

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dan Hull, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Executive Director

Telephone (907) 271-2809



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

Fax (907) 271-2817

Visit our website: <http://www.npfmc.org>

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

December 8-12, 2015

Anchorage, AK

The following members were present for all or part of the meetings (absent ~~stricken~~):

Ruth Christiansen (Chair)	Jeff Kauffman	Joel Peterson
Kurt Cochran	Mitch Kilborn	Theresa Peterson
John Crowley	Alexus Kwachka	Sinclair Wilt
Jerry Downing	Craig Lowenberg	Jeff Stephan
Jeff Farvour	Chuck McCallum	Matt Upton (Co-Vice Chair)
Art Nelson	Dan Donich	Anne Vanderhoeven
John Gruver	Paddy O'Donnell	Ernie Weiss (Co-Vice Chair)

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved without objection.

C2 BSAI Groundfish Harvest Specifications

Beginning with a substitute motion that carried 17-3:

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2016 and 2017 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs for groundfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands as shown in Attachment 1. An amendment to reduce the pollock TAC by 30,208 mt to increase the Atka mackerel TAC by 19,500 mt and the Pacific ocean perch TAC by 10,708 mt passed 11-9. A second amendment to reduce the Arrowtooth flounder TAC by 10,000 mt and the Rock sole TAC by 20,000 mt to increase the pollock TAC by 30,000 mt passed 15-5.

The final motion as amended passed 19-1.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- The increase in the BSAI pollock TAC (over 2015), supported by the observed increase in pollock abundance, will allow for increased deliveries and benefits to shore-based western Alaska communities.
- Status quo funding of target species for the Amendment 80 species was not done given that a percentage of those species continues to go unharvested in spite of the additional tools provided to the sector that were intended to increase catches of target species.
- The amendment resulting in an increase to the Atka mackerel and Pacific ocean perch TACs (funded from the pollock TAC) helped return those fisheries to historical levels prior to implementation of Stellar Sea Lion restrictions. Additionally, these are two of the cleanest bycatch fisheries targeted by the Amendment 80 sector.
- The amendment to reduce the Arrowtooth flounder and Rock sole TACs (in order to fund the pollock TAC) specifically addressed these two flatfish species because they generally have higher bycatch amounts than the other flatfish targets.

- Both of the amendments passed were thought to be responsive to public comment and achieve a more equitable balance between the numerous impacts among sectors and stakeholders that results from TAC setting.

Rationale in Opposition of the final motion:

- Using the TAC sheet approved in the Substitute Motion should be considered problematic because of its single species focus. It is more appropriate to begin discussions with status quo from 2015 and make modifications to species TACs as deemed appropriate.
- A dramatic increase in the pollock TAC (approximately 65,000 mt before approved amendment) would result in an approximate 20% reduction in revenue to the Amendment 80 fleet. The Amendment 80 sector harvests many different target species such that the TAC of certain species will likely always go unharvested. While flatfish flexibility is a tool to help minimize the underharvest of certain target species, this tool only allows for a one-for-one trade and does not result in the sector getting additional target flatfish.

The AP recommends the Council rollover PSC limit amounts for 2016 and 2017 in Tables 14 and 17 as shown in [Attachment 2](#). Table 16 from the SSC was amended to reduce the pollock/Atka mackerel halibut PSC limits by a total of 13 mt (resulting in 200 mt), with 8 mt going to Yellowfin sole (resulting in 150 mt) and a 5 mt increase for Pacific cod (resulting in 391 mt); also shown in Attachment 2.

The amendment passed 18-2. The final motion as amended passed 15-5.

Rationale in Support of the motion:

- The movement of halibut within the BSAI trawl limited access fisheries, including the increase to the Pacific cod halibut mortality amount, recognizes the efforts of that sector as they operate under a significant PSC reduction.

The AP recommends the Council approve the attached table ([Attachment 3](#)) of flatfish reserves based upon the recommended 2016-2017 TACs for flathead sole, rock sole and yellowfin sole. Further, the AP recommends the Council approve the 2016 BSAI Groundfish SAFE report.

Motion passed 17-0.

The AP recommends the following as first steps towards addressing the biological, economic and social issues highlighted by the Council at their October 2015 meeting.

1. The annual BSAI groundfish specifications will be determined taking into consideration groundfish species bycatch rates, the potential effects of groundfish harvest on directed halibut fisheries, and the health of the halibut resource recognizing a shared responsibility with the IPHC to maintain the viability of halibut commercial, sport and personal use fisheries, and the communities dependent on them.
2. Further, in order to continue minimizing bycatch, the Council will receive reports from Amendment 80 participants annually to assess the adequacy of the Amendment 80 cooperatives' bycatch savings plans and voluntary agreements, as well as actual halibut bycatch savings, up to the annual December specifications setting as final species specifications for the following season are determined.

- ~~3. Recommend to the Council that halibut be added to the list of Ecosystem Considerations as part of the SAFE document, reported to the Council in the annual specifications process.~~
- ~~4. The Plan Team and SSC will review the provided model as a potential tool for the NPFMC future halibut and groundfish management.~~

An amendment to replace items 3 and 4 above with the following passed 20-0.

3. Recommend to the Council that halibut be added as an appendix to the list of Ecosystem Considerations as part of the SAFE document, reported to the Council in the annual specifications process.
4. The AP asks the Council to refer the provided model to the Plan Team and SSC to evaluate this and other possible tools **in a discussion paper** for their potential use in future halibut and groundfish management.

