations associated with collecting information from the public must be reviewed every 3 years, and NMFS must obtain approval from the OMB to continue to collect the information. NMFS also must apply for and receive approval from OMB for any new or revised information collection requirements that occur as a result of a new rulemaking, and for any voluntary collection of information from a survey or a request for information, such as the Council's requests that cooperative representatives provide information in annual reports in addition to the information required in regulation.

⁵ <https://meetings.npfmc.org/CommentReview/DownloadFile?p=a145541d-f07b-4e98-b223-d02f5c098883.pdf&fileName=D2%20Regulatory%20Reform%20Review.pdf>

The PRA review process requires NMFS to describe the information collection requirements, explain why the information should be collected or continue to be collected, estimate the number of respondents and the cost to respondents of submitting the information, and address a number of other related questions. NMFS issues a notice in the *Federal Register* when it initiates a review of regulations under the PRA to solicit public comment on the information collection requirements. These notices are posted on the NMFS [AKR web page](#).⁶ NMFS responds to comments received in the analysis (“supporting statement”) it submits to OMB. The AKR PRA analysis packages can be found at <https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>.

In 2025, AKR is starting the PRA renewal process for 11 information collections with OMB expiration dates in 2026 or 2027. The first step in the renewal process is to publish a notice in the *Federal Register* to request comments. The next public comment opportunities will be for information collections related to the AFA permits and reports (OMB control numbers 0648-0393 and -0401), the CQE Program (OMB control number 0648-0665), and EDR (OMB Control numbers 0648-0518, -0564, and -0633).

Regulatory Flexibility Act:

Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires periodic review of rules “which have or will have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities.” In practice, this requires NMFS to review all final rules for which a final regulatory flexibility analysis was prepared. The RFA requires this review to address whether the regulations implemented in the final rule should be continued, amended, or rescinded, consistent with the stated objectives of the applicable statutes, to minimize any significant economic impact on small entities. NMFS conducts this review each year, starting with a notice in the *Federal Register* soliciting comments on the final rules NMFS has identified for review.

As part of these regulatory review processes, or through other means, NMFS sometimes identifies regulatory revisions to remove requirements that are no longer necessary. In most cases, these regulatory revisions are recordkeeping or reporting requirements or other types of information collection requirements. The revisions cannot be made directly through the PRA or RFA review processes. They must be made through a proposed and final rule with an accompanying analysis of impacts and other requirements associated with rulemaking packages. Once a revision is identified, it can take several years to implement consistent with statutory and other legal requirements. These revisions generally are included in rulemaking revisions to other elements of the program or category of regulations in question. This reduces the work associated with preparing standalone analyses and rulemaking documents. However, in past years, NMFS also has prepared omnibus recordkeeping and reporting rulemakings to implement a series of regulatory amendments identified through various regulatory review processes.

⁶ <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/federal-register-notices-proposed-and-or-continuing-information-collections-required>

2 Considerations in Making and Prioritizing Recommendations

There are a broad range of potential actions that could be responsive to EO 14276. The Council may wish to consider the following as it evaluates and prioritizes potential actions and recommendations.

Consistency with applicable laws.

Any action recommended by the Council must comply with applicable laws, including the MSA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Endangered Species Act. Deregulatory actions that may have consequences such as increasing bycatch or causing increased effects to marine mammals will require careful review.

Impact.

Substantive revisions to existing programs may result in significant cost savings or more potential for increased harvest. However, these major actions require more development work and may have additional implementation and operation costs to the agency which could also result in increased cost recovery fees. If considering major revisions, starting with a clean sheet could be more efficient than fundamentally changing an existing program. Alternatively, small actions may have a more limited impact, but could be completed quickly. Another category of potential actions could reduce regulatory complexity. While not all actions reducing regulatory complexity may directly reduce the burden on industry, they could increase the usability of regulations and reduce agency staff time and costs associated with implementing them and providing regulatory guidance. This may have potential benefits to industry in the form of decreased cost recovery expenses and increased staff capacity to work on other Council priorities. The Council will have to decide how to balance these considerations.

Council and NMFS staff capacity.

Recommendations from the Council will have to be integrated with other ongoing work by Council and NMFS staff. At this time, NMFS and the Council have reduced staff capacity and there is currently no information indicating additional resources will be available to implement the recommendations resulting from this EO. The Council will have to consider its recommendations and prioritization in the context of other ongoing work in weighing how to be responsive EO 14276. Clear direction on prioritization would help provide guidance on how to balance ongoing actions.

Synergy with ongoing actions.

Combining multiple related elements into a single action, or integrating additional elements to ongoing actions may increase efficiency. Integrating recommendations, particularly those of an administrative nature, into actions that are already in process may allow more rapid implementation.

Actions that need Council development versus recommendations to NMFS to implement actions directly through MSA 305(d).

If there are policy neutral or largely administrative actions, the Council could choose to recommend that NMFS complete development and implement these through MSA 305(d) authority if they determined no additional Council development work is required and the action is authorized under an FMP.

3 Actions in Process that Reduce Regulatory Burden

Most of the actions recommended by the Council and implemented by NMFS reflect, to some extent, an intent to reduce regulatory burden, increase economic stability, and increase flexibility. The following actions are either 1) currently under Council development or 2) NMFS is in the process of implementing the Council recommendation.

3.1 Actions currently under Council development

NMFS has preliminarily identified the following ongoing Council actions as potentially responsive to EO 14276. These include actions for which the Council is in the process of making recommendations and also actions from the Council's roster of actions that it has already made motions to develop a discussion paper or analysis, but has not scheduled work on it yet. These can be found in the [Council's 3-meeting outlook](#).⁷ It is not currently known if all of these actions would be considered responsive to EO 14276. The Council may wish to consider how each of these could be responsive to the EO, if additional modifications or elements could make these potential actions more responsive to the EO, or if prioritizing or deprioritizing specific actions could better address priorities identified in recent EOs, including EO 14276.

3.1.1 Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition: Initial review/Final action in June scheduled

In June 2025, the Council is scheduled to review an analysis and make recommendations to NMFS for potential changes to the definition of pelagic trawl gear and limitations on pelagic trawl gear in regulations. The purpose of this action is to update the regulatory definition of pelagic trawl gear that applies in federal waters off Alaska to clearly allow commonly used components in codends and bycatch excluder devices, allow instrumentation necessary to monitor net performance, remove unnecessary outdated text, and provide some flexibility for future gear innovation. The definition of pelagic trawl gear within [§ 679.2](#) has remained unchanged since 1993. Clarifying the definition of pelagic trawl gear limitations on pelagic trawl gear in regulations will also facilitate the process to incentivize trawl gear innovation or other measures to minimize the impacts of pelagic trawl gear on bycatch, sensitive habitat, and unobserved mortality.

3.1.2 Maximum Retainable Amounts (MRA): Final action in October scheduled

NMFS identified potential changes to the MRA regulations in the October 2023 B2 NMFS Management Report. The Council then received a discussion paper in April 2024 followed by an initial review draft analysis presented in April 2025. In October 2025, the Council is scheduled to review an analysis and make recommendations to NMFS for potential changes to MRA regulations. The MRA regulations establish the amounts of groundfish species that are closed to directed fishing (incidentally-caught species) that a vessel operator may retain while engaged in directed fishing for a different species or species group that is open to directed fishing. The purpose of this action is to improve and update the MRA regulations by clarifying current MRA regulations, making MRA calculations easier, reducing regulatory discards, and addressing medical, mechanical, or weather issues that can impact MRA calculations. The Council intends to maintain the original intent of MRAs and is not considering changes that increase MRA

⁷ <https://www.npfmc.org/three-meeting-outlook/>

percentages or changes in how MRAs assist in limiting harvest of a groundfish species within its annual total allowable catch (TAC).

