

**ADVISORY PANEL
Motions and Rationale
June 2-5, 2025 - Newport, OR**

D3-BSAI Pacific cod pot gear limited access privilege program (LAPP) – Discussion Paper

AP Motion 1

The AP appreciates the responsiveness of the Discussion Paper to the June 2024 Council request. With the acknowledgement of NPFMC staffing and budgetary issues, as well as, EO 14276 and EO 14192, the AP recommends the Council continue to prioritize development of a LAPP program for the $\geq 60'$ Bering Sea and Aleutian Island Catcher Vessel and Catcher Processor sector pot cod fishery vessels and shoreside processors.

Main Motion passed 19-0

Rationale in Support of Main Motion

- *The AP appreciates the additional information and clarifications provided in the discussion paper. It was noted that there were no significant issues or roadblocks were identified that would prevent the development of a LAPP for this sector.*
- *The AP noted that they had previously provided a motion to the Council in June 2024 to move the BSAI Pot Cod LAPP to Initial Review with a Purpose and Need and full range of alternatives. By passing this simple motion to the Council at this meeting, it's the AP's intent to signal to the Council that this LAPP should be given priority in moving forward using the June 2024 P&N and alternatives.*
- *The same conditions and concerns exist in the fishery, including crab PSC and safety concerns. It was noted at the AP table that one vessel participating in the fishery did run on the beach last season. While there were no injuries or significant damage it highlights that there is greater risk to safety in race or derby style fisheries.*
- *The AP expressed concern over the continued differences and polarization in the BSAI Pacific pot cod fishermen regarding this proposed program that was heard in public testimony. However, it was noted that approximately 70% of the written comments are in favor of development of a LAPP program.*
- *The AP noted that while there isn't typically full consensus within sectors prior to initiating LAPP programs, it was hoped that both sides can come together during this process to have their positions come closer or even to reach an agreement to come back to the Council with.*
- *The AP heard that continued conversations with stakeholders indicate there is much more agreement in moving forward with development of a LAPP if equal shares are allocated. This allocation scheme is one of the alternatives from the AP's June 2024 motion.*

- *The development of a LAPP program for this fishery is in alignment with recently issued executive orders including: increased product quality and value, increased stability in harvesting and processing sectors, increased flexibility in fishing plans, increased benefits across multiple sectors*
- *The AP also noted that the development of a LAPP program is in alignment with the MSA National Standards 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10.*
- *An AP member noted it is appropriate to prioritize and continue working on development of a LAPP program until the Council receives a “hard-stop” or directive from NMFS or the Administration. (i.e. additional direction and information on how to comply with current policy and budget concerns).*
- *When considering a regulatory package for a LAPP program, the following list of regulated items are examples or recommendations of those that could be considered for removal/modification in order to meet the “10 to 1 rule,” if not included elsewhere:*
 - *Economic Data Reports*
 - *Crab Rationalization Market Report*
 - *Codify the non-binding price formula*
 - *Regulatory changes to improve the ability of lead level 2 observers by having more full coverage pot gear platforms for observers to gain experience*
- *Although there was unanimous support from the AP to signal their continued interest in the LAPP, one AP member did note the potential for a magnitude of consolidation if this were to move forward to implementation. Concerns brought forward by the U60 sector during public comment regarding this topic at the June 2024 meeting were reiterated. However, the AP member noted that since these concerns would be analyzed in a future analysis, should the Council move in that direction, and that at this time they were still comfortable with supporting this motion.*