*An amendment to add the language in **bold and underlined** to item 4 passed 20-0.*

The final motion as amended passed 15-5.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- Needs to be recognized that the Amendment 80 sector has made tremendous strides and achievements towards reducing halibut bycatch, which can be seen, in part, by the IPHC blue line harvest recommendations for 2016.
- The reduction of halibut bycatch is a Council priority with the practicability (e.g., those measures that can be taken by sectors to reduce halibut bycatch and also minimize the economic impacts to the groundfish fisheries) of achieving such as a key focus.
- Public testimony identified a potential tool that could be used as part of the TAC-setting process to help achieve the goal of practicability where additional halibut savings could result in greater overall value to the groundfish fisheries. This could in turn support the directed halibut fisheries and help conserve the halibut resource.
- The MSA provides for bycatch considerations as part of the annual specifications process and Council policy should assess savings of halibut as a consideration in the annual TAC setting process going forward.
- Given the many aspects in achieving equity for all parties, this recommendation is responsive to National Standards 1 (Optimum Yield), 4 (Allocations should be Fair and Equitable), 8 (Community Participation), and 9 (Minimize Bycatch to the Extent Practicable).
- The amendment specifying that halibut be included as an appendix was done to address issues raised related to the authorities of both the IPHC and the Council.
- The recommendations may merit further consideration. The amendment made to item 4 was done in response to procedural questions and concerns raised so that exploration of the proposed changes to TAC setting and use of the proposed model will be able to be fleshed out for future consideration.

Rationale in Opposition of the final motion:

- As this was the first time the proposed model was presented for consideration, many of the assumptions and calculations that went in to its development and outputs are unclear (e.g., what are the assumptions that went into calculation of bycatch rates given that differing vessel

types and sectors will have varying rates for the same bycatch species). Additionally, it is unclear what the potential predictive elements/capabilities of the proposed model are.

- The recommendations are premature at this time given that the multiple other related agenda items under consideration by the Council that still need to be further developed and fleshed out themselves.
- The BSAI TAC setting process should not be primarily driven by consideration of PSC; therefore, tasking of this item is not appropriate under the Specifications agenda item and would be more appropriate as part of the Staff Tasking agenda item.

C3 GOA Groundfish Harvest Specifications

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2016 and 2017 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs for groundfish in the Gulf of Alaska as shown in Attachment 4. The TACs for both GOA Pacific cod and pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHL fisheries as shown in the C3 action memo (Pacific cod and pollock adjustments).

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2016 and 2017 GOA halibut limits and apportionments, apportionment of halibut PSC trawl limits in the GOA between shallow and deep-water species, and apportionments of “other hook and line fisheries” annual halibut PSC allowance between hook and line gear catcher vessels and catcher processors contained in the C3 action memo (PSC limits and Seasonal apportionments).

The AP recommends the Council approve the BSAI and GOA Halibut DMRs as recommended by the SSC Plan Team for in-season management in 2016-2017. *Amendment to change the stricken language above, passed 20-0.*

The AP recommends the Council approve the 2016 GOA Groundfish SAFE report.

Motion, with all components, passed 20-0.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- Recognizing that the recommended TACs result in room under the GOA OY cap, the amounts recommended reflect realistic expectations of harvest and also account for amounts necessary to support the GHL fisheries.
- Until there is more information and a broader analysis to support a change, the AP agreed with the SSC’s recommendation to use the status quo method for determining halibut DMRs.

C4 GOA Chinook Salmon PSC Reapportionment

The AP recommends the Council take final action and adopt Alternative 2, Option 4, as amended below:

Alternative 2 – Allow NMFS to reapportion unused Chinook salmon PSC between the GOA Pollock and non-pollock sectors based on criteria established for inseason reapportionments (examples in regulations at 679.20). ~~Existing reapportionment procedures from the Rockfish Program catcher vessel to the non-Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector would not be modified.~~ *[An amendment to strike the last sentence passed 20-0.]*

Option 4. To increase flexibility and options for NMFS Alaska region to manage the different catcher vessel non-pollock Chinook salmon PSC caps, revise the Rockfish Program Chinook salmon PSC reapportionment to read as follows:

“If, on October 1 of each year, the Regional Administrator determines that more than 150 Chinook salmon are available in the Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector Chinook salmon PSC limit, the Regional Administrator may reapportion Chinook salmon PSC available to the Rockfish Program catcher vessel except for the 150 Chinook salmon to the non-Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector Chinook salmon PSC limit.”

The final motion, as amended, passed 15-5.

Rationale in Support of final motion:

- The recommended Alternative and Option are directly responsive to both public testimony and the purpose and need statement adopted by the Council for preventing unnecessary fishery closures and mitigating potential negative economic impacts to communities and the groundfish fleet.
- Under this recommendation, NMFS has full control over any Chinook PSC reapportionment. As was noted in the analysis, options that provide the greatest flexibility will work to best meet the goals of the action.
- The flexibility gained under this recommendation will help to alleviate some of the potential consequences that result from the inaccuracies of basket sampling and its extrapolations.
- NMFS has an established reputation for conservatively managing fisheries that operate under PSC limits. It is anticipated that only small amounts of Chinook will be used to open a fishery in order to support efforts of achieving OY.
- This action is not considered to be a long-term fix but will help prevent events like those that occurred previously, which necessitated emergency action.
- New information is available from recent GOA Chinook salmon genetic sampling that has occurred since implementation of Amendment 97 that was unable to be included and considered as part of that previous action.

Rationale in Opposition of the final motion:

- Maintaining the integrity of the goals established under Amendment 97, including minimizing Chinook salmon PSC to the extent practicable, should be considered as part of this action.
- The Chinook salmon PSC cap established under Amendment 97 was based slightly above the long-term average PSC taken by the groundfish fleet; therefore, action should not be taken that would negate the benefits to the salmon resource (regardless of origin) that comes from that PSC amount.
- Without the restrictions offered by the inclusion of Option 5, there is concern that the Chinook PSC limit established under Amendment 97 will be undone.

The following amendment to add Option 5 failed 9-11.

Option 5. Only salmon allow a sector to receive a reapportionment that does not exceed 35% of the sectors initial Chinook PSC limit during a calendar year.

Prior to the specific amendments noted above, the following substitute motion failed 9-11.

The AP recommends the Council select the following Alternative and options for final action:

Alternative 2 – Allow NMFS to reapportion unused Chinook salmon PSC between the GOA Pollock and non-pollock sectors based on criteria established for inseason reapportionments (examples in regulations at 679.20). ~~Existing reapportionment procedures from the Rockfish Program catcher vessel to the non-Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector would not be modified.~~

Option 3. Prohibit the reapportionment of Chinook salmon PSC from catcher vessel sectors to the non-pollock catcher/processor sector.