3.1.3 CR Program Revisions

Crab Arbitration: Initial Review in June

In December 2024, the Council initiated action to consider changes to the arbitration process. Options include: 1) removing the requirement that the arbitrator can only select a remedy proposed by one side and allow the arbitrator to select an independent or compromise remedy; 2) allowing parties to receive the arbitrator's written report and rationale, as well as a publicly available report providing key rationale (without including confidential information); 3) removing the requirement for the market report; and 4) removing the arbitration option for non-performance after a contract has been established to define BSAI crab price, delivery, or other terms. This action also includes an alternative that would allow IFQ and IPQ applications to be withdrawn within 24 or 48 hours after the TAC limits are announced by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). **The Council will review an initial review draft analysis in June 2025 and could consider adding additional elements to this action as described in this paper.**

Remove unnecessary requirements for Alaska Crab Arbitration System reports

In response to the 2018 renewal of the authority to collect information for the Alaska Crab Arbitration System for the CR Program fisheries, a commenter noted that some of the information required to be submitted for a complete annual arbitration organization report appears to be redundant. Section [§§ 680.20\(d\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#) and [\(iii\)](#) require submission of the amount of QS/IFQ or PQS/IPQ held by each member and QS, PQS, IFQ, and IPQ ownership information for the members. Neither arbitration organization currently submits this information with its annual report. The report is due May 1, but information on IFQ pounds is not available until October. NMFS has access to the information on IFQ pounds and detailed information on the organizations' members, so there is no need for some of this information to be submitted with the annual report. Additionally, NMFS recommends reviewing the need to annually submit the information listed in [§ 680.20\(d\)\(2\)](#) if this information has not changed. NMFS also recommends reviewing two other components of the arbitration system, the notifications and the market report, to determine if some requirements at [§ 680.20](#) for these are no longer necessary, or could be revised. **These issues could be added to the Crab Arbitration paper.**

Crab C-Shares: Initial Review in October 2025 (T)

At the June 2024 meeting, the Council requested a discussion paper to consider modifications to eligibility requirements and use caps for crew quota shares (C shares) in the BSAI CR Program. Modifications included: 1) revise eligibility requirements for receiving C-shares through transfer either as a new entrant or a current C-shares holder buying more to mirror the requirements recently implemented for holding or maintaining active participation requirements for C-shares and 2) increase C-share use caps. The Council reviewed the discussion paper at the December 2024 meeting and recommended alternatives for a draft initial review analysis which include 1) revising eligibility requirements to purchase/receive C-shares by transfer to allow for time tendering in any Federal or State commercial fishery off Alaska to count toward the 150-day eligibility and increase time to 3 years to participate in a CR Program fishery trip and 2) increasing C-share use caps for CR Program fisheries within a range of up to 5-10% individually

for the Bristol Bay red king crab, Bering Sea snow crab, Eastern Bering Sea Tanner crab, Western Bering Sea Tanner crab, St. Matthew Island blue king crab, and Pribilof Islands blue and red king crab. **The Council is tentatively scheduled to review the initial review draft analysis in October 2025.**

Evaluate earlier Aleutian Islands (AI) golden king crab fishery start date: Discussion Paper

In June 2021, the Council initiated a discussion paper to identify potential regulatory or administrative changes that would allow Eastern AI golden king crab and Western AI golden king crab IFQ to be issued or fished prior to August 1. Changes could include regulatory changes to the crab fishing year for golden king crab or other administrative or FMP/regulatory changes that would allow golden king crab IFQ to be issued or fished earlier in the year. The paper should include potential impacts on other CR Program fisheries including cost recovery fees. **The Council has not yet scheduled its review of the discussion paper.**

3.1.4 Economic Data Reports (2025 analysis)

In April 2025, the Council initiated an analysis to consider removing EDR requirements for all LAPPs. The Council indicated it has successfully analyzed the economic performance of numerous fisheries without the use of EDRs. The Council has reviewed and modified EDRs in the past to improve their usability, efficiency, and consistency and sought to minimize costs to industry and the Federal government. In response, the Council and NMFS have removed EDR requirements for one program and streamlined others. EDRs are currently required for only three LAPPs: the BSAI Amendment 91, the CR, and A80 Programs. These LAPPs pay fees for administering their EDRs through cost recovery. At this stage of development, the Council has indicated that given the substantial cost recovery fees for submitting and maintaining EDRs, their inconsistent application across LAPPs, and the lack of a clear overriding management need, the cost of EDRs to fishery participants and the agency outweighs the value of EDRs to management. **The Council has not yet scheduled further review of this potential action.**

3.1.5 Cost Recovery Process Streamlining: Discussion Paper

In April 2025, the Council received a discussion paper to inform options to adjust the annual timing and administrative processes for all of the Council's cost recovery and fee collection programs. The paper identified inefficiencies and challenges faced by stakeholders and NMFS as well as opportunities to improve clarity, consistency, and efficiency within the cost recovery processes administered by NMFS AKR. The Council requested NMFS continue to evaluate options for the cost recovery changes proposed in the discussion paper. These changes could increase efficiency and be responsive to the EO. However, these changes are expected to be largely administrative. **The Council has not yet scheduled further review of this potential action.**

At the same meeting, the Council requested NMFS implement cost reduction actions to minimize incremental costs billed to cost recovery and provide additional data in future cost recovery reports, which NMFS provides annually to the Council. The Council could also consider streamlining or removing features of LAPPs that are expensive for NMFS to administer as a means to reduce agency costs. This would be separate from the cost recovery process streamlining action currently in process. It is also important to note that cost recovery funding is likely to help expedite development and implementation of Council recommended changes to

existing LAPPs relative to other programs, which have to compete for more limited discretionary funding.

3.1.6 Pot gear regulation consistency: Discussion Paper

In February 2022, the Council initiated a discussion paper to evaluate changes to pot gear regulations for the IFQ and Greenland turbot fisheries that could increase operational efficiency. An increasing number of vessels are using new pot gear designs (*i.e.*, slinky pots). Existing regulations may limit potential innovations in pot gear design that improve harvest efficiency and may minimize bycatch of non-target species. The Council requested staff provide a discussion paper that explores potential regulatory changes to simplify pot gear regulations, allow for additional flexibility to use pots in the BSAI and GOA groundfish fisheries, and consider revised gear configuration requirements for biodegradable panels, escape mechanisms, tunnel opening sizes, and/or the use of longline and single pot gear. **The Council has not yet scheduled its review of the discussion paper.**

3.1.7 IFQ transfer and beneficiary changes: Discussion Paper

In December 2024, as a result of the IFQ program review, the Council initiated a discussion paper to consider the following changes to the IFQ Program:

1. Explore options to allow the automation of in-season transfers of CQE-held quota share between eligible residents; and
2. Potential changes to the criteria to be eligible to receive QS or IFQ by transfer (Transfer Eligibility Certificate):
 - a. Waive or reduce the transfer eligibility requirements for CQE eligible community residents fishing CQE-held quota share;
 - b. Allow time as crew on a tender vessel operating in support of a commercial fishery managed by the State of Alaska or in a Federal commercial fishery in the EEZ off Alaska to count towards the 150 days of sea time required for a Transfer Eligibility Certificate; and
 - c. Establish a regulatory minimum age to be eligible to receive IFQ or QS by transfer. Discuss administrative and legal considerations of establishing a minimum age less than the interim policy of 18 years old (*e.g.*, 16 years old).

The paper will also include information on the amount of QS held by beneficiaries beyond the 3-year period during which the NMFS Regional Administrator will approve an application for transfer of IFQ. This would allow the Council to assess the scope of retention of QS by beneficiaries who do not have a Transfer Eligibility Certificate and whether changing the survivorship transfer privilege regulations at [§ 679.41\(k\)](#) may be warranted. **The Council has not yet scheduled its review of the discussion paper.**

3.1.8 Allow the Use of NMFS-Approved Scales in the Sablefish Fishery: Discussion Paper

In 2023, the Council requested a discussion paper to address an option for sablefish A share IFQ holders to use NMFS-approved flow or hopper scales when participating in the sablefish fishery. The paper will explore the potential operational and management impacts of utilizing NMFS-approved 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.

The Council has not yet scheduled its review of the discussion paper.

4 Actions that Reduce Regulatory Burden in the NMFS Rulemaking Process

The Council recommended the following actions that NMFS is in the process of implementing. As recommended by the Council, these actions are intended to increase flexibility, reduce regulatory burden, and/or improve fishing opportunities. **Table 1** summarizes recent Council actions, the impact that is expected by implementing the recommended changes, and an assessment of implementation complexity.

Table 1 Assessment of the expected impact and implementation complexity for recent Council final actions for which NMFS is undergoing rulemaking.

