The AP recommends the Council select Alternative 1 and take no further action.

Motion passed 19-1

Rationale in Favor:

- The impetus for this action was driven by low cod TACs and reduced rollovers from other sectors. It was not driven by a sudden influx of new capacity entering the fishery. Five vessels participated each year in 2018, 2019 & 2020 (4 vessels would qualify under Alt. 2, Option 2). In the 2021 A-season, just 3 vessels participated. Without any intervention from the Council, the number of vessels participating has already been reduced by 40%.

- Cod dependent operators are being forced to make difficult decisions and modify their business plans in light of low TACs and reduced rollovers, but removing endorsements from some of the LLPs in the pot CP sector will not solve these problems.

- If cod TACs rebound, the purpose and need for this action would no longer be relevant and the 4 qualifying vessels (under Alt. 2, Option 2) would receive a substantial economic benefit from this action. If cod TACs continue to decrease, the fishery will still be condensed. One vessel could have easily prosecuted the entire fishery the last 3 years.

- The BSAI pot cod CP sector allocation under Amendment 85 was never intended to fully support vessels that did not participate in other fisheries. Instead, it has been utilized by some operators that ran out of opportunities in the crab or longline cod fisheries.

- There is currently nothing that prevents a coop from forming in this sector.

- At least one vessel that was actively participating in the fishery before this action was initiated would be excluded under Alt. 2, Option 2. By definition, this LLP should not be considered latent.

- The total net benefit of this action is limited. If Alternative 2 had been in place for 2020, it would have provided approximately one additional fishing day for each of the 4 qualifying vessels under Option 2. With further TAC reductions for 2021, the net benefit will be even less.