Option 4. To increase flexibility and options for NMFS Alaska region to manage the different catcher vessel non-pollock Chinook salmon PSC caps, revise the Rockfish Program Chinook salmon PSC reapportionment to read as follows:

“If, on October 1 of each year, the Regional Administrator determines that more than 150 Chinook salmon are available in the Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector Chinook salmon PSC limit, the Regional Administrator may reapportion Chinook salmon PSC available to the Rockfish Program catcher vessel except for the 150 Chinook salmon to the non-Rockfish Program catcher vessel sector Chinook salmon PSC limit.”

Option 5. Only allow a sector to receive a reapportionment that does not exceed **10%** of the sectors initial Chinook salmon PSC limit during a calendar year.

Minority Report: The minority believed Alternative 2, option 5 with a 10% reapportionment limit provides necessary controls to limit the amount of salmon which could be reapportioned into a sector and maintain the integrity of the previous established PSC limits. The limits that were established under Amendment 97 were arrived at through a comprehensive analytical and public process that should be recognized. The language in the Final Rule to establish the limit of 7,500 clearly outlines the necessity of the action to minimize the catch of Chinook salmon to the extent practicable in the GOA non-pollock trawl fisheries. While some apportionment ability is warranted to provide the fleet the opportunity to adjust to the restrictions, this should not be an action which provides unlimited access to the Pollock PSC limits which were set far above historical averages. [Signed by: Theresa Peterson, Jeff Farvour, Chuck McCallum, Jeff Stephens, Daniel Donich, Alexis Kwachka, Art Nelson, Joel Peterson, Jeff Kauffman]

C5 Charter Halibut Management Measures

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following management measures for the 2016 charter halibut fishery in Area 2C and Area 3A, based on initial reference (blue line) allocations of 1,771,000 lbs in Area 3A and 847,000 lbs in Area 2C, resulting from the IPHC interim meeting.

Area 3A recommendations: (projection is 1.799 mlbs, 28,000 over the 1.771 mlbs)

- Two-fish daily bag limit
- Maximum size of one of the two fish is 28”
- One trip per day (use of each charter halibut permit is limited to one charter halibut fishing trip per calendar day)
- 4-fish annual limit
- Prohibition on halibut charter fishing on Wednesdays, all year

Include a requirement to record halibut on the back of the license or harvest record card as an enforcement mechanism for the annual limit (this was not in place last year).

If the final Area 3A FCEY is halfway between the 2015 FCEY and the 2016 blue line, it would equate to a charter allocation of 1.84 mlbs. In this case, increase the annual limit to 5 fish (projection is 1.833 mlbs). If the Area 3A charter allocation is the same as 2015 (1.89 mlbs), increase the maximum size of one of the two fish to 29" and increase to a 6 fish annual limit (projection is 1.891 mlbs).

Area 2C recommendations: (projection is 854,000 lbs, 7,000 lbs over the blue line of 847,000 lbs)

- One-fish daily bag limit
- Reverse slot limit of U42" – O80" (must be ≤42" or ≥80")

If the final charter allocation is sufficiently higher than the "blue line" to accommodate a change in the reverse slot limit, adjust the size of the lower limit upward to meet the allocation. If the final charter allocation is below the "blue line", the first restriction added would be a 5-fish annual limit, and if further restrictions are needed, adjust the size of the lower limit downward to meet the allocation.

The regulations for GAF remain the same.

The AP requests that Council consider expanding membership of the Charter Management Implementation Committee to include one or more persons who would be identified as a charter angler. *[An amendment to add this language passed 20-0.]*

The final motion, as amended, passed 20-0.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- For Area 3A, the recommended combination of measures are those that were recommended by the Charter Implementation Committee as the best way to keep the charter sector below the Catch Sharing Plan allocation for 2016. They fall within the confidence interval predicted by ADF&G to keep the charter sector in both areas at or under their allocation.
- The combined effects of the recommended measures fall within 1% of the IPHC blue line for 2016.
- Due to an oversight last year, the recording requirement to immediately record the harvest on the back of the license was not implemented as part of the annual limit measure so it is intended that this requirement be provided to the IPHC and part of the final regulations by explicitly including it in this motion. This enforcement tool should be sufficient incentive to ensure a high degree of compliance with the annual limit. A recording requirement would increase compliance and improve enforcement capability.
- For the day of the week closure, this recommendation assumes the same level of reduction as was achieved with a Thursday closure with a 4% additional reduction by changing that day to Wednesday and extending throughout the entire year, which was determined from the analysis.
- For Area 2C, the recommended combination of measures are those that were recommended by the majority of Area 2C Charter Implementation Committee members as the best way to keep the charter sector below their allocation in 2016. Table 7 in the analysis shows the projected effect of the recommended reverse slot limit.

- The majority of the Area 2C charter fleet believe there is an advantage to keeping the same type of management measure in place (reverse slot limit) from one year to the next.
- Regarding GAF, the last sentence of the motion confirms that the Guided Angler Fish regulations are not changed by this motion, similar to last year. GAF does not count toward the charter allocation, as it is commercial halibut IFQ that is leased by an individual charter operator annually such that it continues to be come off the commercial IFQ allocation. To be consistent, these management measures should not apply to GAF.
- Some concern was voiced that a requirement to record the size of halibut along with the inclusion of the requirement to record halibut on the back of the license or harvest record card as an enforcement mechanism for the annual limit. A requirement to record the size of halibut would further strengthen the enforcement intent of this provision.
- Some concern was also voiced on the amendment for additional members to the Charter Halibut Implementation Committee and how too many members may take away from the effectiveness of the committee as it is currently functioning.

C6 Charter Recreational Quota Entity

The AP recommends the Council approve the following changes to the Purpose and Need Statement and Alternatives, Elements, and Options to be incorporated into another initial review draft analysis. [The changes shown in **bold/underlined** or ~~strikeout~~ were in the original motion as presented to the AP. Any changes shown with shaded **bold** or ~~strikeout~~ reflect amendments made by AP during deliberation].