Council Action	Current Status	Expected Impact	Implementation Complexity
Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) Funding (Charter halibut stamp) - April 2022 & October 2024	Proposed rule: 89 FR 86772 , Oct 31, 2024. Final rule development.	Industry requested program that would require CHP holders to purchase a \$20 stamp for each charter vessel angler. The RQE would use funding from the stamp sales to purchase halibut QS which could allow for less restrictive annual management measures for the charter halibut fishery such as bag limits, size limits, and day of the week closures. This action is intended to promote stability and economic viability in the charter halibut fishery.	High - involves development of software to facilitate the sale of stamps and tracking the transfer of QS, and development of new inter-agency processes between AKR and ADF&G, NMFS HQ, and the Treasury Department.
BSAI Amendment 125 - Small Boat Cod - October 2022	Proposed rule development.	Additional harvest opportunity for small vessels using hook-and-line or pot gear to harvest Pacific cod earlier in the year.	Moderate - involves highly specific and technical modifications to allocation regulations and annual harvest specification process, and programming changes to the catch accounting system.
Small Sablefish Release - April 2025	Proposed rule development.	Additional limited operational flexibility to carefully release sablefish may increase the value of the commercial harvest.	Moderate/high - involves highly specific and technical modifications to allocation regulations and annual harvest specification process including adjustments to the stock assessment modeling framework to incorporate discard mortality rates, account for voluntary discards, and the limited data to inform them, and IT programming changes to the catch accounting system as well as outreach and education to the Observer Program and NOAA OLE.
Halibut IFQ Vessel Use Caps - April 2025	Proposed rule development.	Provide additional harvest opportunities for vessels that were constrained by the previous vessel use cap.	Low - Involves basic programming changes to the IFQ Landings system.
Sablefish Season Start Time - April 2025	Proposed rule development.	Provide additional flexibility for NMFS to set the time of day annually for the sablefish IFQ.	Low - operational change for the fishing fleet only, no programming changes necessary.

5 NMFS's Recommendations for New Actions that Reduce Regulatory Burden

NMFS identified regulatory changes that could be responsive to EO 14276. The Council could choose to recommend that NMFS proceed with one or more of these actions, or could choose to initiate Council analyses to further develop recommendations related to any of these issues. Note that, at this stage, these are simply ideas for further discussion and each recommendation would need to be fully analyzed and follow the rulemaking process, including requests for public comment, to be implemented, consistent with the MSA and other applicable law.

5.1 Streamlining and expanding the use of Electronic Monitoring

5.1.1 Rockfish Program Electronic Monitoring (EM)

In April 2025, the Council's Advisory Panel recommended that the Council initiate a discussion paper on implementing EM in the Rockfish Program shoreside sector for all target species and harvests with both pelagic trawl gear and nonpelagic trawl gear. Given that a large amount of effort has gone into implementing the Trawl EM program in the pelagic pollock fishery, which shares participants with the CGOA Rockfish Program, the discussion paper should compare and contrast the two fisheries to explore which aspects of Trawl EM could be utilized in a Rockfish Program EM program. This paper should describe the CGOA Rockfish Program shoreside fishery, including management structure, with suggestions for a Rockfish Program Trawl EM program goals and objectives. It should include a description of elements within the pelagic pollock Trawl EM program and how each element could be similar or may need to be different for an effective CGOA Rockfish Program shoreside trawl EM program.

5.1.2 Consolidation of EM Regulations

If the Council recommends EM for the Rockfish Program, it's anticipated that the applicable regulations would be moved into [§ 679.51\(f\)](#). There is considerable overlap between the nontrawl EM regulations at [§ 679.51\(f\)](#) and trawl EM regulations at [§ 679.51\(g\)](#). By consolidating these sections, the requirements that apply broadly to all EM programs would exist in a single location, increasing the usability to the public. This change could also help streamline the implementation of future EM programs.

5.2 Remove regulations for Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs) in the North Pacific

The regulations for EFPs found at [§ 679.6](#) are largely consistent with the nationwide EFP regulations at [§ 600.745](#) that were developed subsequently, but the Alaska-specific regulations are more rigid and cumbersome. Nationwide regulations have broader eligibility for a wide array of purposes and allow for discretionary Council consultation that can provide flexibility.

Additionally, as part of a broader national initiative under section 4(c) of [EO 14276](#), NMFS is also seeking feedback on ways to expand the use of EFPs to promote fishing opportunities, support innovation, and accelerate access to pilot projects. Removing [§ 679.6](#) and relying on [§ 600.745](#) regulations for North Pacific EFP processes would incorporate any modifications made in the nationwide initiative and could provide greater opportunity and flexibility for industry and researchers to test new gear, methods, monitoring options and management strategies under a faster, more adaptive process.

5.3 Modernize and streamline recordkeeping and reporting regulations

5.3.1 Removing unnecessary documentation for the Application for Annual Crab Harvesting Cooperative IFQ Permit

In 2018, NMFS identified and recommended making two revisions to the CR Program that have not yet been analyzed nor implemented. The Council is considering two actions that would modify the CR Program and could consider adding these changes to the C share and Crab Arbitration actions that are currently scheduled for consideration at the June and October 2025 meetings, as described in Section 3.1.3 above. In addition to removing unnecessary documentation for the Application for Annual Crab Harvesting Cooperative IFQ Permit, NMFS recommended removing unnecessary requirements for Alaska Crab Arbitration System reports that are also described in Section 3.1.3 above. [§ 680.21\(b\)\(2\)\(iii\)](#) requires a complete annual crab harvesting cooperative IFQ permit application must contain the following information, which cannot be submitted in an on-line application: a copy of the business license issued by the state in which the crab harvesting cooperative is registered as a business entity, a copy of the articles of incorporation or partnership agreement of the crab harvesting cooperative, and a copy of the crab harvesting cooperative agreement signed by the members of the crab harvesting cooperative (if different from the articles of incorporation or partnership agreement of the crab harvesting cooperative).

Most of this information is not necessary for existing crab cooperatives, unless something in these documents changes. This information generally is only necessary for new crab harvesting cooperatives. NMFS recommends consideration of revising this regulation to require some or all of this documentation only for new cooperatives, or if changes occur for existing cooperatives. This would reduce the cost and time burden on the applicants, and possibly enable online submission of the application in some cases. Some documents also could be submitted as part of another information collection (e.g., submit the harvesting agreement as part of the cooperative's annual report) to allow online submission of the annual permit application.

5.3.2 Remove shoreside processor check in / check out reports

In 2018, NMFS recommended the Council review the requirement for Shoreside Processor Check-in/Check-out Reports ([§ 679.5\(h\)](#)). With implementation of eLandings and the evolution of inseason management, these reports are not used for management. These reports were used to identify which processors were operating when NMFS managed the fisheries based on weekly reports from processors. Now NMFS receives daily reports at the vessel level, which makes this report obsolete; therefore, these reports are rarely, if ever, used by inseason managers. NMFS has identified this reporting requirement for additional internal review to determine whether the requirement should be removed or revised. This regulation remains unchanged.

5.3.3 Modernize electronic logbook (eLogbook) regulations

Current regulations were written with technology requirements and processes that are two decades out of date and no longer relevant in modern eLogbook development. Modifications to these regulations for both groundfish and crab could help provide clarity and stimulate development and expansion of eLogbook applications. This could also reduce the number and complexity of related recordkeeping and reporting forms and reduce regulatory complexity.

5.3.4 Reduce regulatory burden on vessels that catch small amounts of groundfish

Some federal fisheries with management delegated to the State of Alaska may also be subject to additional federal regulations when they harvest federally-managed groundfish species, which may result in additional and unintended regulatory burden for participants. One example of this is frozen-at-sea trollers in the East Area salmon fishery that freeze groundfish bycatch in addition to their salmon. The operator of a vessel intending to retain groundfish in the GOA or BSAI, including groundfish bycatch, is required to be designated on a Federal fisheries permit (FFP), as specified at [§ 679.4\(b\)](#). Processing, as defined at [§ 679.2](#), includes the term “freezing.” While the Southeast Alaska salmon troll fleet is not subject to observer coverage requirements under the North Pacific Observer Program specified at 679 subpart E, the operator of a vessel designated or required to be designated on a Federal fisheries permit (FFP) under [§ 679.4\(b\)](#) is. The action of freezing a small amount of groundfish bycatch (rockfish) therefore classifies these vessels as a groundfish C/P that must either comply with full observer coverage requirements at [§ 679.51\(a\)\(2\)](#), or request to be placed in the partial coverage category under [§ 679.51\(a\)\(3\)](#). Because a groundfish C/P endorsement is required on their FFP to freeze groundfish, this means that the vessel is classified as a C/P for the purpose of observer coverage requirement as specified at [§ 679.51\(a\)\(2\)\(iv\)](#). There may also be additional record keeping and reporting requirements, such as daily production reports and landing reports, as specified throughout [§ 679.5](#).

If a C/P processes, on average, less than 79,000 pounds (35.8 mt) per week, they may annually request to be placed in the partial observer coverage sector. This request must be submitted by July 1 of the year prior to the fishing year in which they intend to participate in the partial observer coverage sector. NMFS sent a letter in May 2025 to notify the fleet of their options for the 2026 fishing year.

The annual opt-in could be streamlined to use available data to identify small C/Ps for placement in partial coverage, instead of requiring a form to be submitted each year. A de minimis exemption language for these vessels could simplify the reporting requirements and remove undue burden to these vessels, such as removing the requirement to complete a Daily Cumulative Production Log (DCPL) ([§ 679.5\(c\)\(3\)](#)), production reports ([§ 679.5\(e\)\(10\)](#)), or product transfer reports ([§ 679.5\(g\)](#)).

