

**Alaska Region discussion of fishery impacts from
October 18-22, 2013 BOF proposals**

Proposal 1: No impact

Proposal 2 – 5:

1. An increased GHL would require a change in harvest specification total allowable catch (TAC) tables.
2. An increased GHL may not allow enough TAC to manage smaller Federal GOA Pacific cod allocations.
3. An increased GHL may allow more harvest in Steller Sea Lion (SSL) areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries. (i.e. The State does not currently follow 50 CFR 679, Table 5 closure areas in the GOA GHL fisheries.)

Proposal 6:

1. NMFS would need to create a catch accounting system (CAS) account for hook-and-line gear.
2. It may cause issues with prohibited species catch (PSC). For example, if the hook-and-line halibut PSC limit is reached and it is necessary to close hook-and-line gear due to halibut PSC.

Proposal 7: No impact

Proposal 8 - 12:

1. These may slow down the pace of the fishery causing more overlap in dates of Federal and State fisheries. This would be a minor impact since overlapping fisheries are already dealt with in some areas.

Proposal 13:

1. It would cause overlap in dates of Federal and State fisheries. This would be a minor impact since overlapping fisheries are already dealt with in some areas.

Proposal 14:

1. It may potentially increase participation in State jig fisheries in other areas. No impact on Federal fisheries.

Proposal 15:

1. The State fishery may potentially be harvested at a faster rate. No impact on Federal fisheries.

Proposal 16 - 17:

1. These proposals would base part of the Western GOA GHL fishery area on the BSAI ABC. It is unclear if it would be a separate GHL fishery or if it would be combined with a State GHL Bering

Sea fishery (should it be created). If the State includes part of the Western GOA in Bering Sea fishery but takes a portion of the BSAI ABC to set the Bering Sea fishery then NMFS will have no way to determine how much GHL will be harvested from BS vs WGOA. Since NMFS will have no way to determine where the catch may occur then the State GHL will need to be deducted from both the WGOA ABC and the BSAI ABC before setting the TAC. If it is a separate GHL fishery then NMFS would have to deduct the GHL from the WGOA ABC regardless of whether or not the WGOA GHL was derived from the BSAI ABC.

2. It may potentially allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries.
3. It would require changes to the CAS to accommodate new area description and catch accounting.

Proposal 18 - 21:

1. An increased GHL would require a change in harvest specification TAC tables.
2. An increased GHL may not allow enough TAC to manage smaller Federal GOA Pacific cod allocations.
3. An increased GHL may allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries. (i.e. State does not currently follow 50 CFR 679, Table 5 closure areas in the GOA GHL fisheries.)

Proposal 22:

1. Change in registration may potentially lower participation in State Pacific cod fishery which may cause overlap in dates of Federal/State fisheries. This would be a minor impact since overlapping fisheries are already dealt with in some areas.

Proposal 23:

1. The start date of the South AK Peninsula Pacific cod fishery would change to seven days after closure of the Federal fishery. This would eliminate chance of overlap in dates of Federal and State fisheries. No impact on Federal fishery.

Proposal 24:

1. The start date of the South AK Peninsula Pacific cod fishery would change to seven days after closure of Federal fishery or on March 12 whichever comes later. This may cause overlap in dates of Federal and State fisheries. This would be a minor impact since overlapping fisheries are already dealt with in some areas.

Proposal 25: No impact

Proposal 26 - 27:

1. This may create a situation where pot gear is being stored inside three miles while the Federal fishery is occurring. This would be more of an enforcement issue as there may be both pot fishing in the parallel fishery and pots being stored for the State fishery inside three miles. However, there are other areas in the GOA that already operate under these regulations.

Proposal 28:

1. This would close two areas to non-pelagic trawl gear. No impact to Federal fisheries.

Proposal 29:

1. An increased GHL would require a change in the harvest specification TAC tables.
2. An increased GHL may not allow enough TAC to open directed fishing for the Federal Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fisheries.
3. It may allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries. (i.e. State follows 50 CFR 679, Table 5 closure areas from 2004).

Proposal 30: ADF&G housekeeping proposal. No impact.

Proposal 31:

1. This potentially allows for the State to set their own bycatch limits (maximum retainable amounts (MRAs)) inside three miles instead of following Federal MRAs.

Proposal 32: ADF&G housekeeping proposal. No impact.

Proposal 33:

1. The way the proposal currently is written, Federal regulations for the Seguam Foraging Area and Table 12 (no fishing/no transit zones which includes Kanaga Island/Ship Rock) would be referenced in ADF&G regulation to NMFS most current regulations instead of to a specific *Federal Register* citation. Table 5 would still reference NMFS 2004 SSL regulations. No federal fisheries impact.

Proposal 34:

1. This would prevent creation or expansion of BSAI State Pacific cod fisheries unless they undergo a more rigorous review process. No federal impact.

Proposal 35-36:

1. Increased GHL may require a change in the harvest specification TAC tables.
2. A new State GHL fishery would require an additional account created in the CAS.
3. It may allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries. If they mirror South AK Peninsula regulations then only Table 12 SSL closures would be applied to the GHL fishery.

4. The State may open the Federal Bogoslof exemption area to the Bering Sea State GHL fishery then the 113 mt annual TAC limit for that area may be exceeded.
1. The State may allow pot fishing in the Bogoslof exemption area which is currently prohibited under Federal regulation. Federal regulations allow directed fishing for Pacific cod by catcher vessels less than 60 ft (18.3 m) LOA using jig or hook-and-line gear.
2. The State may open all of the Bogoslof area that is currently closed to Pacific cod directed fishing under Federal regulation.

Proposal 37:

1. An Atka mackerel GHL may require change in the harvest specification TAC tables.
2. A new State GHL would require an additional account created in the CAS.
3. The GHL fishery would follow SSL regulations in the Seguam Foraging Area and Table 12. No other SSL regulations would apply since NMFS does not address the use of seine gear.
4. Other Federal Atka mackerel sector allocations would have decreased TACs (Amendment 80 and BSAI trawl limited access).

BOF proposals for later meeting dates

Proposal 43:

1. An increase in GHLs would require a change in the harvest specification TAC tables.
2. It may not allow enough TAC to manage other GOA trawl fisheries.
3. It may allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries.
4. It may violate Federal regulations enforcing season dates.
5. It may cause PSC concerns such as an increase in salmon bycatch.

Proposal 44:

1. Would require a change in the harvest specification TAC tables.
2. May not leave enough TAC to manage Central GOA Federal pollock allocations.
3. May allow more harvest in SSL areas closed by Federal regulation but open during State fisheries.
4. May violate Federal regulations enforcing season dates.
5. May cause PSC concerns such as an increase in salmon bycatch.

Proposal 45:

1. Would require 100% observer coverage in all trawl fisheries inside State waters in the Central GOA. However, the State currently does not have a groundfish observer program so NMFS may be asked to be responsible for providing observers.

Proposal 101:

1. It would close Alitak Bay to all trawl fishing. No impact to federal fisheries.

Proposal 102:

1. It would close an undefined area of ADF&G's Kodiak area to non-pelagic trawl. Impact on Federal fisheries depends on the exact area to be closed.

Proposal 342:

1. It changes the start date of the State Tanner crab GHL fishery from January 15 to January 3. This may potentially cause earlier participation in the Federal Western GOA pot Pacific cod fishery than in recent years. This would cause minimal Federal impact as NMFS should be able to react appropriately inseason.

Proposal 349:

1. It changes the Aleutian Islands Golden King Crab fishery dates from August 15 – May 15 to May 15 – February 15 which does not match up with NMFS IFQ crab seasons.

DRAFT