

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Eric A. Olson, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Executive Director



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

Telephone (907) 271-2809

Fax (907) 271-2817

Visit our website: <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc>

Approved: February 11, 2010

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES North Pacific Fishery Management Council December 7–11, 2009

The following members were present for all or part of the meetings:

Joe Childers
Mark Cooper
Craig Cross
John Crowley
Julianne Curry
Jerry Downing
Tom Enlow

Tim Evers
Jeff Favour
Becca Robbins Gisclair
Jan Jacobs
Bob Jacobson
Simon Kinneen
Mike Martin

Chuck McCallum
Matt Moir
Rex Murphy
Theresa Peterson
Ed Poulsen
Beth Stewart
Lori Swanson

The AP unanimously approved the minutes from the previous meeting.

The AP heard a brief presentation on the Northern Fiber Optic Link project from Ike Icard, Kodiak Kenai Cable Company, who is engineering the undersea fiber optic cable system, which extends from the Gulf of Alaska through Bristol Bay to northern Alaska.

C-1 GOA Pacific Cod Sector Allocations

Within the components, **bold** represents preferred option(s), ***bold, italics, underline*** are additions, ~~strikeouts~~ are deletions.

AP recommends that the Council adopt the following problem statement for final action for the Allocation of Pacific cod among sectors in the Western and Central GOA.

Purpose and Need Statement

The limited access derby-style management of the Western GOA and Central GOA Pacific cod fisheries has led to competition among the various gear types (trawl, hook-and-line, pot and jig) and operation types (catcher processor and catcher vessel) for shares of the total allowable catch (TAC). Competition for the GOA Pacific cod resource has increased for a variety of reasons, including increased market value of cod products, rationalization of other fisheries in the BSAI and GOA, increased participation by fishermen displaced from other fisheries, reduced Federal TACs due to the State waters cod fishery, and Steller sea lion mitigation measures including the A/B seasonal split of the GOA Pacific cod TACs. The competition among sectors in the fishery may contribute to higher rates of bycatch, discards, and out-of-season incidental catch of Pacific cod.

Participants in the fisheries who have made long-term investments and are dependent on the fisheries face uncertainty as a result of the competition for catch shares among sectors. To reduce uncertainty and contribute to the stability across the sectors, and to promote sustainable fishing practices and facilitate

development of management measures, the Western GOA and Central GOA Pacific cod TACs should be divided among the sectors. Allocations to each sector would be based primarily on qualifying catch history, but may be adjusted to address conservation, catch monitoring, and social objectives including considerations for small boat sectors and coastal communities. Because harvest sector allocations would supersede the inshore/offshore processing sector allocations for Pacific cod by creating harvest limits, the Council may consider regulatory changes for offshore and inshore floating processors in order to sustain the participants of fishing communities.

The timing of the Pacific cod A and B seasons may have limited the participation of jig vessels in the parallel and Federal fisheries of the GOA. Additionally, the State waters jig allocation has gone uncaught in some years, potentially due to the lack of availability of Pacific cod inside three miles. A non-historical federal catch award, together with the provision of access in Federal waters for the State Pacific cod jig allocations, offers entry-level opportunities for the jig sector.

Currently, there are no limits on entry into the parallel waters groundfish fisheries, and no limits on the proportion of the GOA Pacific cod TAC that may be harvested in parallel waters. There is concern that participation in the GOA Pacific cod parallel waters fishery by vessels that do not hold LLP licenses may increase. The Council, in consideration of options and recommendations for the parallel fishery, will need to balance the objectives of providing stability to the long term participants in the sectors, while recognizing that new entrants who do not hold Federal permits or licenses may participate in the parallel fishery.

AP recommends that the Council select alternative 2 as the preferred alternative selecting the options in bold within the components of Alternative 2.

~~ALTERNATIVE 1. No Action. The GOA Pacific cod TACs will not be allocated among the sectors.~~

ALTERNATIVE 2. The GOA Pacific cod TACs will be allocated among the sectors.

Component 1: Management areas

The Western and Central GOA Pacific cod TACs will be allocated among the various gear and operation types, as defined in Component 2 (the management areas could be treated differently).

Component 2: Sector definitions

The Western and Central GOA Pacific cod TACs will be allocated among the following sectors. The Council has the option to either give a single allocation to each sector, or to divide any allocation by vessel length based on the option(s) listed below.

CENTRAL GOA:

- **Trawl catcher processors**
- **Trawl catcher vessels**
- **Hook-and-line catcher processors**
 - ~~Option: Hook and line catcher processors <125 ft~~
 - ~~Hook and line catcher processors ≥125 ft~~
- ~~**Hook and line catcher vessels**~~
 - Option:**
 - **Hook-and-line catcher vessels <50 ft**
 - **Hook-and-line catcher vessels ≥50 ft**
 - ~~Pot catcher processors~~

- ~~_____~~ Pot catcher vessels

Suboption:

- **Combine CP Pot sector**
- **and CV Pot Sector**
- **Jig vessels**

WESTERN GOA:

- **Trawl catcher processors**
- **Trawl catcher vessels**
- **Hook-and-line catcher processors**
 - ~~Option:~~ Hook and line catcher processors <125 ft
 - ~~_____~~ Hook and line catcher processors ≥125 ft
- **Hook-and-line catcher vessels**
 - ~~Option:~~ Hook and line catcher vessels <60 ft
 - ~~_____~~ Hook and line catcher vessels ≥60 ft
- ~~_____~~ Pot catcher processors
- ~~_____~~ Pot catcher vessels
 - ~~Option:~~ Pot catcher vessels <60 ft
 - ~~_____~~ Pot catcher vessels ≥60 ft

Suboption: Combine

- **CP Pot Sector**
- **CV Pot Sector**
- **Jig vessels**

~~Option:~~ For Western GOA only, create a single sector allocation for combined trawl and pot catcher vessels.

~~Suboption:~~ Applies only to vessels <60 ft.

Western and Central GOA:

Option: Restrict vessels from participating in the GOA Pacific cod fishery using more than one operational type in a given year. Holders of CP licenses shall make a one-time election to receive a WGOA and/or CGOA CP or CV endorsement for Pacific cod if that CP license made a minimum of one landing while operating as a CV under the authority of the CP license from 2002 to 2008, except CP licenses with landings made only operating as CVs will have a GOA Pacific cod CV endorsement added to the license.

Upon implementation of the GOA Pacific cod sector allocations, holders of these licenses will be limited to fishing off of the allocation assigned to operating in the sector designated by their license in the GOA cod fishery. For example, CPs licenses assigned to the CP sector may not fish off of the allocation assigned to operate as CVs in the GOA Pacific cod fishery. Future catch accounting for these vessels should be according to the sector to which those licenses are assigned operating mode.

(Note: This CP or CV endorsement would be added to the LLP license, and would apply only to the Western and Central GOA Pacific cod fisheries; the existing operation type endorsement would remain on the LLP license and would apply to other groundfish fisheries.)

Component 3: Definition of qualifying catch

Qualifying catch includes all retained legal catch of Pacific cod from the Federal and parallel waters fisheries in the Western and Central GOA.

- Catch will be calculated using Fish Tickets for catcher vessels and Catch Accounting/Blend data for catcher processors.
- Under all options, incidental catch allocated to trawl catcher vessels for the Central GOA Rockfish program (currently, 2.09% of the Central GOA Pacific cod TAC) will be deducted from the Central GOA trawl catcher vessel B season allocation.
- Each sector's allocation will be managed to support incidental and directed catch needs for that sector.