5.3.5 Daily cumulative production logbook (DCPL) adjustments

Remove logbook active/inactive periods

The trawl catcher processor logbooks are fully electronic and marking active/inactive periods is unnecessary. Regulations for vessels using electronic logbooks could be updated or streamlined.

Update the DCPL regulations.

There are two types of DCPLs: 1) Shoreside processor; and 2) Mothership. The shoreside processor DCPL has been replaced by eLandings and the regulations are no longer necessary so the regulations can be removed. The mothership DCPL is completed through eLandings but is still used for management and to provide the observers copies. The mothership DCPL regulations are necessary, but should be modernized to reflect current technology.

5.3.6 Remove requirements to print documents

This proposal includes targeted revisions to [50 CFR Part 679](#) to modernize how industry participants meet federal documentation requirements. Currently, several provisions require individuals to physically print and sign paper forms, such as logbooks, catch reports, and permit applications. These steps can be burdensome, especially in remote or at-sea operations, and increase costs without improving data quality or regulatory compliance.

This idea could explore ways to allow for the use of digital signatures and redefine "print" to include digital file formats, such as printing to PDF. Rather than maintaining hard copies, operators could retain and submit documentation electronically, reducing the need for physical storage and manual processing. These updates would not eliminate any recordkeeping or reporting requirements but would change the way those requirements are met, preserving compliance while reducing cost. The result is a more modern and flexible regulatory approach that aligns with industry technology, improves efficiency, and fulfills the EO directive to remove outdated regulatory barriers that hinder innovation and competitiveness in U.S. fisheries.

Catcher vessels in the trawl EM category are currently using eLogbooks. While not explicitly in regulation, allowing the use of eLogbooks was a joint decision between AKRO and OLE to resolve an issue for smaller vessels in the Western GOA that may not have space aboard for a printer. In this case, a PDF copy of the eLogbooks is considered to be "printing".

5.3.7 Scale and video streamlining

Remove Kodiak as a valid inspection location.

Historically, vessel operators infrequently request inspections in Kodiak, usually only once every few years. The Kodiak-based Catch Monitoring and Control Plan (CMCP) specialist previously conducted these inspections in Kodiak, but this position is currently vacant and there are no plans to fill this position at this time. To continue inspections in Kodiak, AKR staff will need to travel to Kodiak from Anchorage or Seattle. Removing Kodiak as a valid inspection location could reduce costs for NMFS and the industry, such as cost recovery expenses, and allow NMFS to allocate staff time to other projects. However, it would result in fewer inspection locations available to industry.

Allow shoreside processors and stationary floating processors (SFPs) to supply observer scales that have not been certified by the State of Alaska.

Observer scales are meant for the exclusive use of observers to weigh samples of catch. The observers test these scales daily to ensure the scales are accurate. If the scales are found to be inaccurate the observer notifies the processor who is then responsible to either replace or fix the scale. Because observers are testing the scales, the State of Alaska certification is unnecessary. Currently, if the scale fails the observer test, the processor must find another State of Alaska certified scale to replace it. However, the processor may not have another certified scale readily available at the plant which may leave the observer without a working scale and cause the plant to scramble to either fix or find another appropriate scale. Most plants do have extra platform scales available that have not been certified by the State of Alaska. By removing the State requirement, the processor would gain additional flexibility without losing accountability. This would not change how the State of Alaska currently certifies scales and is not meant to circumvent State scale requirements.

Remove requirements to track shoreside processors or SFP scales.

Observer scales are often replaced at the shoreside processors or SFPs during the season. Currently, CMCPs require that processors include the serial numbers of scales for observer use. Tracking these serial numbers and updating CMCPs is time consuming and provides no tangible benefit to the agency. These scales must still meet weighing requirements specified at [§ 679.28](#), and as long as scales utilized by the observer meet minimum weighing requirements and pass daily observer tests, the serial number is not pertinent.

Serial numbers for other scales used at shoreside processors and SFPs for catch weighing are also tracked in CMCPs and Crab Catch Monitoring Plans (CMPs). Tracking of these serial numbers is also time consuming and provides little benefit to the agency. These scales must meet the weighing requirements specified at [§ 679.28](#) and are currently subject to State of Alaska yearly certifications (although these proposed changes could still be implemented if the requirement to be certified by the State of Alaska were removed (as discussed above)). It may not be necessary to continue to track the serial numbers on these scales.

5.4 Remove unused regulations or consolidate similar regulations to improve clarity

This category of changes may not directly reduce regulatory burden or increase harvests, but it could remove unused regulations and improve the general readability and clarity of fishery regulations, which may make compliance easier for the industry. For example, removal of initial allocation regulations for catch share programs could significantly reduce the number of regulatory paragraphs in regulations at [50 CFR Parts 300, 679, and 680](#). These were important for the distribution of initial QS allocations, however upon completion of the allocation distribution and appeals processes these regulations are no longer used. Additionally, various regulations specify requirements that apply through a specific date. For those dates that have passed and the requirement is longer applicable, these regulations should be removed (*e.g.*, the portion of [§ 679.55\(f\)](#) that states: “The observer fee percentage is 1.25 percent through December 31, 2020.” This type of change would not modify the requirements that are currently applicable, but would remove unnecessary words from the regulations for clarity and readability.

5.4.1 Streamlining and consolidation opportunities

- ***Applications.*** A significant amount of the information requested across multiple applications is either similar or identical. Contents of the applications often include basic contact information along with valid evidence that would be used to determine eligibility. There is potential to streamline these applications into a single section, improving readability and streamlining the implementation of future programs that utilize an application process.
- ***Cost Recovery.*** Cost recovery regulations are found in different locations for each fishery. There is potential to consolidate these into a single section, improving readability and streamlining the implementation of future programs that include cost recovery. This would be a part of the Cost Recovery streaming project.

- ***eLandings***. This section contains duplicative language that could be removed. Each program has a section that lists fields that are automatically completed by eLandings, which could be consolidated. This revision would increase readability of this section.
- ***Initial Administrative Determinations (IADs)***. There are multiple instances where some or all of the IAD process is described in the 50 CFR part 679 and 680 regulations. There is potential to consolidate these into a single section, and cross reference the process outlined in the National Appeals Office Rules of Procedure at 15 CFR Part 906. Consistently referencing these regulations would improve readability, maintain consistency with the National Appeals Office regulations, and streamline the Alaska regulations.
- ***Incentive Plan Agreements (IPAs)***. There is considerable overlap in the language used in IPAs. There is potential to consolidate these regulations into a single section, improving readability and streamlining the implementation of IPAs in the future.

5.5 Housekeeping improvements

NMFS has identified numerous minor regulations that may be obsolete, inconsistent, or in error. These include:

- ***Remove other Rockfish Program CMCP specialist regulations***. The Rockfish Program CMCP specialist notification for Rockfish Program landings is no longer necessary. This position in Kodiak, AK is vacant and there are currently no plans to backfill.
- ***Remove regulations on calculating the Rockfish Program groundfish sideboard limits***. A final rule that implemented Amendment 111 to the GOA Groundfish FMP ([86 FR 11895](#), March 1, 2021) removed Western GOA rockfish sideboard limits for Rockfish Program CPs from regulation. As such, the regulations on the calculation of Rockfish Program groundfish sideboard limits are no longer necessary. This change could also be considered in conjunction with a broader discussion of changes to sideboard limits (discussed below under **Potential Changes to Catch Share Programs-Revisit Sideboards**).
- ***Remove the prohibition on hook-and-line gear in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery***. This regulation is in error, as C/Ps in the BSAI are permitted to use hook-and-line gear to harvest Pacific cod.
- ***Remove regulatory references to non-specified species***. Regulations at [50 CFR Part 679](#) reference non-specified species, which is a category FMP species that are no longer included in the groundfish FMPs. All references could be removed for consistency with the groundfish FMP species categories. Such changes would not impact the current harvest specifications process.
- ***Remove the Shortraker / Rougheye species group***. This regulation describes the allocation between vessels using trawl gear and vessels using non-trawl gear for Shortraker rockfish and Rougheye rockfish, which has not existed since 2004. These

species have been consistently closed to directed fishing at the start of the fishing year such that gear allocations in regulations may no longer be necessary.

