



**ADVISORY PANEL**  
**Motions and Rationale**  
**October 1-3, 2024 - Anchorage, AK**

REPORT

October 1-3, 2024 – Anchorage, AK

*The Advisory Panel met on Tuesday, October 1, through Thursday, October 3, 2024, at the Egan Center in Anchorage, AK. The following members were present for all or part of the meetings:*

Agayar, Tiffany

Briggie, Tamara

Burk, Eva Dawn

Carroll, Shannon **(Chair)**

Evens, Nels

Gudmundsson, Gretar

Heuker, Tim

Johnson, Jim

Johnson, Mellisa

Kavanaugh, Julie

Laitinen, Rick

Lowenberg, Craig

Mann, Heather **(Co-VC)**

Howard, Lauren

O'Donnell, Paddy

Price, Landry

Radell, Chelsae

Wilkins, Paul **(Co-VC)**

Zagorski, Suzie

**C1 BSAI Crab**

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2024 Crab SAFE Report, as well as the 2024-25 OFL and ABC as recommended by the SSC for EBS Snow Crab, Bristol Bay Red King Crab, EBS Tanner Crab and St. Matthew Island Blue King Crab.

*Motion passed unanimously: 20/0*

**Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *The AP appreciates the continued diligence of the BSAI Plan Team and SSC in developing models and assessing the status and dynamics of the BSAI crab stocks.*
- *The AP thanks the SSC for reviewing the CPT EBS snow crab recommendations and taking a second look reviewing the CPTs original recommendations.*
- *The AP understands that the SSC recommendation for Snow Crab allows for the chance of a directed fishery, while the model that the plan team recommended would not have allowed the opportunity for a directed fishery.*

### **C3 BSAI Groundfish Specs**

The AP recommends the Council adopt the proposed 2025 and 2026 BSAI groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC and set TACs, with all proposed specifications consisting of rollovers of 2025 final specifications from 2024/2025 harvest specifications. The TACs for both BS and AI Pacific cod have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries. The TACs for sablefish have also been reduced in the BSAI by 5% to accommodate the GHL fishery.

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed flatfish ABC reserves, 2025 and 2026 annual and seasonal PSC limits and apportionments in the BSAI as provided in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. The Proposed 2025 and 2026 Prohibited Species Bycatch Allowances in Table 10 account for the Pacific Cod Trawl Cooperative Program. Additionally, the AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed 2025 and 2026 halibut discard mortality rates (DMRs) for the BSAI as shown in Table 12. Tables 1 and 7 - 12 can also be found in the meeting agenda under C3.

***Motion passed unanimously: 20/0***

*Rationale in support of Main Motion*

- *This is a regular action in October of each year and this action helps to inform the public of what is likely to be adopted in December after the final numbers are available from the groundfish plan teams.*

### **C3 GOA Groundfish Specs**

The AP recommends the Council adopt the proposed 2025 and 2026 Gulf of Alaska (GOA) groundfish specifications for OFLs and ABCs, as recommended by the SSC and set TACs and shown in Table 1. Final specifications will be approved in December. The TACs for both GOA cod and pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries. The proposed GOA Pacific cod adjustments are shown in Table 2. The AP recommends that the Council adopt the proposed 2025 and 2026 annual and seasonal Pacific halibut PSC limits and apportionments in the GOA as provided in Tables 9, 10, and 11 and the proposed 2025 and 2026 halibut discard mortality rates (DMRs) for the GOA in Table 12.

*Motion passed unanimously: 20/0*

#### **Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *At this meeting the Council will recommend, for proposed rulemaking, both BSAI and GOA groundfish harvest specifications for the upcoming two-year period (2025 and 2026) which will notify the public of expected Council action to set final harvest specifications in December 2024.*
- *Final harvest specifications in December 2024 will be based on stock assessment reports included in the Groundfish SAFE reports for the BSAI and GOA that will be released in late November 2024.*

## **C4 Observer ADP**

The AP acknowledges the receipt of the 2025 Draft Annual Deployment Plan (ADP), the PCFMAC Report, and the FMAC Report and appreciates the time and work that went into the Draft ADP, particularly the challenge to include the Regulated Trawl EM Program into the budget for the first time.