Component 4: Sector Allocations

Part A: Years included for purposes of determining catch history

Central GOA:

The AP recommends the following allocations for the Central GOA Pacific cod sectors:

Central GOA		Annual Allocation	Compare to 60/40		Percent of annual	Percent of annual	Percent of seasonal	Percent of seasonal
			A season	B season				
HAL CP	4.70%	4.75%	60.0%	40.0%	2.8%	1.9%	4.7%	4.7%
HAL CV <50	14.70%	14.85%	60.0%	40.0%	8.9%	5.9%	14.8%	14.8%
HAL CV >=50	6.30%	6.36%	60.0%	40.0%	3.8%	2.5%	6.4%	6.4%
Pot CV	26.20%	26.46%	60.0%	40.0%	15.9%	10.6%	26.5%	26.5%
Pot CP	0.50%	0.51%	60.0%	40.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Trawl CP	3.85%	3.89%	60.0%	40.0%	2.3%	1.6%	3.9%	3.9%
Trawl CV	42.75%	43.18%	60.0%	40.0%	25.9%	17.3%	43.2%	43.2%
Total	99.0%	100.00%			60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Jig	1.50%	1.50%	60.0%	40.0%				

Motion on jig allocation passed 10/9

~~Option 1: Qualifying years 2000–2006: average of best 3 years~~

~~Option 2: Qualifying years 2000–2006: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 3: Qualifying years 2002–2007: average of best 3 years~~

~~Option 4: Qualifying years 2002–2007: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 5: Qualifying years 2002–2008: average of best 3 years~~

~~Option 6: Qualifying years 2002–2008: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 7: Average of above options 1–6.~~

~~Option 8: Average of above options 2, 4 and 6.~~

Option: Average of above options 2 and 6

NOTE: The Council has the option to choose separate qualifying years for each sector.

- In order to reflect a broader range of allocations for the Council's allocation adjustment considerations under Component 9, the range of potential annual allocations in the analysis is increased by 3% above the sector's highest potential allocation and decreased by 3% below the sector's lowest potential allocation, except sectors with an allocation of less than 5% would retain their current lowest potential allocation.
- When sectors are divided into subsectors (e.g., by vessel length), the allocation will be calculated using the best set of years for the sector, and the sum of the subsector allocations will equal the allocation to the sector.

The Central GOA action was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Western GOA:

The AP recommends the following allocations for Western GOA Pacific cod sectors:

Western GOA	AP Rec.	Annual Allocation	Compare to 60/40		A season allocation	B season allocation	A season allocation	B season allocation
			A season	B season	Percent of annual	Percent of annual	Percent of seasonal	Percent of seasonal
HAL CP	20.9%	21.22%	62.0%	38.0%	13.2%	8.1%	21.9%	20.2%
HAL CV	1.0%	1.02%	51.9%	48.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	1.2%
Pot CV	28.3%	28.73%	49.8%	50.2%	14.3%	14.4%	23.8%	36.1%
Pot CP	1.9%	1.93%	41.6%	58.4%	0.8%	1.1%	1.3%	2.8%
Trawl CP	2.4%	2.44%	46.4%	53.6%	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%	3.3%
Trawl CV	44.0%	44.67%	67.3%	32.7%	30.1%	14.6%	50.1%	36.5%
Total	98.50%	100.00%			60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The motion for the Western GOA passed 17/1.

Option 1: Qualifying years 1995—2005: average of best 7 years

~~Option 2: Qualifying years 2000—2006: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 3: Qualifying years 2002—2007: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 4: Qualifying years 2002—2008: average of best 5 years~~

~~Option 5: Average of all options above~~

NOTE: The Council has the option to choose separate qualifying years for each sector.

- ~~• In order to reflect a broader range of allocations for the Council’s allocation adjustment considerations under Component 9, the range of potential annual allocations in the analysis is increased by 3% above the sector’s highest potential allocation and decreased by 3% below the sector’s lowest potential allocation, except sectors with an allocation of less than 5% would retain their current lowest potential allocation.~~
- ~~• When sectors are divided into subsectors (e.g., by vessel length), the allocation will be calculated using the best set of years for the sector, and the sum of the subsector allocations will equal the allocation to the sector.~~

Minority Report on Component 4 – Sector Allocation

A motion to select Option 7, to average options 1-6 failed 6/15. As stated in the sector split document, best years options favor years when an occurrence happened which resulted in a higher than average percentage, what has been referred to as cherry picking. AP minority believe that the option brought forward in the motion represents an average of the two best years option for a particular gear type and is a form of selecting what is best for a particular gear type. An average of all options represents a blend and results in a fair and equitable distribution. In addition, page 138 of the sector split document illustrates the gross revenue figures for the Kodiak fixed gear vessels fishing in 2001- 2008 as \$41,781,338 with 249 vessels participating and the Kodiak trawl fleet at \$20,361,109 with 26 vessels participating.. This factor, combined with the potential of CQE licenses that may be activated with the ability to participate in the fixed gear allocation justify an average of the qualifying years.

Signed by: Theresa Peterson, Jeff Farvour, Becca Robbins Gisclair, Bob Jacobson, Chuck McCallum and Ed Poulsen

Part B: Western and Central GOA Sideboards:

- For AFA sideboard vessels: Combine the inshore and offshore AFA CV sideboard amounts into a single sideboard for each management area.**
- For non-AFA crab sideboard vessels: Recalculate the sideboards and Establish separate CP and CV sideboard amounts by gear type for each management area.**

Part C: Seasonal apportionment of sector allocations (different options may be selected for the management areas):

Central GOA:

Option 1: Apportion each sector's annual allocation 60% to the A season and 40% to the B season

~~Option 2: Apportion each sector's annual allocation based on that sector's seasonal catch history during the qualifying years, while maintaining the overall 60%/40% apportionment of the TAC.~~

- ~~These seasonal apportionment options do not apply to the jig sector.~~

Western GOA:

~~Option 1: Apportion each sector's annual allocation 60% to the A season and 40% to the B season.~~

Option 2: Apportion each sector's annual allocation based on that sector's seasonal catch history during the qualifying years, while maintaining the overall 60%/40% apportionment of the TAC.

~~Option 3: Only the A Season TAC will be apportioned among sectors; the B season TAC will not be apportioned among sectors.~~

- ~~These seasonal apportionment options do not apply to the jig sector.~~

Component 5: Allocation of Pacific cod to jig sector

Western & Central GOA:

Before allocating the TACs among the other sectors, set aside ~~1%, or 2%~~ 1.5% [motion passed 10/9] of the Central GOA Federal Pacific cod TACs and ~~1% or 1.5%~~ of the Western GOA Federal Pacific cod TACs, for the initial allocation to the jig vessel sector, with a stair step provision to increase the jig sector allocation by 1% if 90% of the Federal jig allocation in an area is harvested in any given year. The jig gear allocation will be capped at ~~5% or 7%~~ of the Central and Western GOA Federal Pacific cod TACs.

Subsequent to the jig allocation increasing, if the harvest threshold criterion described below is not met within ~~three~~ two consecutive years, the jig allocation will be stepped down by 1% in the following year, but shall not drop below the level initially allocated.

~~Option 1: 90% of the current allocation.~~

Option 2: 90% of the previous allocation

The jig allocation will be set aside from the TAC.