- ***Remove weekly production reports.*** Regulations at [§ 679.5\(i\)](#) state that these reports are removed from use and indicate that eLandings should be utilized instead.
- ***Remove the specific time of openings and closings for groundfish fisheries.*** Regulations at [§ 679.23\(b\)](#) that currently specify the time of all openings and closures could be removed to allow inseason managers to close fisheries at any time of day, which would enable more precise limitation of harvest. This would reduce the probability of greatly exceeding or falling short of the TAC. This could also create more flexibility and reduce regulatory changes needed if the time of openings and closings of non-groundfish fisheries (e.g., halibut) were changed. In addition, changes could be considered in conjunction with the Council’s request at the April 2025 meeting for NMFS to review and revise the regulations governing the time of day of openings and closures for directed fishing for sablefish using fixed gear to allow NMFS to annually set the opening and closing time in alignment with the fishing period set for the halibut commercial fishery.
- ***Remove BSAI trawl full coverage request.*** Regulations at [§ 679.51\(a\)\(4\)](#) specify the process for a BSAI trawl catcher vessel to request placement in the full observer coverage category for one year. This was implemented in 2016 to relieve vessel owners who request full observer coverage of the reporting requirements and observer fee liability associated with the partial observer coverage category ([81 FR 67113](#), September 30, 2016). Since fishing began under the PCTC Program in 2024 ([88 FR 53704](#), August 8, 2023), all trawl catcher vessels harvesting Pacific cod in the BSAI A and B seasons are in the full coverage category by regulation so this option may no longer be necessary. No vessels opted into the full coverage category for C season Pacific cod for 2025. Notifications provided to the fleet regarding this request were confused with the annual trawl EM category request.
- ***Modernize and streamline language related to the Observer Program.*** These changes would include improving clarity by removing references to obsolete communication methods and requirements within [§§ 679.52](#) and [679.102](#).
- ***Clarify Observer Declare and Deploy System (ODDS) requirements.*** Revise regulations at [§ 679.51\(a\)\(1\)\(ii\)](#) to clarify that vessels must contact the Observer Program to register for ODDS.
- ***Update references to the NMFS Alaska Region website.*** References throughout [50 CFR Part 679](#) would be updated to state “NMFS Alaska Region website” and change instances of “web site” to “website” for consistency.

6 Additional Ideas for Consideration

NMFS has identified the following potential ideas that could be responsive to [EO 14276](#) to reduce burdens on domestic fishing and to increase seafood production. The Alaska Region's eight complex catch share programs were developed over time, starting with the implementation of the Halibut and Sablefish IFQ Program in 1994. Each program was developed to achieve the MSA requirements for LAPPs and the unique goals the Council identified for the fishery under the individual program. Overtime, with experience managing and fishing under these programs, and as fishery conditions have changed, ideas have been raised to modify LAPP programs in ways that may improve efficiency.

All of the ideas presented below are provided for discussion purposes and are not NMFS recommendations. NMFS recognizes these issues are complex, and changes would be time and resource intensive, and potentially controversial. If the Council is interested, further development of these ideas would continue through the normal Council process (*e.g.*, discussion paper and/or initial review draft analysis, followed by Council final action) before making a recommendation to NMFS for approval, rulemaking, and implementation, consistent with the MSA and other applicable law.

6.1 Modify the framework for LAPP use caps

In the development of LAPP programs, the Council has established varying use caps to help limit consolidation and ensure opportunities remain available for a broad range of harvesters and processors. However, as LAPPs have matured, market conditions and other factors have changed significantly from what they were when the program was recommended. In some cases, the scale of the fishery has changed substantially since implementation of the use caps and revisions to use caps have been implemented after the use caps have become constraining. As a result, some of the use caps may not be achieving their originally intended objectives, or are having unintended consequences of constraining fisheries for remaining participants while there is limited interest from prospective participants.

Excessive shares must be defined for LAPPs as required under MSA. However, Councils have the flexibility to develop the use limits to prevent accumulation of excessive shares for the LAPPs in their regions. Typically, use caps are expressed as a limit based on a percentage of a total allocation amount, however an alternate approach could be to establish a use cap framework that specifies a minimum use limit expressed as an amount of harvest or a percentage, whichever is higher. This could allow for a more flexible application of use caps to accommodate harvest in low abundance years (the use cap would be a specific amount of pounds for each fishery) or, at higher abundance, the cap would be calculated as a percentage of the annual allocation as caps are currently specified. The Council could consider establishing a minimum value for all LAPPs, or specific LAPPs as appropriate.

6.2 Revisit sideboards

As part of the development of LAPPs, the Council recommended sideboards to limit the ability of vessels that secured allocations to expand participation into other fisheries as a result of their increased flexibility. Sideboards have been effective in accomplishing that goal. However, sideboards have also resulted in significant regulatory complexity, and due to changing market

conditions and other factors, they may result in unharvested TAC in specific circumstances. Some sideboards the Council may want to revisit include the Rockfish Program and CR Program sideboards.

6.3 Streamline processes for unharvested CR Program stocks

Two CR Program stocks have not had open fisheries since the inception of the CR Program in 2005: Pribilof Island red and blue king crab and the Western Aleutian Islands red king crab. Due to consistently unfavorable environmental conditions, fisheries for these stocks are not expected to occur for the foreseeable future. The Council could consider how to minimize the amount of process time and resources dedicated to these stocks such as, submission of an annual crab IFQ and IPQ applications for crab QS and maintenance of participation and QS records for these fisheries. Annual applications are required prior to any TAC announcements and determinations if the fishery will open for a given season. By removing these two stocks from the CR Program this would reduce the annual crab QS application and issuance requirements for fisheries that have not opened since the inception of the CR Program while still meeting their obligations under the MSA to prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks.

6.4 Remove CMP requirement for Registered Crab Receiver (RCR) holders

CMPs are currently required for all RCR holders under [§ 680.23\(g\)](#) before they can accept IFQ or CDQ crab deliveries. RCR holders must submit a CMP to NMFS each year in order to process crab. CMPs contain processor operational plans for how crab will be offloaded, sorted and weighed. They also include details such as scale serial numbers and location of stored test weights. CMPs can be an additional burden for processors and can be a difficult hurdle to overcome if a vessel would like to be a catcher seller for B or C shares instead of delivering to a processing plant. The sablefish and halibut IFQ Program does not require any kind of CMP, and it may be worth considering whether they are needed (or could be simplified) for crabs. The State and NMFS would still require that all scales used to weigh crab be certified by the State of Alaska to ensure accurate weighing. Scales used by a shoreside processor to weigh catch for the purposes of commerce are required to be certified by the State of Alaska as specified at [§ 679.28\(c\)](#) and [Alaska Statute 45.75](#). It should be noted that scales used to weigh catch for the purposes of commerce are distinct from the scales utilized by shoreside fisheries observers. In addition, NMFS could retain regulations requiring a record of weights for each load to be retained for inspection. The sorting, weighing, and reporting of all crab species in an offload would still be required by both NMFS and the State of Alaska in the absence of CMPs.

6.5 Streamline the BSAI Pacific Cod reallocation process

Current regulations for the BSAI result in an extremely complicated reallocation structure for Pacific cod that can be hard to interpret. Attempting to simplify this or generally adopting a reallocation approach more similar to the GOA could provide more flexibility to allow for optimum harvest. Under the current BSAI reallocation approach, NMFS needs to determine sectors' potential ability to harvest Pacific cod in a specific order. With some sectors, it is harder to predict potential effort or ability to harvest and this sometimes leaves Pacific cod that could be harvested by the catcher processor sectors if the reallocation is implemented with enough time to plan operations. While the current approach can result in additional flexibility and protections for some sectors, it has resulted in situations where Pacific cod is not harvested.