The AP supports the following PCFMAC recommendations in regards to the draft 2025 ADP:

1. NMFS should support trawl EM participation in the WGOA in 2025 as intended in the newly regulated program, by funding being set aside for dockside monitoring in those ports.
2. Funding for EM service/maintenance on tender vessels should also be allocated in the Final ADP.
3. NMFS should pursue changes to the zero-selection pool, including adding vessels with consistently very little quota/fishing or very few trips. Specifically, the committee recommended the agency pursue efforts to remove EM systems on vessels that have not used them for 3-5 years.

Specifically in regards to the ODDS Trip Cancellations and Inherits Discussion paper, the AP recommends that the Council support Option 2: Apply inheritance to the next pending trip in the observer strata for implementation in the 2025 ADP. Additionally, NMFS should:

- Conduct outreach to better explain how ODDS functions
- Encourage vessel operators/ODDS users to modify trips rather than cancel them, and
- Find solutions to improve the ODDS user experience, this could include changing a trip start date and trip details at any point before a trip begins rather than the log start date.

Lastly, the AP would like to reiterate the FMAC's support for the following NFWF Proposals:

- NPFA & Under Sixty Cod Harvester's proposal with Saltwater to evaluate pot cod catch handling protocols.
- FLC's pilot project with FlyWire to reduce work burden on observers
- AGDB's CGOA Rockfish EM Project
- ALFA and Archipelago proposal to implement AI in fixed gear EM review

***Motion passed unanimously: 20/0***

### **Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *The AP noted their appreciation for the work the Agency put into the 2025 ADP, which includes the partial coverage portion of the Trawl EM program in the budget for the first time.*
- *The AP recognized that this was the draft ADP, and appreciated FMA noting that there will be more information available by the Final ADP in December, but wanted to note written public comment, oral public testimony, the PCFMAC recommendations and discussion around the table in regards to the inclusion of the WGOA fleet into the Final ADP.*
- *Specific to Trawl EM and the WGOA:*
  - *Processing capacity in the WGOA is currently extremely unstable and fluid from season to season. Should funding for WGOA dockside monitoring be excluded from the 2025 ADP, it would force WGOA vessels and processors to operate in the non-EM stratum. Since this fleet relies on tender deliveries, it would put the fishery back to the status quo they operated under, prior to the development of the EM program they championed, with associated risks involved with extrapolation of at-sea samples.*
  - *Public comment indicated that there is a processor who is providing a market for displaced King Cove fishermen, and that they have been diligently working to ensure compliance for the 2025 trawl EM implementation. They would need the partial coverage dockside monitoring funds to operate, and providing for two observers for B season so they can operate is essential. Although this may decrease coverage rates in other areas, the WGOA cannot be left with further instability; a closure due to exceeding the chinook cap from non-EM tender vessel extrapolations in the WGOA would adversely affect WGOA fishermen and communities.*
  - *An AP member reiterated public testimony in suggesting funding should be included to allow for EM service and maintenance for tender vessels, considering WGOA trawl EM participation during the EFP period. Although the numbers of tenders needed at any given point fluctuates, it may be possible to allocate funding to accommodate historical patterns of tender needs. If industry exceeded that funding but needed additional tender capacity, they could self-pay, but since tenders are an essential part of the partial coverage fishery their costs must be budgeted as described in the trawl EM Final Rule. The AP chose not to specify specific numbers since they can change year to year but suggested that the Agency could continue dialogue with the processing partners in the region.*
- *Specific to the PCFMAC recommendations to pursue changes to the zero selection pool and removing systems from fixed gear vessels that haven't fished in 3-5 years, there has been significant discussion on these topics over the years. The AP noted that the current method of retaining fixed gear EM participants indefinitely (other than removal for not following their VMP) has created challenges for the agency which include budget projections that cover maintenance, data collection, and review. In the trawl EM program, it is required to annually opt in to the EM program, which eliminates the issue of inactive vessels, and reducing the uncertainty for projecting an annual budget. In light of ongoing market and fishery issues that decrease revenue to the partial coverage budget, the AP encourages NMFS to maximize cost efficiencies without decreasing monitoring implications to the extent possible.*
- *Specific to the ODDS Trip Cancellation and Inherits discussion paper:*