The Council requests that staff continue to work with the State of Alaska and NMFS to explore considerations required to implement possible options for the jig fishery management structure (both State parallel/Federal and State) that create a workable fishery and minimize the amount of stranded quota, focusing on Option 1. Possible solutions that could be explored are:

Option 1: State parallel/Federal managed Pacific cod jig fishery. Federal allocations managed 0-200 miles through a parallel fishery structure. Any State waters jig GHL could (under subsequent action by the Alaska Board of Fisheries) be added to this State parallel/Federal managed jig sector allocation so that the jig sector is fishing off a single account. If the Board of Fisheries chooses not to take the jig GHL, it would roll into the Federal jig allocation. The Council will make such recommendation to the Board of Fisheries. Until the Board changed the GHL in response to this recommendation, ~~Option 2~~

~~would be invoked~~ a distinct Parallel/Federal and State waters fisheries will continue to exist, and the two fisheries will be managed as follows:

The Federal TAC would be divided into an A/B season of 60%/40%. The A season would open on Jan 1st and close when the TAC is reached or on March 15th. The State jig fishery could open either when the Federal season closes due to TAC or on March 15th. The Federal B season would open on Sept 1st or after the state water fishery closes.

If a combined Parallel/Federal fishery is created, the fishery will be managed as follows. ~~There would be no seasonal split of the combined parallel/Federal TAC.~~ The fishery would open on Jan 1st and close when the TAC is reached.

Suboption: The combined State/Parallel Jig fishery would be divided into an A/B season of 60%/40%.

The jig sector for the B season will open on June 10 for directed fishing.

~~Option 2: Until the Board of Fisheries takes action in response to the Council recommendation or input from the public, a distinct Parallel/Federal and State waters fisheries continue to exist, the two fisheries will be managed as follows:~~

~~The Federal TAC would be divided into an A/B season of 60%/40%. The A season would open on Jan 1st and close when the TAC is reached or on March 15th. The State jig fishery could open either when the Federal season closes due to TAC or on March 15th. The Federal B season would open on Sept 1st.~~

Minority Report on Component 5 – Motion to strike jig allocation cap of 5% and insert 7% failed 3/16

The AP minority commented that entry level opportunity in Federal fisheries has been impacted in a variety of ways, from recent license limitation restrictions in cod to the unforeseen high cost of quota to participate in the halibut/sablefish fisheries. The potential found in jig with start up opportunity and room for growth results in a mechanism to provide revenue to enter into other fisheries. It is an entry level with potential to garnish sufficient income to access additional fisheries to create a diverse fishing portfolio. Signed by: Theresa Peterson, Jeff Farvour and Becca Robbins Gisclair

Component 6: Management of unharvested sector allocations – Central and Western GOA

Any portion of a CV, CP, or jig allocation determined by NMFS to remain unharvested during the remainder of the fishery year will become available as soon as practicable to:

Option 1: CV sector to CV sector first, and CP sector to CP sectors first, and then to all other sectors taking into account the capability of a sector, as determined by the Regional Administrator, to harvest the reallocated amount of Pacific cod.

Option 2: all sectors.

Component 7: Apportionment of hook-and-line halibut PSC (other than DSR) between catcher processors and catcher vessels – Gulfwide

Option 1: No change in current apportionments of GOA halibut PSC

Option 2: Apportion the GOA hook-and-line halibut PSC to the CP and CV sectors in proportion to the total Western GOA and Central GOA Pacific cod allocation to each sector. No later than November 1, any remaining Halibut PSC not projected by NMFS to be used by one of the hook-and-line sectors during the remainder of the year would be made available to the other sector. The apportionment of halibut will be proportional to the Pacific cod area apportionment.

Component 8: Community protection provisions

The component would protect community participation in the processing of Pacific cod and protect community delivery patterns established by the inshore/offshore regulations. For the purposes of Options 1, 2 and 3 under Component 8, motherships include catcher processors receiving deliveries over the side and any floating processor that does not meet the regulatory definition of a stationary floating processor in 679.2. Stationary floating processors may process groundfish only at a single geographic location during a given year.

For each management area, the mothership processing cap will be one or a combination of any of the following:

~~Option 1: Motherships may not accept deliveries of directed cod.~~

Option 2: Allow mothership activity up to a percentage of the Pacific cod TAC to be selected by the Council (0-10% in the CGOA; 1.5 2.4% 10% in the Western GOA). [Motion passed 13/7]

~~Suboption 1: Within the boundaries of Western and Central GOA communities that have provided certified municipal land and water boundaries to the State of Alaska Department of Community and Economic Development. [Motion passed 17/3]~~

Need to add definitions to Clarify limits on Stationary Floating Processors (SFP) to retain certain protections provided by the Inshore/Offshore regulations:

- 1. The vessel cannot operate as an SFP in the GOA and an AFA Mothership in the BSAI during the same year.**
- 2. The vessel cannot operate as an SFP in the GOA and a CP in the BSAI during the same year.**
- 3. The vessel cannot operate as an SFP in the GOA and a CP in the GOA during the same year.**

Other existing regulations on SFPs continue to apply.

~~Suboption 2: Within a 2 nautical mile seaward swath of the following list of Census Designated Places:~~

Sand Point	King cove	Larsen Bay	Chenega Bay
Port Lions	Karluk	Chignik	Nanwalek
Chignik Lagoon	Ouzinkie	Old Harbor	Akhiok
Halibut Cove	Perryville	Port Graham	Tatitlek
Seldovia		Ivanoff Bay	Tyonek

~~Option 3: Allow federally permitted vessels to operate as a Motherships:~~

Option 4: Allow federally permitted vessels to operate as a mothership or stationary floating processor at more than one geographic location in the Western GOA in a year provided that the vessel is operating only inside the boundaries of a Western GOA municipality of the State of Alaska. [Motion passed 19/0/2]

~~Suboption: (can be applied to Options 2, 3 and 4): Limit weekly processing of Pacific cod by vessels to (a) 125 mt per week, (b) 200 mt per week, or (c) 300 mt per week. This limit applies to all Pacific cod landings from catcher vessels.~~

Component 9

~~The Council may adjust sector allocations to incorporate considerations that are associated with conservation, catch monitoring, equity of access, bycatch reductions and social objectives.~~

~~Motion to delete Component 9 passed 15/5.~~

AP Minority Report for Component 9 – 3% increase for the CGOA trawl sector

We believe that the CGOA CV trawl sector has been severely disadvantaged by regulations and management decisions that have been made. We believe that an increased allocation of 3% should be awarded to the CGOA CV trawl sector. The reasons for the increase in allocation to the fleet are as follows:

- *Removal of the 1995-2005 time clip for the CGOA sector allocation while including this time period for allocation in the WGOA.*
- *Unequal start and end dates that prohibit trawling from January 1 to January 20 and November 1 to December 31, thereby create an exclusive fishing period for the fixed gear sector.*
- *The creation of the State waters Pacific cod fishery that reallocated the cod ABC to the pot sector – a reallocation of the cod resource to federal pot cod participants.*

These inequities equal a total loss of 14.96% of CGOA cod resource thus justifying the 3% increase allocation to the CV trawl sector.

Signed by: Michael Martin, Mark Cooper, Jerry Downing and Joe Childers.

Component 10: Parallel Waters Issues – Central and Western GOA

Option 1: ~~Develop recommendation for the Alaska Board of Fisheries on the parallel fishery that could complement Council action, such as:~~

- ~~Gear limits~~
- ~~Vessel size limits~~
- ~~Exclusive registration~~

Option 2: Limit access to the parallel fishery for Federal fishery participants.

- **Require any pot or longline vessel with an LLP or an FFP to have the appropriate Pacific cod endorsement and area endorsement on the LLP; and the GOA designation and the appropriate gear and operation type designations on the FFP in order to participate in the Western GOA or Central GOA Pacific cod parallel waters fishery.**
- **Require any trawl vessel with an LLP or an FFP to have the appropriate gear and area endorsement on the LLP; and the GOA area designation and the appropriate gear and operation type designations on the FFP to participate in the Western GOA or Central GOA Pacific cod parallel waters fishery.**

Suboption 1: In addition, require the above Federally-permitted or licensed vessels that fish in the parallel waters to adhere to Federal seasonal closures of the Western/Central GOA sector allocations corresponding to the sector in which the vessel operates.