6.6 Provide additional flexibility for allocations that commonly go unused

Catch share programs and other allocative regulations sometimes result in allocations that are not used each year, either due to TACs too small to manage for a directed fishery to open or a lack of participation. Providing additional flexibility to reallocate to gear groups or sectors that would be able to harvest the fish, or combining sectors, could help increase seafood production. Potential examples of this include:

- Atka mackerel jig
- Rockfish Program entry level longline
- BSAI Pacific cod greater than or equal to 60 ft length overall hook and line catcher vessels

6.7 Increase usability of Aleutian Islands allocations

The Council has established several fishery management provisions intended to create or improve opportunities for harvesters and processors in the AI. These include establishing AI pollock quota for the Aleut Corporation ([§ 679.4\(m\)](#)), AI set-aside of Pacific cod in the PCTC program ([§ 679.132\(b\)](#)), golden king crab Adak community allocation ([§ 680.40\(a\)\(1\)](#)), and establishment of Adak as an eligible crab community under the CR Program and an eligible community ([§ 680.2 “Eligible crab community \(ECC\)”](#)) to hold halibut or sablefish IFQ ([Table 21 to part 679](#)). These provisions are intended to promote economic activity in AI communities, particularly when a shoreplant is operational. Unfortunately, an AI shoreplant has not been operational since 2019 and there is uncertainty about when one may operate again. Therefore, the Council may want to consider increasing flexibility for AI communities and vessels operating in the AI to improve utilization under a broader range of conditions. There could be several potential approaches including but not limited to the following:

- Apply exceptions that were historically specific to Adak to all communities in the Aleutian Islands or to all companies fishing in the AI.
- Provide NMFS inseason management authority to quickly reallocate in the event the AI shoreplant is not open or becomes inoperable mid-season.
- Consider allowing additional flexibility to promote development of processing capacity such as reducing restrictions on the use of SFPs or at-sea processors in the AI.
- Consider developing a regulatory framework that would allow for additional flexibility to harvest allocations or set-asides if a shoreplant is not operating. One possible way to do this would be to include a time-based exception and provisions that would specify who the allocation would be made available to after a specific period of non-use (*e.g.*, 3, 4, or 5 years) or potential changes to transfer provisions to allow more leasing of quota held by entities in the AI. The Council could review each provision that establishes AI community allocations and develop appropriate solutions to increase utilization.
- Remove or increase use caps specific to AI communities considering the consolidation of the communities' fishing resources. For example, in April 2025, the Council recommended revisions to the halibut IFQ vessel use cap such that harvest of halibut IFQ derived from QS held by a CQE in Area 4B (Aleutian Islands west of 172°00'00" W. long. and south of 56°20'00" N. lat.) does not accrue towards the vessel use cap specified

at [§ 679.42\(h\)\(1\)](#). The Council could review other applicable use caps and consider revisions or removing them to incentivize processing activity in the AI.

6.8 Remove stationary floating processor single geographic restriction requirements and clarify mothership definition

The regulation at [50 CFR Part 679](#) limiting SFPs to a single geographic location per fishing year in the GOA was originally adopted to prevent processors from “chasing the fleet.” This helped ensure fair competition with shore-based processors, particularly in communities like Kodiak, where processing activity supports local economies, employment, and infrastructure.

However, fishery infrastructure in Alaska has changed and shoreside processors in some communities no longer operate, operate at reduced levels, or have unpredictable availability. Relaxing the single geographic location restriction could improve access for vessels, create new competition for landings, and increase the likelihood that full harvest allocations are realized. It also provides needed flexibility for processors to adapt to shifting fish distributions and changing conditions in remote regions.

To ensure this modernization does not undermine communities with active processors, a buffer approach that prohibits SFP relocation into designated processor-dependent areas such as the Central GOA could be implemented. This approach would allow flexibility in underserved regions while preserving protections for established processing hubs. Additional safeguards could include limiting the number of relocations per season (for example, currently SFPs taking AFA pollock deliveries can only move locations up to four times per fishing year ([§ 679.7\(k\)\(3\)\(iv\)\(B\)](#))), capping processing volume in secondary areas, or requiring pre-approval of movement plans based on local capacity.

Regulations could also be clarified on the distinction between SFPs and motherships. Under current definitions, these terms can be ambiguous and there are different monitoring requirements depending on how a vessel is permitted. A more accurate definition of mothership activity could specify that they receive unsorted codends directly from trawl catcher vessels. SFPs operate more like anchored, non-mobile processing platforms that process previously sorted deliveries and operate in Alaska State waters. Clarifying this distinction in regulation would help ensure that policy intent is aligned with actual operating behavior and that monitoring and permitting reflect data needs.

6.9 Raise the partial coverage length overall (LOA)

Regulations at [§§ 679.51\(a\)\(1\)](#) and [\(2\)](#) could be revised to state that a catcher vessel over 55.5 ft LOA harvesting groundfish CDQ would require full observer coverage. In four of the past eight years, one or more vessels greater than 46 ft LOA have participated in the CDQ halibut fishery and, on specific trips, they have caught more Pacific cod than halibut and therefore met the definition of groundfish fishing and were in the full coverage category. The issue is that vessels did not know ahead of time that they were going to catch more Pacific cod than halibut and therefore logged trips in ODDS as if the trip were partial coverage. This topic is discussed further in Appendix C of the 2024 Observer Annual Report.

6.10 Process Improvements

6.10.1 Clarify when MSA 305(d) rulemaking authority is appropriate

The Council could revise their FMPs to clarify or expand the types of rulemaking actions that the Council would prefer NMFS to implement under MSA 305(d) rulemaking authority, thereby streamlining the process for future changes and foregoing the need for the Council to develop formal recommendations to the Secretary.

Sections 3.9.1 and 3.9.2 of the BSAI and GOA FMPs outline specific recordkeeping and reporting and monitoring requirements that the Secretary may develop, in consultation with the Council. Section 3.9.1.1 states that processors shall submit reports as implemented in regulations. Presumably, if revisions were needed to processor reporting requirements, NMFS could develop those revised requirements, in consultation with the Council and then implement them under MSA 305(d) rulemaking authority. In contrast, Section 3.9.1.2 lists out four specific reports that must be submitted by at-sea processor vessels. To remove or modify these reports, the FMP must be amended through the Council process. The Council may wish to consider if there are additional types of requirements (*e.g.*, at-sea processor reporting requirements) that should be specified through a simpler process. For example, the Council recently initiated an action to revise monitoring requirements to allow at-sea scales to be used to weigh sablefish onboard hook-and-line and pot catcher/processors.

6.10.2 Catch share program reviews

Since 2018, the Council has completed four allocation reviews and two LAPP Program reviews with three more in progress. The analytical burden of conducting comprehensive reviews every 7 years is great. NOAA Procedure 01-121-01 provides guidance for conducting LAPP reviews and provides guidance on the general approach, scope of review, and use of standardized approaches. However, many decisions about the exact process for conducting reviews are left up to each Council. There may be ways to streamline these reviews to reduce the amount of staff time and Council time necessary to move through the process. Because of the number of LAPP Program reviews, the Council could consider combining the review of interdependent programs (*e.g.* AFA and PCTC Program reviews could be conducted jointly).

Additionally, NMFS Policy 01-119 specifies the fishery allocation review policy⁸ and NMFS Procedure 01-119-02⁹ provides recommended practices and factors to consider when reviewing and making allocation decisions. The Council has identified five allocations for which reviews should be conducted at least once every 10 years, or if a trigger is met. Alternatively, rather than conducting these allocation reviews as separate stand-alone documents, these reviews could be incorporated into ongoing analytical work when changes to these allocations or programs are considered.

⁸ <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-119.pdf>

⁹ <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-119-02.pdf>.

6.10.3 Charter halibut management measures timing

In December 2023, the Council asked for expanded information about potential options to streamline the process for recommending charter halibut management measures each year. The current process timeline generates a bottleneck for affected stakeholders and decision-makers in December each year, providing ADF&G staff only a brief window to finalize the analysis, and subsequently a short opportunity for Charter Halibut Management Committee members to discuss management measures with other stakeholders prior to providing recommendations to the Advisory Panel and Council. Adjusting the schedule could provide additional opportunities for stakeholder involvement and possibly provide charter halibut businesses with more time to efficiently plan their businesses if they know the regulations sooner.

7 Implemented Deregulatory Revisions Resulting from Past Recommendations

For reference, previous recommendations for deregulatory actions that were recommended and implemented in response to EO 13921 are included here. It should be noted that there are differences between the types of reforms called for in EO 13921 compared to EO 14276 and EO 14192.

7.1 American Fisheries Act

Remove the requirements for the AFA inshore cooperative weekly catch report at § 679.5(o).
In 2018, in conducting a PRA review for the information collected from AFA entities, NMFS identified that the AFA inshore cooperative weekly catch report (§ 679.5(o)) was no longer necessary. NMFS recommended adding the proposal to remove the requirement for the AFA inshore cooperative weekly catch report to the rulemaking to close directed fishing for AFA and CR Program sideboard limits that are not large enough to support a directed fishery (“small sideboards”). This change was implemented in 2019 ([84 FR 2723](#), February 8, 2019).

Revise regulations to allow online submission.

In 2018, NMFS identified regulations that could be revised to allow two AFA information collections to be submitted online, thus reducing the cost and time burden for respondents. The regulations have not been modified; however, NMFS now allows submission of the application for inshore cooperative fishing permit via email according to the application instructions. AFA applications and forms are available at: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/american-fisheries-act-pollock-applications-and-forms>.

7.2 Halibut and Sablefish IFQ Program

In 2018, NMFS recommended removing unnecessary data fields in the Application for Medical Transfer of IFQ. NMFS identified data fields that are no longer needed for NMFS to determine eligibility and make the transfer. Removing these regulations helped streamline the IFQ Program regulations as a whole. NMFS removed the following fields from the application, which decreased the public’s cost and time burden to complete this application:

- Removed the fields for the number of units, the range of serial numbers, and the notary public under §§ 679.42(d)(2)(iii)(C) and (H).
- Removed the transferor's and transferee's social security number or tax ID number under §§ 679.42(d)(2)(iii)(A) and (B).