Purpose and Need Statement

Alaska's guided halibut anglers have seen recent increases in regulatory restrictions due to declining halibut stocks and guided recreational allocations. ~~There is currently no sector-wide mechanism to shift allocation between the commercial and guided recreational sectors. The current provision provided under the Catch Sharing Plan to temporarily transfer allocation known as GAF (Guided Angler Fish), may not be sufficient to ensure long-term planning and stability in regulations for all guided anglers.~~ A market-based mechanism for the guided halibut recreational sector may be an effective means to supplement their annual allocations. Allowing an RQE (Recreational Quota Entity) to hold **a limited amount of** commercial halibut QS on behalf of guided recreational halibut anglers under a "willing seller and willing buyer" approach may result in less restrictive annual harvest measures for guided recreational anglers **in times of low halibut abundance**, while complying with total halibut removals under the guided halibut catch limits determined by the International Pacific Halibut Commission **and Catch Share Plan allocations established by the Council**. The guided recreational halibut allocation under the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan would be combined with the halibut quota share held by the RQE to determine the annually adjusted total guided halibut allocation. The total allocation would be the basis for the determination of appropriate management measures for the guided halibut sector each year. **The intent is to consider such a mechanism without undermining the goals of the halibut IFQ Program or significant adverse impacts to other halibut sectors.**

[Amendment to insert shaded language passed, 18-0].

Alternative 1. No Action

Alternative 2. Establish a Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) as a qualified **non-profit** entity to purchase and hold commercial halibut ~~catcher vessel~~ QS for use by the guided halibut sector.

[Amendment to remove insertion of catcher vessel and CV throughout the entire motion carried, 19-0].

Element 1. Number of entities

- Option 1. Two entities, one for each IPHC Regulatory Area 2C and 3A
- Option 2. One entity with two area quota pools, Area 2C and Area 3A

Element 2. Restrictions on transfers. Two-way transfers are allowed. Quota class and block designation is retained if the quota is transferred back to the commercial sector. (Options below are not mutually exclusive)

- Option 1. No restrictions
- Option 2. Annual limit on transfers to the RQE in each regulatory area (Area 2C and 3A)
 - Suboption 1. 30% – 50% of the average amount of commercial ~~CV~~ QS transferred in each area during the previous five years (e.g., the Area 2C transfer limit is based on 30% – 50% of the average amount of commercial QS transferred in Area 2C in the previous five years).
 - Suboption 2. 1% - 5% of commercial ~~CV~~ QS in each area **(2015)** ~~(based on a 5-year average)~~
- Option 3. Total (cumulative) limit on amount held by RQE by regulatory area (Area 2C and 3A)
 - ~~Suboption 1. 10% – 40% **5% – 25% 15%** of commercial ~~CV~~ QS **units (2015)** based on five-year average~~
 - ~~Suboption 2. 10% – 40% **5% – 25% 15%** of each class of ~~CV~~ QS **units (2015)** based on five-year average~~
 - Suboption: RQE acquisitions are considered part of GAF limits by area: 10% Area 2C, 15% Area 3A of area quota share holdings each year. Additional subdivision of GAF pool between individuals and RQE may be specified by the Council.**

[Motion to strike Suboptions 1 and 2 and replace with language contained in the single suboption, passed 15-5.]

Minority Report on above Suboption: It is important to consider leaving in a range of options under another initial review analysis on the Charter RQE program. If the charter sector is unable to transfer enough quota into the RQE, the RQE will not serve its intended purpose of increasing allocation, especially in Area 2C. Combining GAF and RQE percentages was not anticipated under the original RQE program intent; GAF is a temporary increase and RQE is more of a permanent increase. [Signed by: Daniel Donich, Art Nelson, Paddy O'Donnell, Ernie Weiss]

~~Suboption 3. Transfers to mirror current GAF limits by area: 10% (Area 2C) and 15% (Area 3A) of area QS holdings each year.~~

- Option 4. Prohibit purchase of D class commercial quota share by the RQE **(in either or both areas)**

Element 3. Setting of annual charter management measures. Use RQE quota share holdings as of October 1 each year as the basis to estimate IFQ pounds to add to the estimated guided recreational allocation under the catch sharing plan for the upcoming year. This amount

must be maintained for the following fishing year. This estimated combined allocation would be used to recommend the guided recreational harvest measures for the following year. The procedural process steps and timeline would remain unchanged.

Option 1. If the RQE holdings provide a charter harvest opportunity greater than the unguided recreational bag limit in either area, NMFS would not issue annual IFQ in excess of the amount needed for the charter sector to obtain the unguided recreational bag limit to the RQE for that area. Unallocated RQE IFQ would be reallocated as follows: back to the quota share class and area in which it originated. [Amendment to add language, passed 19-0]

~~**Suboption 1.** Equally to all D Class quota shareholders (proportional to QS holdings)~~

~~**Suboption 2.** Equally to all catcher vessel quota shareholders (proportional to QS holdings)~~

Element 4: Limit on use of RQE funds

Option: RQE funds are limited in their use to acquisition of commercial halibut quota; aquisition of charter halibut permits; halibut conservation/research; ~~promotion of the halibut resource;~~ and administrative costs.

[Amendment to strike a portion of the option above under Element 4, passed 17-2].

Element 5: Any IFQ management fees as charged by NMFS and any observer fees as charged by NMFS associated with the IFQ in the commercial fishery would follow with the IFQ used in the charter fishery. [Amendment to add Element 5, passed 19-0].

Alternative 3. ~~Retirement~~ **Removal** of “latent” Charter Halibut Permits. Threshold for determining a latent CHP:

[Amendment to revise language of Alternative 3, passed 19-0].

Option 1. The CHP has been fished less than 50 angler days in the previous 5 years.

Option 2. A CHP that has not been used by the CHP holder in the previous 3 years.

Alternative 4. Establish annual renewal process for CHP holders.

[Amendment to add Alternative 4, passed 19-0].

The Council is requested to include a range of Alternatives, Elements and Options that would seek to implement a more accurate, formal and precise catch accounting protocol for an RQE. [Amendment to insert this additional language, failed 9-9].

The Council is requested to consider, evaluate, analyze and compare the impacts of the RQE Alternatives as they modify the originally adopted objectives, purpose and needs of the commercial halibut IFQ program as passed by the Council in 1982, and as embodied in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) for the Individual Fishing Quota Management Alternative for Fixed Gear Sablefish and Halibut Fisheries (September 15, 1992), and as described in the original Final Rule (58 FR 59375 11-9-1993).