Suboption 2: Vessels with a GOA area designation and the gear and operation type designations specified in Option 2 cannot remove these designations from the FFP and can only surrender or reactivate the FFP:

- ~~Once per calendar year~~
- ~~Once every eighteen months~~
- Once every three years**

Component 10 passed 17/0.

Final amended motion passed 19/1.

C-2 GOA Rockfish Program

The Advisory Panel recommends the Council refine the alternatives for analysis of the rockfish program to include the following

Harvest shares awarded to processors will be transferable.

1. Harvest shares held by processors will be subject to the same 5% cap for holding and use that applies to harvest shares held by harvesters.

Suboption: Grandfather initial recipients

2. The harvest shares held by processors will be divisible for transfer.

3. The harvest shares held by processors may be transferred to:

Option 1: Those processors, at the plant level, who were initially issued harvest shares.

Option 2: Those persons who have processed at least 100-250 mt of rockfish delivered by catcher vessels within a two-year period during the new program

Suboption 1: in the port of Kodiak

Suboption 2: to a shoreside processing facility

The motion passed 18/0/1.

C-3(a) GOA 2010/2011 Groundfish Specifications & SAFE report

The AP recommends that the Council approve the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish SAFE report. *Motion passed 18/0.*

The AP recommends that the Council adopt final GOA specifications for 2010-2011 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs as shown in the attached table and described below.

Set 2010-2011 TACs equal to ABC for all stocks with the following exceptions:

1. Pacific cod TAC is reduced according to the table in C-3(a) supplemental to account for the apportionment to the state waters fishery in 2010 and 2011.
2. Rollover the 2009 TAC for 2010 and 2011 for:
 - Shallow water flatfish and flathead sole in the Central and Western GOA
 - Arrowtooth flounder for all areas
 - Other slope rockfish in the EYAK/SEO
 - GOA Atka mackerel
 - GOA other species

Motion passed 18/0.

Further, the AP recommends the Council adopt the GOA halibut PSC apportionments annually and seasonally for 2010-2011, as indicated in C-3(a) Supplemental. *Motion passed 18/0.*

The AP recommends the Council adopt the revised halibut discard mortality rates for 2010-2012 as provided in the action memo in C-3(a). *Motion passed 18/0.*

C-3(b) BSAI 2010/2011 Groundfish Specifications & SAFE Report

The AP recommends that the Council approve the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish SAFE report. *Motion passed 18/0*

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the final BSAI specifications for 2010-2011 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs as shown in the attached Table 1. *Motion passed 16/1*

The AP recommends the Council adopt the Prohibited Species Catch tables for 2010-2011 (Tables 8a–8e) as modified and attached to these minutes. *Motion passed 18/0*

Further, the AP recommends the Council adopt the revised halibut discard mortality rates for 2010–2012 as provided by the IPHC in action memo in C-3(b). *Motion passed 18/0*

C-4(a) Bering Sea Salmon Bycatch Data Collection

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the following revised alternatives for final action.

Alternative 2A

In addition to the status quo data sources:

- (1) Transaction data for salmon – quantity and price of transfers (survey will be used to determine whether these are arm’s length transactions). As defined by:

Option 2 – Compensated Transfer Form: Require that IPAs and AFA Cooperatives summarize initial holdings of Chinook by vessels or other entities, and that they summarize all transfers regardless of whether the transfers were “compensated” transfers. For all “compensated” transfers, each party (transferor and recipient) must complete and submit to NMFS a Compensated Transfer Form.

Transfer Form will indicate the amount of monetary compensation OR if no monetary compensation was exchanged, a description and value estimate for what was traded for the salmon bycatch credits/quota.

Alternative 3

- (1) Average annual hourly fuel burned fishing and transiting and annual fuel purchases in gallons to be used to:
 - estimate costs of moving vessels to avoid salmon bycatch (vessel fuel use, transit time, and lost fishing time).
- (2) Post-season surveys of skippers to determine rationale for decision making during the pollock season (fishing location choices and salmon bycatch reduction measures). (Summary in IPA report with individual skipper responses to NMFS.)

Information in the IPA or cooperative report will contain: (1) the average annual hourly fuel burned fishing and transiting, and (2) post-season surveys of skippers to determine rationale for decision making during the pollock season (fishing location choices and salmon bycatch reduction measures).

* clarify that under transfers at beginning of the year, "initial holdings" refers to salmon allocations (holdings) as of January 20.

Motion passed 18-0

C-4(b) Bering Sea Chum Salmon Bycatch

The AP received a report from staff on the Bering Sea chum bycatch discussion paper and the salmon bycatch workgroup committee report.

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following revised alternatives for analysis.

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Alternative 1 retains the current program of the Chum Salmon Savings Area (SSA) closures triggered by separate non-CDQ and CDQ caps with the fleet’s exemption to these closures per regulations for Amendment 84 and as modified by the Amendment 91 Chinook bycatch action.

Alternative 2 – Hard Cap

Component 1: Hard Cap Formulation (with CDQ allocation of 10.7%)

- a) ~~58,000~~ **51,633**
- b) 206,000
- c) 353,000
- d) 488,000

Component 2: Sector Allocation

- a) No sector allocation
- b) Allocations to Inshore, Catcher Processor, Mothership, and CDQ
 - 1) Pro-rata to pollock AFA pollock sector allocation
 - 2) Historical average
 - i. 2004-2006
 - ii. 2002-2006
 - iii. 1997-2006
 - iv. **1997-2009** *[motion passed 21/0]*
 - 3) Allocation based on 75% pro-rata and 25% historical
 - 4) Allocation based on 50% pro-rata and 50% historical
 - 5) Allocation based on 25% pro-rata and 75% historical

Component 3: Sector Transfer

- a) No transfers or rollovers
- b) Allow NMFS-approved transfers between sectors
 - Suboption: Limit transfers to the following percentage of salmon that is available to the transferring entity at the time of transfer:
 - 1) 50%
 - 2) 70%
 - 3) 90%
- c) Allow NMFS to roll-over unused bycatch allocation to sectors that are still fishing

Component 4: Cooperative Provision

- a) Allow allocation at the co-op level for the inshore sector, and apply transfer rules (Component 3) at the co-op level for the inshore sector.
 - Suboption: Limit transfers to the following percentage of salmon that is available to the transferring entity at the time of transfer:
 - 1) 50%
 - 2) 70%
 - 3) 90%
- b) Allow NMFS to roll-over unused bycatch allocation to coops that are still fishing**

Alternative 3 – Trigger Closure

Component 1: Trigger Cap Formulation

- a) ~~45,000~~ **30,000**

- b) 58,000
- c) 206,000
- d) 353,000
- e) 488,000

Application of Trigger Caps

- a) Apply trigger to all chum bycatch
- b) Apply trigger to all chum bycatch in the CVOA
- c) Apply trigger to all chum bycatch between specific dates

Component 2: Sector allocation

- a) No sector allocation
- b) Allocations to Inshore, Catcher Processor, Mothership, and CDQ
 - 1) Pro-rata to pollock AFA pollock sector allocation
 - 2) Historical average
 - i. 2004-2006
 - ii. 2002-2006
 - iii. 1997-2006
 - iv. **1997-2009** *[motion passed 21/0]*
 - 3) Allocation based on 75% pro-rata and 25% historical
 - 4) Allocation based on 50% pro-rata and 50% historical
 - 5) Allocation based on 25% pro-rata and 75% historical

Component 3: Sector Transfer

- a) No transfers or rollovers
- b) Allow NMFS-approved transfers between sectors

Suboption: Limit transfers to the following percentage of salmon that is available to the transferring entity at the time of transfer:

 - 1) 50%
 - 2) 70%
 - 3) 90%
- c) Allow NMFS to roll-over unused bycatch allocation to sectors that are still fishing

Suboption: Limit transfers to the following percentage of salmon that is available to the transferring entity at the time of transfer:

 - 1) 50%
 - 2) 70%
 - 3) 90%

Components 4: Cooperative Provisions

- a) Allow allocation at the co-op level for the inshore sector, and apply transfer rules (Component 3) at the co-op level for the inshore sector.