- *There was extensive discussion at the table about all options but the AP agreed that since this change needs to be implemented for the 2025 fishing year, Option 2 is currently the best choice. By moving inheritance to the next pending trip rather than the next logged trip, it reduces the time between when the observed trip should have occurred and when it will occur. It also minimizes the likelihood that an observed trip will carry over into the following fishing year.*
- *Several AP members noted support from the trawl fleet for Option 2 for logistical and operational reasons, and see Option 2 as a reasonable step to improve temporal bias in PC observer coverage with no clear negative impacts on the GOA trawl fleet. The inability to modify or cancel trips once a start date has passed means that a boat could be locked into taking a non-EM trip and be forced to deploy non-pelagic gear even if their plant doesn't want the target species, the weather isn't safe to do so, and at risk of extrapolations of chinook accounting. Additionally, it could also prevent a vessel from being able to switch from EM to do a non-EM trip and take advantage of a market opportunity.*
- *If Option 3 were chosen, an AP member noted that outreach must be done and work needs to be put into improving the ODDS user experience to allow greater efficiencies in changing trip details.*
- *One AP member noted that Option 3 appears to fully resolve the bias issue and was identified as the best solution long term.*

## **C5 Crew Data Collection**

The AP recommends no further action on crew data collection currently.

### ***Motion passed unanimously: 20/0***

#### *Rationale in favor of the Main Motion*

- *The AP acknowledges the importance of the data points that could be collected through a Crew EDR and this motion is not intended to fully table this action, but rather to consider a different way of collecting the information.*
- *Crew members, not boat owners, should bear the responsibility for providing this information for a variety of reasons:*
  - *Confidentiality of information - this is sensitive information that the crew member should be providing*
  - *Rapid crew turn-over and difficulty in tracking crew for boat owners makes this an unfair burden on boat owners - many times crew members give false information regarding current addresses, etc.*
  - *The information being collected would be used to benefit crew members (i.e. disaster relief, etc) so it should be incumbent on the crew member to provide the information*
  - *Boat owners should not be penalized and have quota withheld or some other punitive action because the boat owner can't get the information from crew members or crew members provide false information*
- *The AP is aware that having the onus on crew members to provide the information would require coordination and cooperation with ADFG who issues crew licenses. The AP would encourage the state of Alaska to consider the importance of this data for all fisheries both state and federal and explore the options for collecting this data from the person issued the crew license.*
- *ADF&G required reporting for Sport fish license, hunting license and subsistence/personal use licenses. All of these licenses can be purchased on the same portal as where a crew license is purchased. ADF&G should be encouraged to explore the option to implement the same reporting requirements for crew licenses in the same format that is triggered when a person purchases any of the other licenses.*
- *One of the goals of this action would be to improve understanding of where economic impacts of fisheries funnel by considering crew residence. It was noted during the presentation that licenses for processor crew on vessels are not required, and that the corresponding data for Amendment 80 EDRs are reported as aggregated information, without resolution on processor residence. Processing workers represent a large portion of the vessel labor force and having limited resolution on their residence in this action reduces the context of the remaining crew information.*
- *For many vessels, crew rotate in and out periodically and don't work on a vessel during all the days it fishes in a year. Tracking crew time and pay for data reporting on these operations could significantly increase reporting burden on owners.*
- *Concerns were expressed on what enforcement tools could be administered due to missed or late reporting, and how owners in different fisheries might be penalized differently.*

## C6 Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition

The AP adopts the following purpose and need statement and list of alternatives for analysis.

### Purpose and Need

The purpose of this action is to align regulations with the longstanding interpretation of pelagic trawl gear in Alaska and to remove unnecessary outdated text. Pelagic trawl gear is defined within 50 CFR 679.2 and has remained unchanged since 1993. The Council and NMFS did not intend the codend to be included within the restrictive definition of pelagic trawl gear specified at § 679.2. A regulatory change to the trawl gear definition at § 679.2 is needed to exclude the codend to better reflect the Council's original intent and provide for improved regulatory compliance. Revisions are also needed to the pelagic trawl gear definition in paragraph 14 of the definition of authorized fishing gear at § 679.2 to remove outdated text related to parallel line trawls and to allow for flotation within bycatch excluder devices.

### Alternatives

Alternative 1: No Action (Status quo).

Alternative 2: Revise regulations that define authorized fishing gear for pelagic trawl gear and trawl gear to:

~~'Option 1: Exclude the codend from limitations applicable to the trawl net.'~~

**'Option 1: Change the regulations regarding the codend**

**'Suboption 1: Exclude the codend from limitations applicable to the trawl net;**

**'Suboption 2: Specify which regulations do not apply to the codend.**

Option 2. Remove outdated text related to parallel line trawls.