[Amendment to insert this additional language, failed 4-14].

Final motion, as fully amended, passed 17-1.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- Deliberations and public testimony identified many aspects of an RQE that warrant further analysis, which necessitate the need for a second initial review analysis.
- Under the concept of allowing an RQE to purchase QS, there is no need to limit or restrict purchase to B or C class shares only. If capable, an RQE should have access to A class QS.
- The aggregate amount of QS, both GAF and RQE, allowed to transfer between the commercial and the charter sector should be bounded by and consistent with the individual limits established under the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (10% in Area 2C and 15% in Area 3A).
- RQE purchases of 10% to 40%, as originally put forth, when considered in addition to the charter sector allocations and current GAF limits established under the Halibut Catch Sharing Plan, would result in cumulative impacts to the QS market, processor viability, and availability and cost of QS for entry level fishermen.
- Under Element 4, application to the general promotion of the halibut resource is overly broad and should not be an intended function of the RQE.

Rationale in Opposition of the finale motion:

- Establishment of an RQE will likely result in an upward shift to the price of halibut QS, which would further exacerbate the impediment costs for entry level fishermen.

C8 Halibut Management Framework

A. Objectives

The AP recommends the Council add the following objectives to the Halibut Management Framework, all of which are consistent with the Council's action in June and the genesis of the Framework:

1. Achieve a fair and equitable balance between directed halibut users and halibut bycatch users;
2. Protect and rebuild the halibut stock, with particular attention to preserving the "spawning capital" across a range of abundance levels;
3. Provide for the sustained participation of historic participants and fishery dependent communities; and
4. Minimize the impacts of one sector on another.

B. Stakeholder participation

Once objectives are identified by the Council, the process of developing potential Council action to meet the management objectives may make use of an ad hoc advisory or working group. The working group could include representation from all halibut user groups potentially affected by the objectives, and may also include science advisors, as needed, to aid in the identification of research to support the development of the objectives. The Council could staff the working group as needed, and include the staff person identified as the IPHC liaison.

C. Research priorities

As a first step in focusing research, the Council may request the SSC to meet jointly with IPHC and NMFS scientists as soon as possible to review and prioritize the overall research needs listed in the draft Framework, and provide the results to the Council.

Consider how to gather further research on the following priorities:

- **Natural mortality variability with age/size/density to understand the effects of bycatch, wastage, and discards on the spawning biomass.**
- **Migration of halibut between areas and associated implications.**
- **Discard mortality rates in all fisheries, as well as overall bycatch estimation in all fisheries.**

Amendment to add bolded text above passed 13-3.

D. Council and IPHC interaction

1. The Council and IPHC may convene joint meetings, preferably in February.
2. The Council may establish a Joint Halibut Committee with the IPHC, made up of two or four members from each body. The Committee would meet twice annually.
3. The Council may identify a staff member as a permanent liaison to the IPHC.
4. The Council may establish a permanent section in the Council agenda for a Commission report to keep the Council apprised of IPHC issues and initiatives.

Final motion, as amended, passed 15-1.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- The identified objectives and areas of focus are consistent with public testimony.
- Reductions to BSAI halibut PSC limits in June were the first step in an iterative process to reduce halibut bycatch in the BSAI groundfish fisheries.
- To help shape the Framework into an effective planning tool, specific management objectives were identified. These objectives are broad enough to be applicable in both the BSAI and the Gulf of Alaska, yet narrow enough to provide meaningful direction when prioritizing research needs or considering a management action.

Rationale in Opposition to the final motion:

- The objectives are focused more on subjective management and policy issues instead of the important biological/scientific issues around halibut that need to be further explored.

C9 Biomass-based BSAI Halibut PSC Limits

The AP recommends the Council request staff to prepare an expanded discussion paper to guide development of a purpose and need statement and clear alternatives and options for development of an analysis on abundance-based PSC limits for halibut in the BSAI. ~~Recommend the Council initiate an analysis on the development of an abundance-based PSC limit for halibut in the BSAI.~~

Amendment to replace stricken language with bolded language above passed 9-7.

The process should result in coordinated management policies that may be used by both the Council and the IPHC in managing halibut bycatch and directed halibut fisheries. This approach would require that a relative harvest intensity be assigned to each sector, resulting in an allocation or catch sharing plan.

Alternatives may include:

1. Status Quo. Fixed PSC limits.
2. PSC limits based on a measure or index of the abundance of the halibut resource.

Option 1: Base harvest intensity assignment for PSC use on yield expressed in pounds, the current process.

Option 2: Base harvest intensity assignment for PSC use on impact to stock, the Spawner Per Recruit (SPR) approach.

Methodology:

1. Use empirical estimates of abundance based on fisheries independent surveys and a harvest control rule for setting BSAI PSC limits.
2. Use model-based estimates of biomass and apportionment along with a harvest control rule for setting PSC limits in each of the IPHC Regulatory Areas.
3. Integrate bycatch encounter catch rate data from commercial fisheries into the model-based estimates in option 3.

The index should use both the NMFS trawl survey and commercial CPUEs from the trawl and factory longline fleet.

Final motion as amended passed 12-4.

Rationale in Support of the final motion:

- Fixed PSC limits are not effective during times of low halibut abundances. It is important to move ahead with efforts to establish abundance-based PSC limits.
- A spawner per recruit approach to halibut management could help with the stock's recovery.
- The utility of an abundance based approach needs to be more fully developed through an expanded discussion paper.

Rationale in Opposition of the final motion:

- Multiple models for determining an abundance-based approach to halibut PSC limits should be solicited and considered.
- Any abundance based models for halibut should try to consider a range of options for determining natural mortality whenever that choice can influence the outcome.
- Halibut PSC limits have been recently reduced and the Amendment 80 sector has also adopted a halibut avoidance plan, both these measures should be allowed time to see if they can work before instituting another approach.

The AP recommends the Council explore how they and the IPHC may shut down the directed halibut fishery, by area, when other fish species taken by the directed halibut fishery approaches its OFL. [Amendment to include language failed 7-9].

The AP recommends the Council consider implications of the accuracy of an abundance based cap given that there is not full enumeration and accounting of halibut catches by both the directed and bycatch users. [Amendment to include language failed 5-11].