7.3 Rockfish Program

In 2018, NMFS recommended the removal of unnecessary documentation for the Application for Rockfish Cooperative Fishing Quota specified at § 679.81(f)(4) and additional regulations were identified for review. The Council considered NMFS recommendations in the ongoing action to reauthorize the Rockfish Program. The Council recommended reauthorizing the Rockfish Program in January 2020, and NMFS implemented recommended changes in a final rule to implement Amendment 111 to the GOA FMP ([86 FR 11895](#), March 1, 2021).

7.4 Vessel Monitoring Systems

During the review conducted for the 2017 renewal of authority to continue to collect data through Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS), NMFS identified that the VMS check-in form (a faxed VMS registration form), required in [§ 679.28\(f\)\(4\)\(ii\)](#), was no longer necessary. This requirement and the VMS check-in form were removed in the final rule to implement BSAI Amendment 118 to authorize the retention of halibut in pot gear in the BSAI ([85 FR 840](#), January 8, 2020).

7.5 Revisions to Economic Data Reports (2018 recommendation)

In 2018, NMFS identified the GOA Trawl catcher vessel EDR and the Bering Sea Chinook Salmon EDR for review. From April 2018 through February 2022, the Council conducted a comprehensive review of its EDR programs including a range of options to remove or revise each EDR. The Council recommended the removal of the GOA Trawl EDR and revision of the crab and groundfish EDR to remove burdensome requirements related to third party data verification and data aggregation processes. NMFS implemented these revisions in the final rule to implement Amendment 52 to the Crab FMP ([88 FR 7586](#), February 6, 2023). (In April 2025, NMFS presented the 2024 consolidated cost recovery report. In response to this report, the Council initiated an analysis to consider removing all EDR requirements for LAPPs, which is discussed in Section 3.1.4.)

7.6 Recordkeeping and Reporting, General

In 2018, NMFS recommended review and removal of notary requirements on transfer applications. In 2021, NMFS removed notary requirements to obtain and submit a notary certification on various programs' application forms ([86 FR 70751](#), December 13, 2021). This rule modifies regulations applicable to the halibut and sablefish IFQ Program, Charter Halibut Limited Access Program (CHLAP), CQE Program, License Limitation Program (LLP), and the CR Program.

The notary certification was removed from the following application forms:

IFQ Program

- Application for Eligibility to Receive QS/IFQ;
- Application for Transfer of QS;
- Application for Temporary Transfer of Halibut/Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) (this includes: Category A IFQ transfer, surviving beneficiary, Temporary military transfer, and IFQ transfer to CDQ groups during year of low halibut abundance);
- Application for a Non-profit Corporation to be Designated as a Recreational Quota Entity (RQE); and
- Application For Transfer Of Quota Share To Or From A Recreational Quota Entity (RQE).

CQE Program

- Application for a Non-profit Corporation to be Designated as a Community Quota Entity (CQE); and
- Application for Transfer of Quota Share to or From A Community Quota Entity (CQE).

CHLAP - Application For Transfer Of Charter Halibut Permit (CHP).

LLP - Application For Transfer License Limitation Program Groundfish/Crab License.

CR Program

- Application for Transfer of Crab Quota Share (QS);
- Application for Transfer of Crab Processor Quota Share (PQS);
- Application to Become An Eligible Crab Community Organization (ECCO);
- Application for Transfer of Crab QS/IFQ to or from an Eligible Crab Community Organization (ECCO); and
- Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) CR Program Quota Share (QS) Beneficiary Designation Form.

Notary requirements remain, but may be removed, in regulations regarding the application for initial QS regulations:

- § 680.40(d)(4)(ii) - As documentation of ownership interest for the purpose of determining qualification for initial allocation of PQS.
- § 680.41(h)(3) - As part of a paper application for transfer of crab QS or PQS.
- § 679.4(l)(6)(ii)(G) - Application for an AFA inshore cooperative fishing permit.
- § 679.40(a)(3)(iii) and (iv) - As official documentation of vessel lease or ownership interest to qualify for an initial allocation QS under the IFQ Program.

In 2018, NMFS recommended increasing online and electronic means of submitting information. Regulatory requirements sometimes limit the electronic submission of the documents, especially in cases where confidential or business identifying information or personally identifiable information is required on the application form. Other regulatory requirements specify the means of submittal or specify documents or information that must be submitted that prevent submittal online. NMFS AKR is working toward offering more online services, and, as this happens, some regulatory requirements could be removed or revised.

Table 2 Status of review of collection of information requirements authorized under the Council's Fishery Management Programs. An * in the next review column indicates we are starting the review process in 2025 to get ahead of the scheduled workload in 2026.

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
0648-0206	Alaska Region Permit Family of Forms (FFP, FPP, EFP)	Federal Fisheries Permits Federal Processing Permits Exempted Fishing permits	§§ 679.4, 600.745(b), 679.6	2024	Ongoing
0648-0213	Alaska Region Logbook and Activity Family of Forms	Three Paper Logbooks Check -in/out reports Product Transfer Report Vessel Activity Report	§ 679.5	2024	2027
0648-0269	Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) Program	Use of non-CDQ Harvest Regulations Groundfish/Halibut CDQ and PSC Transfer CDQ Vessel Registration	679 Subpart C	2024	2026*
0648-0272	Alaska Pacific Halibut & Sablefish Fisheries: Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ)	Application for: - Eligibility to Receive Quota Share (QS) /IFQ -QS Holder: Identification of Ownership Interest -IFQ/CDQ Hired Master Permit -IFQ/CDQ Registered Buyer (RB) Permit -Transfer of QS -Temporary Transfer of Halibut/Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) -Transfer of QS/IFQ by Self Sweep-up -Medical Transfer of IFQ -Replacement of Certificates, Permits, or Licenses Annual Report for CDQ IFQ Transfers QS/IFQ Beneficiary Designation Form Appeals	679 Subpart D and § 679.5(e)	2024	Ongoing

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		IFQ Administrative Waiver Prior Notice of Landing IFQ Departure Report Transshipment Authorization Dockside Sales Receipt Application for a Non-profit Corporation to be Designated as a Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) Application for Transfer of Quota Share To or From a Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) Recreational Quota Entity Annual Report NMFS Alaska Region eFISH On-line Services User Authorization Form			
0648-0316	Alaska Prohibited Species Donation Program	Application to become a NMFS Authorized distributor	§ 679.26(b)	2024	2027
0648-0318	North Pacific Observer Program	Observer notification Industry request for assistance in improving observer data quality issues ATLAS communications and observer data entry Pre-cruise meeting notification Catcher/processor request to be placed in partial observer coverage Request to be placed in the full observer coverage category Request to be placed in or removed from electronic monitoring Observer Declare and Deploy System (ODDS) log a fishing trip Deck safety plan—initial year Deck safety plan—annual renewal Deck sorting safety meeting	679 Subpart E and 15 CFR 906	2023	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		Vessel Monitoring Plan Closing electronic monitoring trips in ODDS Submit electronic monitoring data to NMFS Landing notice for electronic monitoring pollock trawl offloads Trawl electronic monitoring incentive plan agreement (TEM IPA) TEM IPA annual report Observer provider permit application Candidate college transcripts Observer training registration Observer briefing registration Projected observer assignments Physical examination verification Observer deployment/logistics report Observer debriefing registration Certificates of insurance Observer provider contracts Other reports Update to provider information Observer provider invoices EM Hardware Service Provider Permit Administrative Appeals			
0648-0330	Alaska Region Scale & Catch Weighing Requirements	Scale Type Evaluation At-Sea Scales (maintenance) Video Monitoring System (installation) Video Monitoring System (maintenance) Observer Sampling Station (installation) Observer Sampling Station (maintenance)	§§ 679.28, 680.23, 679.100, and 679.63	2023	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		Inspection Request Form (Observer Sampling Station, Video, Bin Monitoring and At-Sea Scales) Observer Notification Record of Daily Flow Scale Tests Record of Daily Hopper Scale Tests Catch & Cumulative Weight Audit Trail Calibration Log Fault Log Catch Weight Audit Trail Video Monitoring Data Submission Notification of Pacific Cod Monitoring Option Annual Submission CMCP Addendum Printed Record from Scale Notify Observer Annual Submission CMP Addendum Printed Record from Scale			
0648-0334	Alaska License Limitation Program for Groundfish, Crab, and Scallops	Application for the transfer of groundfish and crab LLP licenses Application for the transfer of scallop LLP licenses Transfer appeal	§ 679.4 and 15 CFR 906	2023	2026*
0648-0353	Alaska Region Gear Identification Requirements	Groundfish Hook-and-line Marker Buoys Longline Pot Gear Marker Buoys	§ 679.24	2025	2028
0648-0393	Alaska American	Application for:	§§ 679.4, 679.62(c)	2023	2026*