Option 3. Allow the use of flotation and metallic components for bycatch excluder devices.

Option 4. Allow metallic components in the form of observing, monitoring, or sensing technology as well as hardware that secures such technology to the trawl. Observing, monitoring, and sensing technology that may need to be secured to the trawl includes cameras (eg. live feed and recording), sensors (eg. water flow, net shape, fishing environment), etc.



## C6 Motion - Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition

Option 5. Distinguish between the forward and aft sections of the pelagic trawl net to that currently defined in 50 CFR 679.2(14)(iii) and (iv) (large mesh locations). And allow connectors, trawl mounted instruments to observe or monitor, hardware to secure such instruments, and flotation attached to or within 6 feet of such instruments as long as connectors, instruments, hardware, and flotation do not affect the bycatch reduction functions of the forward large meshes. Trawl mounted instruments may need to be secured to the trawl to observe or monitor trawl shape, water flow, fishing environment (including seafloor clearance), organisms being caught, or to manipulate trawl components during fishing (related to bycatch reduction). Flotation shall be capable of providing up to 100lb (45.3kg) of buoyancy.

Options 1-4 are not mutually exclusive, if selected without Option 5. Option 5 is mutually exclusive of Option 3 and Option 4.

*Amendment<sup>1</sup>: strike option 1 and replace with new option 1 and suboptions 1 and 2 ( in bold)*

*Amendment 1 passed: 11/9*

*Amended main motion passed: 17/3*

#### **Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *The motion addresses the issue of outdated and ambiguous regulatory language for the Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition. This is a narrowly focused agenda item specific to the authorized gear definition found in 50 CFR 679.2. This process is separate from any other actions related to gear research, incentivizing innovations, and addressing the performance standard.*
- *This motion is intended to align the pelagic trawl gear definition with current fishing practices that have evolved since 1993 due to NPFMC and NMFS management actions, and align with the Council's intent. These changes are also intended to address enforcement and compliance issues. For example, current national regulations related to mesh smaller than 5.5 inches essentially make all pelagic trawl nets currently used to fish BSAI pollock illegal because the regulations do not allow for the floats that are required for salmon excluders to work effectively.*
- *Specific to Option 2, the text addresses the antiquated regulations referring to parallel line (rope) trawls, which are no longer in use and haven't been for many years*
- *Specific to Option 3:*
  - *Allowing flotation and metallic components would allow for excluders (important conservation management measures) to be used as they currently are in the fishery. Flotation and metallic components (whether that be live feed cameras, recording cameras, sensors, lights, and leadline) are important parts of an excluder design that are necessary for it to function.*
  - *The current definition is contrary to conservation goals and National Standard 9 to reduce bycatch to the extent practicable, since flotation and metallic components are necessary to the excluder design and function.*
  - *Current salmon excluders in the Bering Sea can be installed in the intermediate of the net which is just before the codend, and the mesh sizes vary (both less than and greater than 5.5 in mesh), so the additional clarity in the definition related to excluders is necessary.*
  - *Incentive Plan Agreements (IPAs) to avoid and minimize salmon bycatch to the extent practicable are required by federal regulation to describe certain aspects of salmon avoidance and in that, the fleets are required to use salmon excluders. This change is important to address the inconsistency among regulatory language at this time.*
  - *Option 3 ensures the allowance of salmon excluders is in line with current industry efforts and management goals to reduce PSC bycatch.*