D2 Halibut Retention in Sablefish Pots

The AP received a staff report on the summary discussion paper related to the Council's previous action on Halibut Retention in Sablefish Pots.

D3 Area 4 Halibut Leasing Options for CDQ Vessels

The AP recommends that the Council move forward with development of a problem statement and analysis of regulation changes to allow CDQ entities in Area 4 to lease Area 4 IFQ on an annual basis, only when the halibut FCEYs in Area 4 falls below threshold levels.

The threshold levels in Area 4B and Area 4CDE should be separately established, from a range of threshold level options for each area:

1. 1 million pounds
2. 1.2 million pounds
3. 1.5 million pounds

The Council would establish a control date of December 15, 2015, to prevent speculation. Area 4 IFQ purchased after that date would not be eligible for leasing to Area 4 CDQ entities for (options: 3 years, 4 years, or 5 years) after the date of purchase.

Area 4D IFQ under the lease agreement could be fished in Area 4E.

Only CDQ member vessels 46 feet LOA or less would be eligible to harvest the leased CDQ quota, and vessels would have to comply with IFQ use restrictions.

As part of the analysis, potential impacts on displaced crew due to leasing should be examined.

[Amendment to add bolded language passed 15-0].

Final motion as amended passed 14-1.

Rationale in Support of final motion:

- The idea of establishing Area 4 CDQ leasing options was brought forward during the June 2015 Council meeting as a result of the action taken on BSAI halibut PSC limits.
- Concerns were raised on the potential for this action to possibly undermine the goals of the Halibut IFQ program.

E1 Staff Tasking

The AP recommends the Council move forward with a discussion paper on non-transferable charter halibut permits with the following points of emphasis:

- A permit renewal process every year;
- If a charter permit isn't renewed that year, it dies;
- If non-transferable permits should or should not be leased to another person; and
- When the person that a permit is issued to dies, the permit dies.

The discussion and analysis of non-transferable permits should come in conjunction with the latent charter halibut permit action and move forward ahead of action related to the charter halibut RQE.

Motion passed 15-0.

Rationale **in Support** of the final motion:

- This recommendation was made as a result of questions and concerns raised during action taken on the Charter Halibut RQE program.
- Issues associated with charter halibut permits need to be addressed prior to other actions that would modify the program.

ATTACHMENT 1 -- AP Minutes, December 2015

AP recommendations for BSAI Groundfish TAC (SSC recommendations for OFL and ABC, change from Plan Team in bold) (metric tons) for 2016-2017

Species	Area	OFL	2015 ABC	TAC	Catch as of 11/7/15	OFL	2016 ABC	TAC	OFL	2017 ABC	TAC
Pollock	EBS	3,330,000	1,637,000	1,310,000	1,318,833	3,910,000	2,090,000	1,374,792	3,540,000	2,019,000	1,374,792
	AI	36,005	29,659	19,000	916	39,075	32,227	19,000	44,455	36,664	19,000
	Bogoslof	21,200	15,900	100	733	31,800	23,850	100	31,800	23,850	100
Pacific cod	BS	346,000	255,000	240,000	202,626	390,000	255,000	238,680	412,000	255,000	238,680
	AI	23,400	17,600	9,422	9,060	23,400	17,600	12,496	23,400	17,600	12,496
Sablefish	BS	1,575	1,333	1,333	209	1,304	1,151	1,151	1,241	1,052	1,052
	AI	2,128	1,802	1,802	431	1,766	1,557	1,557	1,681	1,423	1,423
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	266,400	248,800	149,000	122,363	228,100	211,700	150,000	219,200	203,500	150,000
Greenland turbot	BSAI	3,903	3,172	2,648	2,199	4,194	3,462	2,798	7,416	6,132	2,798
	BS	n/a	2,448	2,448	2,086	n/a	2,673	2,673	n/a	4,734	2,673
	AI	n/a	724	200	113	n/a	789	125	n/a	1,398	125
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	93,856	80,547	22,000	11,005	94,035	80,701	2,000	84,156	72,216	2,000
Kamchatka flounder	BSAI	10,500	9,000	6,500	4,961	11,100	9,500	5,000	11,700	10,000	5,000
Northern rock sole	BSAI	187,600	181,700	69,250	45,350	165,900	161,100	35,000	149,400	145,000	35,000
Flathead sole	BSAI	79,419	66,130	24,250	10,955	79,562	66,250	12,000	77,544	64,580	12,000
Alaska plaice	BSAI	54,000	44,900	18,500	14,269	49,000	41,000	14,500	46,800	39,100	14,500
Other flatfish	BSAI	17,700	13,250	3,620	2,394	17,414	13,061	2,452	17,414	13,061	2,452
Pacific Ocean perch	BSAI	42,558	34,988	32,021	30,034	40,529	33,320	32,624	38,589	31,724	32,624
	BS	n/a	8,771	8,021	6,588	n/a	8,353	8,353	n/a	7,953	8,353
	EAI	n/a	8,312	8,000	7,861	n/a	7,916	7,916	n/a	7,537	7,916
	CAI	n/a	7,723	7,000	6,777	n/a	7,355	7,355	n/a	7,002	7,355
	WAI	n/a	10,182	9,000	8,808	n/a	9,696	9,000	n/a	9,232	9,000
Northern rockfish	BSAI	15,337	12,488	3,250		14,689	11,960	4,000	14,085	11,468	4,000
Blackspotted/Rougheye rockfish	BSAI	560	453	349	180	693	561	200	855	694	200
	EBS/EAI	n/a	149	149	65	n/a	179	75	n/a	216	75
	CAI/WAI	n/a	304	200	115	n/a	382	125	n/a	478	125
Shortraker rockfish	BSAI	690	518	250	149	690	518	150	690	518	150
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,667	1,250	880	683	1,667	1,250	700	1,667	1,250	700
	BS	n/a	695	325	184	n/a	695	200	n/a	695	200
	AI	n/a	555	555	499	n/a	555	500	n/a	555	500
Atka mackerel	BSAI	125,297	106,000	54,500	53,265	104,749	90,340	59,500	99,490	85,840	58,796
	EAI/BS	n/a	38,492	27,000	26,342	n/a	30,832	30,000	n/a	29,296	29,296
	CAI	n/a	33,108	17,000	16,669	n/a	27,216	17,000	n/a	25,860	17,000
	WAI	n/a	34,400	10,500	10,253	n/a	32,292	12,500	n/a	30,684	12,500
Skates	BSAI	49,575	41,658	25,700	24,886	50,215	42,134	25,700	47,674	39,943	25,700
Sculpins	BSAI	52,365	39,725	4,700	4,612	52,365	39,725	4,700	52,365	39,725	4,700
Sharks	BSAI	1,363	1,022	125	96	1,363	1,022	100	1,363	1,022	100
Squids	BSAI	2,624	1,970	400	2,360	6,912	5,184	400	6,912	5,184	400
Octopuses	BSAI	3,452	2,589	400	370	3,452	2,589	400	3,452	2,589	400
Total	BSAI	4,769,174	2,848,454	2,000,000	1,870,168	5,323,974	3,236,762	2,000,000	4,935,349	3,128,135	1,999,063