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
	Fisheries Act: Permits	-Rebuilt, Replaced, or Removed Vessel Application -American Fisheries Act Inshore Cooperative Permit -Inshore Vessel Contract Fishing Notification American Fisheries Act -Approval as an Entity to Receive Transferable Chinook Salmon PSC Allocation -Application for Transfer of Bering Sea Chinook Salmon PSC Allocations	and 679.21(f)		
0648-0401	Alaska American Fisheries Act: Reports	AFA Cooperative Contract Bering Sea Pollock Fishery Incentive Plan Agreement (IPA) Administrative appeals to disapproved IPA Bering Sea Pollock Fishery IPA Annual Report	§§ 679.61 and 679.21(f)	2024	2027*
0648-0428	Commercial Operator's Annual Report (COAR)	Commercial Operator's Annual Report	§ 679.5(p)	2024	2027
0648-0445	NMFS Alaska Region Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Program	VMS installation of new units VMS installation of replacement units VMS maintenance VMS failure troubleshooting	§ 679.28(f)	2023	2027
0648-0512	Alaska Pacific Halibut Fisheries: Subsistence	Subsistence Halibut Application for: -Subsistence Halibut Registration Certificate (SHARC) Rural Resident -SHARC Alaska Native Tribal Member -SHARC Alaska Native Tribe -Special Permits Ceremonial or Educational Permit Harvest (CPEP) Log Subsistence Halibut Community Harvest Permit (CHP) Log Subsistence Appeals	§300.65	2024	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		Subsistence Gear Marking			
0648-0513	Aleutian Islands Pollock Fishery	Annual Aleutian Islands Pollock Fishery Participant Letter	§ 679.4(m)	2025	2028
0648-0514	Alaska Region Crab Permits	<p>Application for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Annual Crab Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) permit -Annual Crab Individual Processing Quota (IPQ) Permit -Annual Crab Harvesting Cooperative IFQ Permit -Registered Crab Receiver (RCR) Permit -BSAI Crab Hired Master (Skipper) Permit -Federal Crab Vessel Permit (FCVP) -Become An Eligible Crab Community Organization (ECCO) -CR Program Eligibility To Receive QS/PQS OR IFQ/IPQ By Transfer -Transfer (Lease) Of Crab IFQ -Transfer of Crab QS/IFQ to or from an Eligible Crab Community Organization (ECCO) -Transfer of Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) between Crab Harvesting Cooperatives -Transfer (Lease) of Crab IPQ -Transfer of Crab Quota Share (QS) -Converted CPO Quota Share (QS) and CPO IFQ -Annual Exemption from Western Aleutian Islands Golden King Crab West Region Delivery Requirements -Exemption from CR Crab North or South Region Delivery Requirements -Transfer Of Crab Processor Quota Share (PQS) Annual North or South Regional Delivery Exemption Report 	§§ 680.4 and 680 Subpart C	2024	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		CDQ Group Notification of Community Representative Community Impact Report or IPQ Holder Report (Response Report) BSAI Crab Rationalization Program Quota Share (QS) Beneficiary Designation Form ECCO annual report Appeal of denial of any application			
0648-0515	Alaska Interagency Electronic Reporting System (elandings and other elements)	eLandings Registration Shoreside Processors Landing Report (LR) (non IFQ) Registered Buyer LR IFQ/CDQ and Manual LR (paper back up) Registered Crab Receiver (RCR) LR for IFQ/CDQ and Manual LR (paper backup) Out-of-State LR Mothership LR Catcher/Processor LR Tender LR Shoreside Processor PR At-Sea PR Catcher Vessel eLogbook Catcher/Processor eLogbook Mothership eLogbook	§§ 679.5(c), (e), and (f)	2025	2028
0648-0516	Alaska Crab Arbitration	Annual Arbitration Organization Report Market Report Non-binding Price Formula Report Contract Arbitrator Report Cost Allocation Agreement	§ 680.20	2024	2027
0648-0518	Alaska Region Bering Sea and Aleutian	Annual Catcher Vessel Crab EDR Annual Catcher/Processor Crab EDR	§ 680.6	2023	2026*

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
	Islands Crab Economic Data Reports (EDRs)	Annual Processor Crab EDR			
0648-0545	Central Gulf of Alaska Rockfish Program: Permits and Reports	Application for Rockfish Cooperative Fishing Quota (CQ) Rockfish Program Vessel Check-In/Check-Out Report Vessel Check-in/Check-out Report with Termination of Fishing Declaration	§§ 679.81 and 679.5	2024	2027
0648-0564	Groundfish Trawl Catcher/Processor Economic Data Report (EDR)	Annual GOA Trawl Catcher/Processor EDR	§ 679.94	2023	2026*
0648-0565	Alaska Region Amendment 80 Program	Application for: -Amendment 80 Quota Share -Amendment 80 Limited Access Fishery Permit -Cooperative Quota Permit -Transfer A80 Quota Share -Inter-Cooperative Transfer of A80 CQ -Flatfish Exchange -A80 Vessel Replacement Appeals	§§ 679.4 and 679.91	2023	2026*
0648-0575	Alaska Pacific Halibut Fisheries: Charter	Application for: -Annual Registration of Charter Halibut Permit (CHP) -Transfer of Charter Halibut Permit (CHP) -Military Charter Halibut Permit -Transfer (Lease) Between Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) and Guided Angler Fish (GAF) and issuance of GAF permit Electronic and manual GAF landing report GAF permit log	§§ 300.65 and 300.67	2024	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		Administrative Appeals ADF&G Saltwater Sport Fishing Charter Trip Logbook			
0648-0633	Alaska Chinook Salmon Economic Data Report (EDR)	Compensated Transfer Report (CTR) Vessel Fuel Survey Vessel Master Survey	§ 679.65	2023	2026*
0648-0665	Alaska Community Quota Entity (CQE) Program	Application for: -Nonprofit Corporation to be Designated as a CQE -Transfer of Quota Share to or from a CQE -CQE to Transfer IFQ to an Eligible Community Resident or Non-resident -Transfer (Lease) Between IFQ and Guided Angler Fish by a CQE -CQE to Receive a Non-trawl Groundfish LLP License CQE License Limitation Program Authorization letter -Application for Community Charter Halibut Permit CQE Annual Report	§§ 679.4, 679.5, 679.41, 300.65, and 300.67	2023	2026*
0648-0678	North Pacific Fishery Management Council Cooperative Annual Reports	Alaska Crab Rationalization Program Cooperative Annual Report Annual Rockfish Cooperative Report Annual Amendment 80 Cooperative Report Amendment 80 Halibut Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) Management Plan Amendment 80 Halibut Bycatch Avoidance Progress Report American Fisheries Act Annual Catcher Vessel Intercooperative Report American Fisheries Act Cooperative Annual Report Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Annual Report	§§ 679.5(s), 679.61(f), and 679.131(j)	2024	2026*
0648-0711	Alaska Cost Recovery and Fee Programs	Observer Coverage Fee Payment Full Coverage Trawl Electronic Monitoring Fee Payment	§§ 679.5, 679.33, 679.45, 679.55,	2024	2027

OMB Control No.	Name of Information Collection	Form name or information collected	Regulation cite	Last review	Next review
		Cost Recovery Fee Payments IFQ Permit Holder Fee Calculation Form Registered Crab Receiver Fee Calculation Form Volume and Value Reports Appeals	679.56 , 679.66 , 679.67 , 679.85 , 679.95 , 679.135 , 680.5 , and 680.44		
0648-0811	Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program (PCTC)	Application for: -Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program Quota Share -Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program Cooperative Quota -Inter-Cooperative Transfer of Cooperative Quota (CQ) -Transfer of Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program Quota Share for Processors Notification of Intent to Process PCTC Program Pacific Cod Ninety-Day Transfer Window for Non-Exempt AFA LLP holders Appeals	679 Subpart L and 15 CFR 906	2023	2026*
0648-0818	Cook Inlet EEZ Commercial Salmon Fishery	Application For Salmon Federal Fisheries Permit Application For Salmon Federal Processor Permit Application For Registered Salmon Receiver Permit Salmon eLandings Processor Registration Salmon Receiver Landing Report Catcher Vessel Daily Fishing Logsheet Salmon Gillnet Gear Salmon Drift Gillnet Marker Buoys	679 Subpart J	2024	2027