## C6 Motion - Pelagic Trawl Gear Definition

- *Specific to Option 4:*
  - *Option 4 language still refers to the boundaries described in paragraph 14 (vii) (between the 5.5 meshes in the aft of the net and up to the fishing circle), but has been adjusted from the February 2024 version to clarify and correctly capture the intent expressed by pelagic trawl users. New language would provide a necessary exception to use technology for either monitoring, sensing, or observing as well as the hardware needed to secure it to the net, in between 5.5 meshes and the fishing circle.*
    - *Example of why this is necessary and aligns with current practices: When a pelagic trawl fisherman notices fish aren't accumulating like they think it should based on the biomass sign they are fishing on, they use cameras or sensors to take a look at how the net is shaping and what the fishing environment is in their net. This allows for them to identify the issue and make the correct mends and adjustments to the net so that it fishes properly.*
  - *The limited exceptions described in Option 4 are not intended to contradict conservation and management goals, these limited exceptions are intended to help ensure fishermen and pelagic trawl nets are meeting conservation and management goals.*
  - *The allowances in option 4 do not affect the fishing performance (crab and halibut bycatch reduction via large front meshes) of the front end of the trawl as described in paragraph 679.2(14)(iii) and (iv)*
- *Specific to Option 5:*
  - *This option responds to one public comment that suggested an inventive way to respond to the concerns posed by the authors of the analysis in relation to how Options 3 and 4 were originally crafted. Notably:*
    - *Distinguishing the between forward and aft parts of the net to that already defined in 50 CFR 679.2(14)(iii) and (iv) would simplify the boundaries within the net and the rules on what is and isn't restricted. The action to make that distinction would be to remove paragraph (14)(viii), thus lifting restrictions on the aft section of the net.*
    - *Allowing flotation in the aft sections of trawls would not affect the bycatch reduction functions of the large meshes in the front of the trawl. The intent is not to allow for anything that would change the vertical opening of the net.*
    - *Both flotation and metallic components would be allowed aft of the meshes regulated in paragraphs (14)(iii) and (14)(iv). Weights would be disallowed where they could press meshes onto the seafloor. Floats could not be placed anywhere near where they could raise the headrope and vertically open the net mouth.*
    - *Float use for all existing salmon excluders, including active excluders would be allowed because they would be installed aft of the regulated meshes described in (14)(iii) and (14)(iv). The action to allow floats aft of the forward mesh sections would be to remove paragraph (14)(vi).*
    - *The changes described in option 5 would also give exceptions for the listed components to be allowed in the front meshes, when necessitated.*

**Rationale in Opposition to Motion:**

- *An AP member noted agreement with some public comment that considering adjusting the pelagic trawl gear definition under this action is a distraction from the larger question of how pelagic trawl gear is fished in relation to the environment, and preferred that the Council should prioritize this question. There is confusion regarding the “long-standing interpretation of pelagic trawl gear” definition, thus leading to concerns of defining a pelagic trawl net without first defining its intended performance.*
- *There was concern expressed about deregulating the codend completely.*

### **Rationale in Support of Amendment 1:**

- *The definition for pelagic trawl gear is very specific largely due to the inverse definition of non-pelagic trawl gear being very simple. It is important to maintain the intent and integrity of this definition and not begin to deregulate a portion of the net which is very much part of the gear.*
- *There are concerns around inhibiting innovation or technology but most of these changes are involving metal components and flotation. The use of the language “does not apply to the codend” could be added to the specific elements of the definition that this applies to such as sections 50 CFR 679.2(14)(vi) and 50 CFR 679.2(14)(viii).*
- *<sup>1</sup>This action is responsive to public comment and testimony concerned with fully deregulating the codend, and especially around the concept of separating this integral portion of the gear out of the definition as if it were not a part of the gear. Related to this, AP members referenced a 2015 Scientific paper (1) that questions whether or not the codend influences mesh openings, dimensions, movements, position, or drag of the gear.*
- *Staff indicated in their presentation and in answering AP questions that this idea of adding language to the regulation related to which parts do or do not apply to the cod end is one way in which this issue could be addressed. This idea was also presented in public comment.*

### **Rationale in Opposition to Amendment 1:**

- *The Council’s original Purpose and Need Statement for this action is specific in regards to the codend: “The Council and NMFS did not intend the codend to be included within the restrictive definition of pelagic trawl gear specified at § 679.2. A regulatory change to the trawl gear definition at § 679.2 is needed to exclude the codend to better reflect the Council’s original intent and provide for improved regulatory compliance.”*
- *The original language in Option 1 is in line with the Council’s stated intent to not regulate the codend and instead match up and remove contradiction with national regulations by simply removing the codend from the authorized gear definition*
- *Some AP members felt this amendment was introducing unnecessary confusion and that the Council and Agency had both indicated previously that regulating the codend was not their intent when identifying Authorized Gear.*
- *The function and result of the additional suboption does not seem to be different in terms of management goals from the original motion.*
- *The original language of Option 1 is more streamlined, concise, and more easily understood for enforcement and compliance.*
- *No other gear authorized under 50 CFR 679.2 has such a complicated definition or a performance standard associated with it, attempting to change the pelagic trawl gear performance is not appropriate for this agenda item, which is only to adjust regulations defining authorized gear.*

---

<sup>1</sup> (1) Madsen et al, Behavior of different trawl codend concepts, Ocean Engineering Volume 108, 2015, Pages 571-577.