Suboption: Limit transfers to the following percentage of salmon that is available to the transferring entity at the time of transfer:

 - 1) 50%
 - 2) 70%
 - 3) 90%
- b) Allow NMFS to roll-over unused bycatch allocation to coops that are still fishing.**

Component 5: Area Option

- a) Area identified in October, 2008 discussion paper
- b) Existing Chum Salmon Savings Area (differs from status quo with application of other components)
- c) **New areas [to be identified by staff] which are small, discrete closure areas, each with its own separate cap whereby bycatch in that area only accrues towards the cap.**

Component 6: Timing Option – Dates of Area Closure

- a) ~~Existing closure dates (August 1 – August 31 and September 1 through October 14 if trigger is reached.)~~
- b) New closure dates

Component 7: Rolling Hot Spot (RHS) Exemption – Similar to status quo, participants in a vessel-level (platform level for Mothership fleet) RHS would be exempt from regulatory triggered closure(s).

- a) Sub-option: RHS regulations would contain an ICA provision that the regulatory trigger closure (as adopted in Component 5) apply to participants that do not maintain a certain level of rate-based chum salmon bycatch performance.

Motion passed 12/8/1

Minority Report: A minority of the AP felt that the upper end of the range of caps in the motion – up to 488,000 – was too high and did not represent a “reasonable” range of alternatives. While not predisposed to a hard cap, the minority felt that when considering hard cap options relative to other potential bycatch measures that it was prudent to only analyze realistic options. Only in one year did chum salmon bycatch exceed this cap level, and record high bycatch levels are not an appropriate cap to be considered in an action designed to reduce chum salmon bycatch. Recent historical averages, which provide a more accurate representation of recent bycatch experience, and what is practicable for bycatch reductions, should be utilized instead. A range of caps utilizing averages which include the most recent years provides a reasonable range of alternatives and still provides a high end cap (233,844) which has only been exceeded three times in the history of the pollock fishery.

Signed by: Rebecca Robbins Gisclair, Simon Kinneen, Jeff Farvour, Tim Evers, Theresa Peterson, Chuck McCallum, Rex Murphy and Julianne Curry

C-4(c) Rural Community Outreach

The AP received an update from staff on the draft Bering Sea chum salmon bycatch outreach plan, and a report on the Rural Community Outreach Committee meeting.

C-5 Amendment 80 Cooperative Formation

The AP recommends moving the document forward for public review with the following preferred alternatives selected:

Alternative 4: Reduce both the number of unique QS holders and the number of QS permits required to form a cooperative

New suboption 5: 2 QS holders, 7 QS permits

GRS suboption: The GRS shall be applied in aggregate to all cooperatives if this calculation meets or exceeds the GRS requirement.

The AP recommends the Council delete Alternative 6 and the accompanying language in the Purpose and Need statement which reads ‘or by requiring that any otherwise eligible member be accepted by a cooperative subject to the same terms and conditions as other members.’

Motion passed 17/1/1

C-6(a) BSAI Crab – Amendment Package Alternatives

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following Purpose and Needs Statement and revised alternatives for analysis (as highlighted).

Purpose and need statement:

The Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands (BSAI) Crab Rationalization Program is a comprehensive approach to rationalize an overcapitalized fishery in which serious safety and conservation concerns needed to be addressed. Conservation, safety, and efficiency goals have largely been met under the program.

Experience under the BSAI Crab Rationalization Program has made apparent the need to analyze alternatives to status quo to achieve: entry-level investment opportunities for active participants

This focused analysis on entry level investment opportunities for active participants will by definition include an analysis of the A/B split through potential share conversions.

Additional flexibility under the program is needed to address some inefficiencies created through the share matching system. For example, if a PQS holder opts not to apply for IPQ, the program should allow competitive markets to determine whether resources are harvested rather than redistribute the IPQ for share matching.

Processors and communities have received protections through processor quota shares under this program since the year of implementation. Higher TACs afford an opportunity to expand competition while maintaining protection for processor investments and recognizing community dependency under an IPQ threshold.

Alternative 1:

No action, status quo.

Alternative 2:

Increase investment opportunities for active participants by increasing the proportion of C share quota in all rationalized fisheries through a market-based reallocation.

Change the 3 percent C share allocation to:

- a) 6 percent
- b) 8 percent
- c) 10 percent

Suboption: Applicable only to b) and c) above (increase to 8 or 10 percent), redesignated C shares will be subject to:

- 1) the A share/B share split (including regionalization)
- 2) regionalization

Suboption: Applicable to a), b) and c) above (increase to 6, 8 or 10 percent), redesignated C shares will be subject to:

- 3) the A share/B share split (including regionalization)**
- 4) regionalization**

Suboptions: Use the following mechanism to achieve the increase (i and iii can be combined):

- i) A pro-rata reduction in owner shares (distributed over a period not to exceed 5, 7, or 10 years **in equal portions every year**) to create C shares available for active participants to purchase. Owner share holders who meet active participation requirements would be able to retain their converted C shares.
- ii) ~~A percentage re-designation of owner shares to C shares at the time of each transfer. The purchasing owner is required to comply with the active participation definition or divest of the C shares.~~
- iii) A pro-rata reduction of PQS (distributed over a period not to exceed 5, 7, or 10 years) and conversion into C shares available for active participants to purchase through market transactions.

For catcher processor QS, the creation of C share QS will be achieved strictly by the conversion of CP owner QS to CP C share QS.

PQS/QS Conversion Rate

~~Each crab fishery may have a different conversion ratio. These ratios are based on rough estimates of the relative value of each PQS to CVO QS. This range could be expanded or modified based on further analysis.~~

- ~~a) 1 PQS unit = 0.5 CVO QS unit~~
- ~~b) 1 PQS unit = 0.4 CVO QS unit~~
- ~~c) 1 PQS unit = 0.3 CVO QS unit~~
- ~~d) 1 PQS unit = 0.2 CVO QS unit~~
- ~~e) 1 PQS unit = 0.1 CVO QS unit~~
- ~~f) 1 PQS unit = 0.075 CVO QS unit~~

The new catcher vessel C share QS would be created by converting catcher vessel owner QS and PQS to catcher vessel C share QS with:

- a) 100 percent created from catcher vessel owner QS and 0 percent created from PQS;**
- b) 75 percent created from catcher vessel owner QS and 25 percent created from PQS;**
- c) 50 percent created from catcher vessel owner QS and 50 percent created from PQS;**
- d) 25 percent created from catcher vessel owner QS and 75 percent created from PQS; or**
- e) 0 percent created from catcher vessel owner QS and 100 percent created from PQS.**

The intent is to maintain the current share caps as a percentage of the pool.