Sources: 2015 OFLs and ABCs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2014, 2015 catches through November 7, 2015 from AKR Catch Accounting.

TABLE 14-FINAL 2016 AND 2017 APPORTIONMENT OF PROHIBITED SPECIES CATCH ALLOWANCES TO NON-TRAWL GEAR, THE CDQ PROGRAM, AMENDMENT 80, AND THE BSAI TRAWL LIMITED ACCESS SECTORS

PSC species and area ¹	Non-trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ ²	Total trawl PSC	Trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ ²	CDQ PSQ reserve ²	Amendment 80 sector ³	BSAI trawl limited access fishery
Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	710	2,805	n/a	315	1,745	745
Herring (mt) BSAI	n/a	2,631	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	n/a	97,000	86,621	10,379	43,293	26,489
C. <u>opilio</u> (animals) COBLZ	n/a	4,708,314	4,204,524	503,790	2,066,524	1,351,334
C. <u>bairdi</u> crab (animals) Zone 1	n/a	830,000	741,190	88,810	312,115	348,285
C. <u>bairdi</u> crab (animals) Zone 2	n/a	2,520,000	2,250,360	269,640	532,660	1,053,394

¹Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of zones.

²The PSQ reserve for crab species is 10.7 percent of each crab PSC limit.

Note: Sector apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

TABLE 16—FINAL 2016 AND 2017 PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCES FOR THE BSAI TRAWL LIMITED ACCESS SECTOR (changes from action memo tables in **bold**)

BSAI trawl limited access fisheries	Prohibited species and area ¹				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	<u>C. opilio</u> (animals) COBLZ	<u>C. bairdi</u> (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	150	23,338	1,273,886	293,234	1,005,879
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish ²	0	0	0	0	0
Greenland turbot/arrowtooth flounder/Kamchatka flounder/sablefish	0	0	0	0	0
Rockfish April 15 - December 31	4	0	2,104	0	849
Pacific cod	391	2,954	54,298	50,816	42,424
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species ³	200	197	21,046	4,235	4,242
Total BSAI trawl limited access PSC	745	26,489	1,351,334	348,285	1,053,394

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, Kamchatka flounder, and arrowtooth flounder.

³ “Other species” for PSC monitoring includes skates, sculpins, sharks, squids, and octopuses.

Note: Seasonal or sector apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

TABLE 17--FINAL 2016 AND 2017 HALIBUT PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCES FOR NON-TRAWL FISHERIES

Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI				
Non-trawl fisheries	Seasons	Catcher/processor	Catcher vessel	All Non-Trawl
Pacific cod	Total Pacific cod	648	13	n/a
	January 1-June 10	388	9	n/a
	June 10-August 15	162	2	n/a
	31	98	2	n/a
Total	May 1-December 31	n/a	n/a	49
Groundfish pot and jig	n/a	n/a	n/a	Exempt
Sablefish hook-and-line	n/a	n/a	n/a	Exempt
Total for all non-trawl PSC	n/a	n/a	n/a	710

Note: Seasonal or sector apportionments may not total precisely due to rounding.

ATTACHMENT 3 -- AP Minutes, December 2015

AP Recommended 2016 AND 2017 ABC SURPLUS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA (CDQ) ABC RESERVES, AND AMENDMENT 80 ABC RESERVES IN THE BSAI FOR FLATHEAD SOLE, ROCK SOLE, AND YELLOWFIN

[Amounts are in metric tons]

Sector	2016			2017		
	Flathead sole	Rock sole	Yellowfin sole	Flathead sole	Rock sole	Yellowfin sole
ABC	66,250	161,100	211,700	64,580	145,000	203,500
TAC	12,000	35,000	150,000	12,000	35,000	150,000
ABC surplus	54,250	126,100	61,700	52,580	110,000	53,500
ABC reserve	54,250	126,100	61,700	52,580	110,000	53,500
CDQ ABC reserve	5,805	13,493	6,602	5,626	11,770	5,725
Amendment 80 ABC	48,445	112,607	55,098	46,954	98,230	47,776
Alaska Groundfish Cooperative for 2016 ¹	4,969	27,856	21,890	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alaska Seafood Cooperative for 2016 ¹	43,476	84,752	33,208	n/a	n/a	n/a

¹ The 2017 allocations for Amendment 80 species between Amendment 80 cooperatives and the Amendment 80 limited access sector will not be known until eligible participants apply for participation in the program by November 1, 2016.