## **D1 Observer Availability**

The AP acknowledges the receipt of the Observer Availability discussion paper and appreciates the significant work that Council and Agency Staff put into this multi-faceted and nuanced issue. The AP would like to note that while observer availability is an ongoing issue, no further action is recommended at this time.

***Motion passed unanimously: 20/0***

### **Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *The paper does a good job of teasing out some of the challenges with attracting and retaining observers.*
- *Staff and AP members noted that it is difficult to address this issue comprehensively. However, the AP did want to reiterate that observer availability is an ongoing issue.*
- *An AP member did note that there are ways that the observer program can continue to improve observer training and morale, including doing more to explain to observers the value of their data and role in the Council process. It was also mentioned that while observing in itself may not have specific room to grow within the field, observer experience is very important in this process, and that many Agency, Industry, AP and Council members began their careers as observers, so fostering observer development is important.*
- *The AP also noted the FMAC's two recommendations:*
  - *Maintaining the current high standards and requirements for observers is of primary importance. While looking at ways to increase flexibility, the principal objective is to maintain data quality, which requires observers with proper knowledge and understanding of sampling methods and design.*
  - *The committee also expressed concern regarding the loss of diversity of deployment opportunities on vessels and highlighted the importance of maintaining a variety of deployments to keep the job interesting and less routine and to sustain a vibrant observer program.*
- *Finally, the AP supports any efforts for continuing to consider solutions at the committee level.*

## D2 Climate Reports

The AP recommends the Council direct staff through the IRA work plan to incorporate the following information and SSC recommendations to create an inclusive, action-oriented framework for climate-resilient fishery management. This should leverage ongoing work, support habitat conservation, expand precautionary measures, engage stakeholders equitably, and establish a clear path for implementation. Staff should take meaningful outreach and engagement to inform the programmatic evaluation process and incorporate LKTKS protocols and onramps.

This should begin with a clear definition of what climate resilient fisheries management means. The following context papers should be drafted with clear definitions and barriers of how to work towards creating climate resilient fisheries and fishing communities and what changes can or cannot occur within the Council process.

Context Papers topics should include:

- What we can and cannot do with IRA funding to help guide the public;
- How to collect and utilize fishery data outside of surveys through fishermen and fishing communities on the frontlines of climate change;
- Benchmarking what the NPFMC is doing in comparison to other regions

***Motion passed unanimously: 20/0***

### **Rationale in Favor of Motion:**

- *By leveraging existing work it will build on established goals, objectives, and frameworks to maximize effectiveness and avoid duplication. For example: Bering Sea Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP), groundfish management objectives, the Local Knowledge, Traditional Knowledge, and Subsistence Protocol, and the SSC's climate scenario recommendations.*
- *Expanding the Council's precautionary management strategy to account for the cumulative and unpredictable impacts of climate change on marine ecosystems could include stricter measures for bycatch reduction, habitat protection, and adaptive responses to climate shocks, drawing on the SSC's recommendations for flexibility and stock resilience.*
- *Prioritizing protection of benthic habitats through time/area closures and uncertainty buffers can be accomplished by developing strategies that reduce ocean stress, support vulnerable species, and promote ecosystem resilience, aligning with the SSC's emphasis on adapting management practices in response to climate variability.*
- *By initiating the PEIS the outcomes from the Climate Scenarios Workshop and the SCS8 discussion can be incorporated. This PEIS will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of federal fisheries in a changing climate. It will include meaningful engagement with Tribes and Tribal organizations, integrating Traditional Knowledge into the analysis.*
- *The Council could develop a policy grounded in Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management (EBFM) with specific goals and objectives for climate resilience across all federal fisheries in the North Pacific. The policy will include clear management actions, a detailed implementation plan, milestones, targets, and metrics to assess progress, transforming the policy into a core component of the Council's regulatory framework.*

## D2 Motion - Climate Reports

- *Engagement and equity can be improved to enhance public engagement to ensure diverse representation, with a focus on Indigenous and subsistence perspectives. Create pathways for underrepresented voices, including Tribes and coastal communities, to actively participate in discussions on fishery management and climate resilience, ensuring alignment with SSC recommendations to include local knowledge and socioeconomic data.*
- *The AP encourages Council staff to engage with the Alaska Fishery Science Center (AFSC) to incorporate climate synthesis information into agenda items, ensuring scientific insights are effectively integrated into decision-making processes.*

### **Motion 1 - Pelagic Trawl Motion**

The AP recommends that the Council prioritize scheduling of the Pelagic Trawl Gear Innovation: Discussion Paper agenda item to allow for meaningful discussion on the potential to limit seafloor contact and the review of options for changes to the performance standard.