Alternative 3:

~~Increase investment opportunities for active participants by establishing a preferential purchase and finance program for all share types (but no share conversion).~~

- 1) ~~The Crab Advisory Committee is directed to consider the potential for a private contractual proposal to increase investment opportunities for active participants. A response and recommendations will be made to the Council.~~
- 2) ~~The proposed program should address the following:~~
 - a. ~~Establishing goals for an aggregate amount of QS owner shares to be held by active participants at 5, 7, and 10 years.~~
 - b. ~~Identify and address any potential impacts on industry efficiency or investment and on communities.~~
 - c. ~~Identify any regulatory issues that may need to be addressed, such as use and ownership caps, and provide recommendations to address these issues.~~

Alternative 4:

C share Regional Fishery Association

~~The committee is tasked to review proposals to form a regional fishery association (RFA) to hold and distribute C shares on behalf of RFA members.~~

~~If RFAs are established, the aggregate total of all C shares shall be:~~

- a) ~~6 percent~~
- b) ~~8 percent~~
- c) ~~10 percent.~~

Component 1 (IPQ accounting when PQS holder opts not to apply)

If a PQS holder opts not to apply for IPQ in a year, distribute harvesting quota that would have been the matching CVO IFQ A shares as open delivery B shares.

Request staff to provide a discussion on the issue of stranded IFQ and IPQ resulting from a QS holder opting not to apply for IFQ.

Note: The original motion deleted Component 2; however a motion to put Component 2 back in with these changes, passed 11/9.)

Component 2 (Establish IPQ thresholds)

The amount of IPQ (individual processing quota) issued in any year shall not exceed,

Option a) in the *C. opilio* fishery,

- i) ~~26 million pounds.~~
- ii) 45 million pounds.
- iii) 64 million pounds.
- iv) 80 million pounds.

Option b) in the Bristol Bay red king crab fishery,

- i) 12 million pounds.
- ii) 15 million pounds.
- iii) 18 million pounds (status quo).

Suboption: Any IFQ above the threshold will be auctioned by NMFS to the highest bidder.

The AP requests that staff come back with information regarding entry opportunities before and after rationalization.

Final motion passed 20/0

Minority Report: Under Alternative 2, the minority supports adding an option of 12% to the C share allocations that would complement the existing range of options. Adding a 12% option to the upper range of the C share allocation addresses “Experience under the BSAI Crab Rationalization Program has made apparent the need to analyze alternatives to status quo to achieve entry-level investment opportunities for active participants” in the Purpose and Need Statement.

The minority feels adding an option of 12% is not unreasonable considering that a C share allocation of 33% is no longer on the table. It addresses issues of loss of crew jobs, consolidation, and getting quota into the hands of active crew.

Signed by: Beth Stewart, Julianne Curry, Rex Murphy, Becca Robbins Gisclair, Chuck McCallum, Theresa Peterson, Tim Evers and Jeff Favour

C-6(b) BSAI Crab – WAG Emergency Rule

Joint Petition for Emergency Regulation for the WAG Fishery

The AP recommends that the Council request NOAA Fisheries to promulgate an emergency regulation under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act to suspend the regional delivery requirement in the Western Aleutian Islands golden king crab (WAG) fishery for the remainder of the 2009-2010 crab fishing year. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following Emergency Relief Proposal for WAG Landing Requirement.

Purpose and Need Statement: The purpose of this proposal is to develop a regulation to allow waiver of the requirement that west-designated Western Aleutian Islands gold king crab (WAG) individual fishing quota (IFQ) be delivered west of 174° W. longitude, in the event that no shoreside processing facility is open to take delivery and process WAG IFQ. In that circumstance, the regional landing requirement needs to be relaxed to allow the IFQ to be delivered outside the west region, to promote full utilization of the TAC.

Alternative 1: Status Quo

Alternative 2: Contractually Defined Exemption

To receive an exemption from the regional landing requirement in the WAG fishery, specified QS holders, PQS holders, shoreside processors, and municipalities shall have entered into a contract. The contract parties will annually file an affidavit with NMFS affirming that a master contract has been signed.

Definitions:

QS Holders: Any person or company that holds in excess of [options: 5, 10, or 20] percent of the west-designated WAG QS.

PQS Holders: Any person or company that holds in excess of [options: 5, 10, or 20] percent of the west-designated WAG PQS.

Shoreside Processors: A shoreside processing facility that is located in one of the defined municipalities and that processed in excess [options: 5, 10, or 20] percent of the west-designated WAG IFQ in the preceding fishing year.

Municipalities: The municipalities of Adak and Atka.

Approval of Exemption:

An exemption to the regional landing requirement will be granted if the contracting parties have filed an affidavit with NOAA Fisheries affirming that a master contract has been signed.

Option 1) In the affidavit, each of the parties as defined above, or their authorized representative, must signify their approval of the exemption in writing.

Option 2) In the affidavit, each of the parties as defined above, or their authorized representative, must signify their approval of the exemption in writing, which shall not be unreasonably withheld. A contracting party's refusal to approve an exemption from the regional landing requirement is subject to binding arbitration. The arbitrator shall be selected from the list of arbitrators identified under the crab rationalization program, and the costs of the arbitration shall be split among the contracting parties. If the arbitrator finds that the contract party unreasonably withheld its approval of an exemption, the arbitrator may order that the requirement for that party's approval be waived and the exemption approved, provided that all other requirements for an exemption are satisfied.

Motion passed 20/0

C-6(c) Snow Crab/Tanner Crab Rebuilding Plans

The AP recommends endorsing the recommendations of the SSC in their minutes on pages 38-40, with one addition. On page 40, in the 3rd bullet the first sentence should read as follows:

“The appropriate base years, including the methodology for calculating the baseline years, over which to estimate average recruitment for all crab stock projections, not just those for snow and Tanner crab, should be reviewed.”

Motion passed 17/0

D-1(a) Groundfish ACL requirements

The AP received minutes of the Non-Target Species Committee that met December 6, 2009 and heard a report from Council staff. The AP recommends the Council adopt the alternatives below for analysis to amend the groundfish FMPs to conform to annual catch limits requirement under Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Alternative 1. No action (status quo).

Alternative 2. Eliminate the other species assemblage and manage (GOA) squids, (BSAI and GOA) sculpins, (BSAI and GOA) sharks, and (BSAI and GOA) octopus separately, move prohibited species and forage fish into the EC category, and move non-specified species out of the FMPs.

Motion passed 15/0

D-1(d) AI Processing Sideboards

The AP recommends the Council take no further action on this item at this time. *Motion passed 13/2*

AP recommended TACs, OFLs, and ABCs for 2010-2011 Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries

Stock/ Assemblage	Area	2009				2010			2011			
		OFL	ABC	TAC	Catch	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC	
Pollock	W (61)		15,249	15,249	14,935		26,256	26,256		34,728	34,728	
	C (62)		14,098	14,098	14,006		28,095	28,095		37,159	37,159	
	C (63)		11,058	11,058	12,135		19,118	19,118		25,287	25,287	
	WYAK		1,215	1,215	1,221		2,031	2,031		2,686	2,686	
	Subtotal		58,590	41,620	41,620	42,297	103,210	75,500	75,500	135,010	99,860	99,860
	EYAK/SEO		11,040	8,280	8,280		12,326	9,245	9,245	12,326	9,245	9,245
Total		69,630	49,900	49,900	42,297	115,536	84,745	84,745	147,336	109,105	109,105	
Pacific Cod	W		21,567	16,175	14,243		27,685	20,764		34,265	25,699	
	C		31,521	23,641	23,380		49,042	36,782		60,698	45,524	
	E		2,212	1,991	778		2,373	2,017		2,937	2,496	
	Total		66,600	55,300	41,807	38,401	94,100	79,100	59,563	116,700	97,900	73,719
Sablefish	W		1,640	1,640	1,341		1,660	1,660		1,488	1,488	
	C		4,990	4,990	4,780		4,510	4,510		4,042	4,042	
	WYAK		1,784	1,784	1,774		1,620	1,620		1,450	1,450	
	SEO		2,746	2,746	2,803		2,580	2,580		2,320	2,320	
	Total		13,190	11,160	11,160	10,698	12,270	10,370	10,370	11,008	9,300	9,300
Deep-water Flatfish	W		706	706	8		521	521		530	530	
	C		6,927	6,927	428		2,865	2,865		2,928	2,928	
	WYAK		997	997	4		2,044	2,044		2,089	2,089	
	EYAK/SEO		538	538	2		760	760		778	778	
	Total		11,578	9,168	9,168	442	7,680	6,190	6,190	7,847	6,325	6,325
Shallow-water flatfish	W		26,360	4,500	96		23,681	4,500		23,681	4,500	
	C		29,873	13,000	8,195		29,999	13,000		29,999	13,000	
	WYAK		3,333	3,333	1		1,228	1,228		1,228	1,228	
	EYAK/SEO		1,423	1,423			1,334	1,334		1,334	1,334	
	Total		74,364	60,989	22,256	8,292	67,768	56,242	20,062	67,768	56,242	20,062
Rex sole	W		1,007	1,007	342		1,543	1,543		1,521	1,521	
	C		6,630	6,630	4,162		6,403	6,403		6,312	6,312	
	WYAK		513	513	1		883	883		871	871	
	EYAK/SEO		846	846			900	900		888	888	
	Total		11,756	8,996	8,996	4,505	12,714	9,729	9,729	12,534	9,592	9,592
Arrowtooth Flounder	W		30,148	8,000	1,517		34,773	8,000		34,263	8,000	
	C		164,251	30,000	22,813		146,407	30,000		144,262	30,000	
	WYAK		14,908	2,500	56		22,835	2,500		22,501	2,500	
	EYAK/SEO		12,205	2,500	52		11,867	2,500		11,693	2,500	
	Total		261,022	221,512	43,000	24,438	254,271	215,882	43,000	250,559	212,719	43,000
Flathead Sole	W		13,010	2,000	303		16,857	2,000		17,520	2,000	
	C		29,273	5,000	3,115		27,124	5,000		28,190	5,000	
	WYAK		3,531	3,531			1,990	1,990		2,068	2,068	
	EYAK/SEO		650	650			1,451	1,451		1,508	1,508	
	Total		57,911	46,464	11,181	3,418	59,295	47,422	10,441	61,601	49,286	10,576

AP recommended TACs, OFLs, and ABCs for 2010-2011 Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries

Stock/ Assmblge	Area	2,009				2,010			2,011		
		OFL	ABC	TAC	Catch	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pacific ocean perch	W	4,409	3,713	3,713	3,805	3,332	2,895	2,895	3,220	2,797	2,797
	C	9,790	8,246	8,246	8,027	12,361	10,737	10,737	11,944	10,377	10,377
	WYAK		1,108	1,108	1,147		2,004	2,004		1,937	1,937
	SEO		2,044	2,044	1		1,948	1,948		1,882	1,882
	E(subtotal)	3,741	3,152	3,152	1,148	4,550			4,396		
	Total	17,940	15,111	15,111	12,980	20,243	17,584	17,584	19,560	16,993	16,993
Northern rockfish ³	W		2,054	2,054	1,946		2,703	2,703		2,549	2,549
	C		2,308	2,308	1,942		2,395	2,395		2,259	2,259
	E										
	Total	5,204	4,362	4,362	3,888	6,070	5,098	5,098	5,730	4,808	4,808
Rougheye	W		125	125	80		80	80		81	81
	C		833	833	100		862	862		869	869
	E		326	326	100		360	360		363	363
	Total	1,545	1,284	1,284	280	1,568	1,302	1,302	1,581	1,313	1,313
Shortraker	W		120	120	151		134	134		134	134
	C		315	315	192		325	325		325	325
	E		463	463	207		455	455		455	455
	Total	1,197	898	898	550	1,219	914	914	1,219	914	914
Other slope ³	W		357	357	401		212	212		212	212
	C		569	569	385		507	507		507	507
	WYAK		604	604	82		273	273		273	273
	EYAK/SEO		2,767	200	11		2,757	200		2,757	200
	Total	5,624	4,297	1,730	879	4,881	3,749	1,192	4,881	3,749	1,192
Pelagic Shelf rockfish	W		819	819	716		650	650		607	607
	C		3,404	3,404	2,143		3,249	3,249		3,035	3,035
	WYAK		234	234	177		434	434		405	405
	EYAK/SEO		324	324	1		726	726		680	680
	Total	5,803	4,781	4,781	3,037	6,142	5,059	5,059	5,739	4,727	4,727
Demersal rockfish	Total	580	362	362	137	472	295	295	472	295	295
Thrnyhd Rockfish	W		267	267	230		425	425		425	425
	C		860	860	275		637	637		637	637
	E		783	783	152		708	708		708	708
	Total	2,540	1,910	1,910	657	2,360	1,770	1,770	2,360	1,770	1,770
Atka mackerel	Total	6,200	4,700	2,000	2,221	6,200	4,700	2,000	6,200	4,700	2,000
Big Skate	W		632	632	68		598	598		598	598
	C		2,065	2,065	1,656		2,049	2,049		2,049	2,049
	E		633	633	87		681	681		681	681
	Total	4,439	3,330	3,330	1,811	4,438	3,328	3,328	4,438	3,328	3,328
Longnose Skate	W		78	78	62		81	81		81	81
	C		2,041	2,041	880		2,009	2,009		2,009	2,009
	E		768	768	175		762	762		762	762
	Total	3,849	2,887	2,887	1,117	3,803	2,852	2,852	3,803	2,852	2,852
Other skates	Total	2,806	2,104	2,104	1,007	2,791	2,093	2,093	2,791	2,093	2,093
Other Species	Total	8,720	6,540	4,500	2,327	9,432	7,075	4,500	9,432	7,075	4,500
Total		632,498	516,055	242,727	163,382	693,253	565,499	292,087	743,559	605,086	328,464

Table 1. Advisory Panel Recommendations for Bering Sea Aleutian Islands TACs, SSC OFL and ABC Recommendations for the 2010-2011 Fisheries.

Species	Area	2009				2010			2011		
		OFL	ABC	TAC	Catch	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pollock	EBS	977,000	815,000	815,000	810,052	918,000	813,000	813,000	1,220,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	AI	34,000	28,200	19,000	1,282	40,000	33,100	19,000	39,100	32,200	19,000
	Bogoslof	58,400	7,970	10	9	22,000	156	50	22,000	156	50
Pacific cod	BSAI	212,000	182,000	176,540	163,587	205,000	174,000	168,780	251,000	214,000	207,580
Sablefish	BS	3,210	2,720	2,720	876	3,310	2,790	2,790	2,970	2,500	2,500
	AI	2,600	2,200	2,200	1,055	2,450	2,070	2,070	2,200	1,860	1,860
Atka mackerel	Total	99,400	83,800	76,400	72,274	88,200	74,000	74,000	76,200	65,000	65,000
	EAI/BS		27,000	27,000	26,433		23,800	23,800		20,900	20,900
	CAI		33,500	32,500	29,541		29,600	29,600		26,000	26,000
	WAI		23,300	16,900	16,300		20,600	20,600		18,100	18,100
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	224,000	210,000	210,000	103,808	234,000	219,000	219,000	227,000	213,000	213,000
Northern rock sole	BSAI	301,000	296,000	90,000	48,593	243,000	240,000	90,000	245,000	242,000	90,000
Greenland turbot	Total	14,900	7,380	7,380	4,284	7,460	6,120	6,120	6,860	5,370	5,370
	BS		5,090	5,090	2,074		4,220	4,220		3,700	3,700
	AI		2,290	2,290	2,210		1,900	1,900		1,670	1,670
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	190,000	156,000	75,000	28,931	191,000	156,000	75,000	191,000	157,000	75,000
Flathead sole	BSAI	83,800	71,400	60,000	19,424	83,100	69,200	60,000	81,800	68,100	60,000
Other flatfish	BSAI	23,100	17,400	17,400	2,155	23,000	17,300	17,300	23,000	17,300	17,300
Alaska plaice	BSAI	298,000	232,000	50,000	13,698	278,000	224,000	50,000	314,000	248,000	50,000
Pacific Ocean perch	BSAI	22,300	18,800	18,800	14,780	22,400	18,860	18,860	22,200	18,680	18,680
	BS		3,820	3,820	623		3,830	3,830		3,790	3,790
	EAI		4,200	4,200	3,867		4,220	4,220		4,180	4,180
	CAI		4,260	4,260	3,879		4,270	4,270		4,230	4,230
	WAI		6,520	6,520	6,411		6,540	6,540		6,480	6,480
Northern rockfish	BSAI	8,540	7,160	7,160	3,087	8,640	7,240	7,240	8,700	7,290	7,290
Shorthead	BSAI	516	387	387	198	516	387	387	516	387	387
Blackspotted/	BSAI	660	539	539	194	669	547	547	650	531	531
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,380	1,040	1,040	586	1,380	1,040	1,040	1,380	1,040	1,040
	BS		485	485	193		485	485		485	485
	AI		555	555	393		555	555		555	555
Squid	BSAI	2,620	1,970	1,970	353	2,620	1,970	1,970	2,620	1,970	1,970
Other species	BSAI	80,800	66,700	50,000	26,653	88,200	61,100	50,000	88,200	61,100	50,000
Total	BSAI	2,638,226	2,208,666	1,681,546	1,315,879	2,462,945	2,121,880	1,677,154	2,826,396	2,457,484	1,986,558