ATTACHMENT 4 -- AP Minutes, December 2015

AP Recommendations for GOA Groundfish TAC and SSC Recommendations for OFL and ABC (metric tons) for 2016 and 2017

(Page 1)

Species	Area	OFL	2016 ABC	TAC	OFL	2017 ABC	TAC
Pollock	W (61)	n/a	56,494	56,494	n/a	55,657	55,657
	C (62)	n/a	124,927	124,927	n/a	123,078	123,078
	C (63)	n/a	57,183	57,183	n/a	56,336	56,336
	WYAK	n/a	9,348	9,348	n/a	9,209	9,209
	Subtotal	322,858	254,310	247,952	289,937	250,544	244,280
	EYAK/SEO	13,226	9,920	9,920	13,226	9,920	9,920
	Total	336,084	264,230	257,872	303,163	260,464	254,200
Pacific Cod	W	n/a	40,503	28,352	n/a	34,998	24,499
	C	n/a	49,312	36,984	n/a	42,610	31,958
	E	n/a	8,785	6,589	n/a	7,592	5,693
	Total	116,700	98,600	71,925	100,800	85,200	62,150
Sablefish	W	n/a	1,272	1,272	n/a	1,163	1,163
	C	n/a	4,023	4,023	n/a	3,678	3,678
	WYAK	n/a	1,475	1,475	n/a	1,348	1,348
	SEO	n/a	2,317	2,317	n/a	2,118	2,118
	Total	10,326	9,087	9,087	9,825	8,307	8,307
Shallow-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	20,851	13,250	n/a	19,159	13,250
	C	n/a	19,242	19,242	n/a	17,680	17,680
	WYAK	n/a	3,177	3,177	n/a	2,919	2,919
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,094	1,094	n/a	1,006	1,006
	Total	54,520	44,364	36,763	50,220	40,764	34,855
Deep-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	186	186	n/a	187	187
	C	n/a	3,495	3,495	n/a	3,516	3,516
	WYAK	n/a	2,997	2,997	n/a	3,015	3,015
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,548	2,548	n/a	2,563	2,563
	Total	11,102	9,226	9,226	11,168	9,281	9,281
Rex Sole	W	n/a	1,315	1,315	n/a	1,318	1,318
	C	n/a	4,445	4,445	n/a	4,453	4,453
	WYAK	n/a	766	766	n/a	767	767
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	967	967	n/a	969	969
	Total	9,791	7,493	7,493	9,810	7,507	7,507
Arrowtooth Flounder	W	n/a	28,183	14,500	n/a	28,659	14,500
	C	n/a	107,981	75,000	n/a	109,804	75,000
	WYAK	n/a	37,368	6,900	n/a	37,999	6,900
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	12,656	6,900	n/a	12,870	6,900
	Total	219,430	186,188	103,300	196,714	189,332	103,300
Flathead Sole	W	n/a	11,027	8,650	n/a	11,080	8,650
	C	n/a	20,211	15,400	n/a	20,307	15,400
	WYAK	n/a	2,930	2,930	n/a	2,944	2,944
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	852	852	n/a	856	856
	Total	42,840	35,020	27,832	43,060	35,187	27,850

Sources: 2015 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2014; 2016 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2015, 2014 catches through December 31, 2014 and 2015 catches through November 7, 2015 from AKR Catch Accounting.

ATTACHMENT 4 -- AP Minutes, December 2015

AP Recommendations for GOA Groundfish TAC and SSC Recommendations for OFL and ABC (metric tons) for 2016 and 2017

(Page 2)

Species	Area	OFL	2016 ABC	TAC	OFL	2017 ABC	TAC
Pacific Ocean Perch	W	n/a	2,737	2,737	n/a	2,709	2,709
	C	n/a	17,033	17,033	n/a	16,860	16,860
	WYAK	n/a	2,847	2,847	n/a	2,818	2,818
	W/C/WYAK	26,313	22,617	22,617	26,045	22,387	22,387
	SEO	2,118	1,820	1,820	2,096	1,802	1,802
	Total	28,431	24,437	24,437	28,141	24,189	24,189
Northern Rockfish	W	n/a	457	457	n/a	430	430
	C	n/a	3,547	3,547	n/a	3,338	3,338
	E	n/a	4	-	n/a	4	-
	Total	4,783	4,004	4,004	4,501	3,768	3,768
Shortraker Rockfish	W	n/a	38	38	n/a	38	38
	C	n/a	301	301	n/a	301	301
	E	n/a	947	947	n/a	947	947
	Total	1,715	1,286	1,286	1,715	1,286	1,286
Dusky Rockfish	W	n/a	173	173	n/a	159	159
	C	n/a	4,147	4,147	n/a	3,791	3,791
	WYAK	n/a	275	275	n/a	251	251
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	91	91	n/a	83	83
	Total	5,733	4,686	4,686	5,253	4,284	4,284
Rougheye and Blackspotted Rockfish	W	n/a	105	105	n/a	105	105
	C	n/a	707	707	n/a	705	705
	E	n/a	516	516	n/a	515	515
	Total	1,596	1,328	1,328	1,592	1,325	1,325
Demersal shelf rockfish	Total	364	231	231	364	231	231
Thornyhead Rockfish	W	n/a	291	291	n/a	291	291
	C	n/a	988	988	n/a	988	988
	E	n/a	682	682	n/a	682	682
	Total	2,615	1,961	1,961	2,615	1,961	1,961
Other Rockfish	W/C	n/a	1,534	1,534	n/a	1,534	1,534
	WYAK	n/a	574	574	n/a	574	574
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	3,665	200	n/a	3,665	200
	Total	7,424	5,773	2,308	7,424	5,773	2,308
Atka mackerel	Total	6,200	4,700	2,000	6,200	4,700	2,000
Big Skate	W	n/a	908	908	n/a	908	908
	C	n/a	1,850	1,850	n/a	1,850	1,850
	E	n/a	1,056	1,056	n/a	1,056	1,056
	Total	5,086	3,814	3,814	5,086	3,814	3,814
Longnose Skate	W	n/a	61	61	n/a	61	61
	C	n/a	2,513	2,513	n/a	2,513	2,513
	E	n/a	632	632	n/a	632	632
	Total	4,274	3,206	3,206	4,274	3,206	3,206
Other Skates	GOA-wide	2,558	1,919	1,919	2,558	1,919	1,919
Sculpins	GOA-wide	7,338	5,591	5,591	7,338	5,591	5,591
Sharks	GOA-wide	6,020	4,514	4,514	6,020	4,514	4,514
Squids	GOA-wide	1,530	1,148	1,148	1,530	1,148	1,148
Octopuses	GOA-wide	6,504	4,878	4,878	6,504	4,878	4,878
Total		892,962	727,684	590,809	815,875	708,629	573,872

Sources: 2014 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2013; 2015 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2014, 2014 catches through December 31, 2014 and 2015 catches through November 7, 2015 from AKR Catch Accounting.