*Motion failed: 9/11*

### **Motion 2 - Chum Salmon Outreach**

The AP recommends the Council prioritize Chum Salmon outreach and engagement activities and accept potential community invitations in preparation for the February 2025 Chum Salmon Bycatch meeting.

*Motion passed unanimously: 20/0*

### **Motion 3 - Pot Cod LAPP rationalization**

The AP recommends prioritizing the Pot Cod LAPP which is currently in the “batter’s box” and initiating a cooperative rationalization program for the GOA trawl pollock and cod fisheries.

*Motion passed: 15/5*

### **Motion 4**

Move to approve the June 2024 minutes.

*Motion passed unanimously: 20/0*

***Rationale in support of Motion #2***

- *There are several wide-reaching engagement opportunities that Council members and staff can attend, either formally or informally. We recommend accepting invitations that may be coming from tribes or tribal organizations to attend their tribal convenings. To-date these invitations have not been extended so this comment is not meant to signal that staff has declined invitations. For example, Tanana Chiefs Conference hosts bi-annual conventions that bring together the tribal leaders from Interior Alaska, primarily from the Yukon River. It is recommended that Council members and staff seek out and attend these regularly scheduled meetings to build communication pathways and effective two-way engagement.*
- *Similarly, Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) Annual Convention takes place Oct 17-19, 2024 and is the largest representative annual gathering in the United States of Native peoples. There is also a AFN Subsistence Workshop at the Tribal Unity gathering on Oct 16, 2024, which is open to the general public with online registration. These convenings around subsistence are excellent learning opportunities for Council members and staff to better understand the current situation with subsistence resources in Alaska and how the lack of resources is affecting subsistence ways of life.*
- *There is a lot of knowledge sharing, networking, and relationship building that occurs at these tribal convenings which will be invaluable to the Programmatic Evaluation process and engagement. Relationship building is a key component of effective communication, outreach, and engagement and building these relationships now will serve the process well moving forward*
- *An AP member recommended the Council consider reestablishing the Community Engagement Committee to support outreach efforts, facilitate cross-cultural communication, and provide a platform for discussing contentious issues like chum salmon bycatch*

***Rationale in support of Motion #3***

- *Both fisheries have been asking for improved management through a cooperative rationalization program for many years and under today's economic environment and with the uncertainty of markets and climate change, participants believe they need improvement management.*
- *Rationalization programs have proven that ending races for fish improves safety, minimizes bycatch, and improves fishery stability. We should continue prioritizing these programs.*
- *The GOA trawl fisheries were promised cooperative management tools when their Chinook hard caps were put into place in 2012, but have never received that program. The closure of the CGOA pollock fishery due to exceeding the Chinook cap in September 2024, which has caused extreme economic hardship to vessels, processors, and the community of Kodiak, could have been prevented if the management tools available through a cooperative program had been given to participants.*
- *Development of a LAPP for these sectors is in line with the Alaska Bycatch Review Task Force and State of Alaska Fishery Priorities*
- *While these two fisheries are in different stages (the Cod LAPP is in the batters box and there is no current action for GOA trawl) - if the Council chooses to move forward with one or both recommendations they could do so under separate motions/actions*
- *The joint motion was put forward as a signal of support across gear types and fisheries*



***Rationale In Opposition to Motion #3***

- *Though some members of the AP appreciate the intent of this motion as well as the collaboration to create it, these are very different issues. Other issues with a lot of public comment were not addressed or voted down at this meeting and it is concerning to introduce very heavy analytical tasks with too many items already pending in the “items not yet scheduled” section of the three meeting outlook.*
- *AP members noted support of both aspects of the motion, but considered that the scope of each would be large and struggled with both being combined into a single motion. Both aspects of this motion are important to industry, to both harvester and processor needs, and have the potential to lead to more effective and efficient prosecution of the respective fisheries. However, the actions suggested support different fleets with out a clear overlap, and so would likely be separated were the Council to take action on either at the current meeting.*