2009 catches through November 7 from AKR Catch Accounting including CDQ.

TABLE 8a–FINAL 2010 AND 2011 APPORTIONMENT OF PROHIBITED SPECIES CATCH ALLOWANCES TO NON-TRAWL GEAR, THE CDQ PROGRAM, AMENDMENT 80, AND THE BSAI TRAWL LIMITED ACCESS SECTORS

PSC species	Total non-trawl PSC	Non-trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ ¹	Total trawl PSC	Trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ ¹	CDQ PSQ reserve ¹	Amendment 80 sector		BSAI trawl limited access fishery
						2010	2011	
Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	900	832	3,675	3,349	393	2,425	2,375	875
Herring (mt) BSAI	n/a	n/a	1,974	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Red king crab (animals) Zone 1 ¹	n/a	n/a	197,000	175,921	21,079	98,920	93,432	53,797
C. opilio (animals) COBLZ ²	n/a	n/a	4,350,000	3,884,550	465,450	2,148,156	2,028,512	1,248,494
C. bairdi crab (animals) Zone 1 ²	n/a	n/a	830,000	741,190	88,810	351,176	331,608	348,285
C. bairdi crab (animals) Zone 2	n/a	n/a	2,520,000	2,250,360	269,640	599,271	565,966	1,053,394

¹ Section 679.21(e)(3)(i)(A)(2) allocates 326 mt of the trawl halibut mortality limit and § 679.21(e)(4)(i)(A) allocates 7.5 percent, or 67 mt, of the non-trawl halibut mortality limit as the PSQ reserve for use by the groundfish CDQ program. The PSQ reserve for crab species is 10.7 percent of each crab PSC limit.

² Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of zones.

TABLE 8b-FINAL 2010 AND 2011 HERRING AND RED KING CRAB SAVINGS SUBAREA PROHIBITED SPECIES CATCH ALLOWANCES FOR ALL TRAWL SECTORS

Fishery Categories	Herring (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1
Yellowfin sole	169	n/a
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish ¹	29	n/a
Turbot/arrowtooth/sablefish ²	14	n/a
Rockfish	10	n/a
Pacific cod	29	n/a
Midwater trawl pollock	1,508	n/a
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species ²	214	n/a
Red king crab savings subarea non-pelagic trawl gear ³	n/a	49,250
Total trawl PSC	1,974	197,000

¹“Other flatfish” for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), flathead sole, Greenland turbot, rock sole, yellowfin sole, and arrowtooth flounder.

²Pollock other than pelagic trawl pollock, Atka mackerel, and "other species" fishery category.

³In October 2009 the Council recommended that the red king crab bycatch limit for non-pelagic trawl fisheries within the RKCSS be limited to 25 percent of the red king crab PSC allowance (see § 679.21(e)(3)(ii)(B)(2)).

TABLE 8c–FINAL 2010 AND 2011 PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCES FOR THE BSAI TRAWL LIMITED ACCESS SECTOR AND NON-TRAWL FISHERIES

BSAI trawl limited access fisheries	Prohibited species and area ¹				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	C. opilio (animals) COBLZ	C. bairdi (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	167	47,397	1,176,494	293,234	1,005,879
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish ²	0	0	0	0	0
Turbot/arrowtooth/sablefish ³	0	0	0	0	0
Rockfish	5	0	2,000	0	848
Pacific cod	453	6,000	50,000	50,816	42,424
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species	250	400	20,000	4,235	4,242
Total BSAI trawl limited access PSC	875	53,797	1,248,494	348,285	1,053,394
Non-trawl fisheries	Catcher processor	Catcher vessel			
Pacific cod-Total	760	15			
January 1-June 10	314	10			
June 10-August 15	0	3			
August 15-December 31	446	2			
Other non-trawl-Total		58			
May 1-December 31		58			
Groundfish pot and jig		Exempt			
Sablefish hook-and-line		Exempt			
Total non-trawl PSC		833			

¹ Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of areas.

² “Other flatfish” for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), flathead sole, Greenland turbot, rock sole, yellowfin sole, and arrowtooth flounder.

³ Greenland turbot, arrowtooth flounder, and sablefish fishery category.

TABLE 8d–FINAL 2010 PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCE FOR THE BSAI AMENDMENT 80 COOPERATIVES

Year	Prohibited species and zones ¹				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	C. opilio (animals) COBLZ	C. bairdi (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
2010	1,754	70,237	1,461,309	257,715	440,277

¹ Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of zones.

TABLE 8e-FINAL 2010 PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCES FOR THE BSAI AMENDMENT 80 LIMITED ACCESS FISHERIES

Amendment 80 limited access fisheries	Prohibited species and area ¹				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	<u>C. opilio</u> (animals) <u>COBLZ</u>	<u>C. bairdi</u> (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	440	9,690	633,544	51,561	128,794
Jan 20 - Jul 1	293	9,500	617,709	46,515	102,242
Jul 1 - Dec 31	147	190	15,835	5,046	26,552
Rock sole/other flat/flathead sole ²	139	18,947	53,203	41,799	30,099
Jan 20 - Apr 1	108	18,685	51,204	37,500	27,000
Apr 1 - Jul 1	16	130	1,000	2,150	1,550
July 1 - Dec 31	15	132	999	2,149	1,549
Turbot/arrowtooth/sablefish ³	6	45	100	100	100
Rockfish	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pacific cod	1	1	1	1	1
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species ⁴	40	0	0	0	0
Total Amendment 80 trawl limited access PSC	671	28,683	686,848	93,461	158,994

¹ Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of areas.

² “Other flatfish” for PSC monitoring includes all flatfish species, except for halibut (a prohibited species), flathead sole, Greenland turbot, rock sole, yellowfin sole, and arrowtooth flounder.

³ Greenland turbot, arrowtooth flounder, and sablefish fishery category.

⁴ Pollock other than pelagic trawl pollock, Atka mackerel, and “other species” fishery category. “Other species” for PSC monitoring includes sculpins, sharks, skates, and octopus.