

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dan Hull, Chairman

Chris Oliver, Executive Director

Telephone (907) 271-2809

www.npfmc.org



605 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 306

Anchorage, AK 99501-2252

Fax (907) 271-2817

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

December 7-11, 2016

Anchorage, AK

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

Shannon Carroll
Ruth Christiansen
Kurt Cochran
John Crowley*
Dan Donich
Jerry Downing*
Angel Drobnica

Jeff Farvour
John Gruver
Jeff Kauffman
Alexus Kwachka
Craig Lowenberg
Chuck McCallum
Art Nelson (absent 12/8)

Paddy O'Donnell
Joel Peterson
Jeff Stephan (Co-Vice Chair)
Ben Stevens
Matt Upton (Co-Vice Chair)
Ernie Weiss (Chair)
Sinclair Wilt

**Absent Dec. 10-11, 2016*

C1 Charter Halibut Management Measures for 2017

The AP recommends the Council approve the halibut charter management measures for Areas 2C and 3A as put forth by the Charter Halibut Management Committee below:

Area 3A

The Charter Halibut Management Committee recommends the following management measures for implementation in Area 3A in 2017, each with a two-fish bag limit, maximum size limit of 28 inches on one fish, one vessel-trip per permit per day, and Wednesday charter halibut closure:

If halibut charter allocation falls within the following ranges, implement incremental closures on Tuesdays as described below, assuming each Tuesday closure reduces charter removals by an estimated 1.32%.

- Below Blue Line: close 7 Tuesdays from Jul 1 – Aug 15
- 1.778 – 1.814 million pounds: close 6 Tuesdays from July 4 – Aug 8
- 1.815 – 1.851: close 4 Tuesdays from July 11 – Aug 1
- 1.852 – 1.890: close 3 Tuesdays from July 18 – Aug 1

Area 2C

The Charter Halibut Management Committee recommends the following management measures for implementation in Area 2C in 2017, each with a one-fish bag limit.

- If halibut charter allocation is at the Blue Line, implement a reverse slot limit (U40:O80), with an annual limit of 3 halibut

- If halibut charter allocation is below the blue line, implement an annual limit of 3 fish, and a reverse slot limit with a maximum size limit of 80". Incrementally reduce the lower size limit until projected harvest falls within the allocation.
- If halibut charter allocation is above the Blue Line, but below SPR, implement a reverse slot limit (U40:O80) and an annual limit of not less than 4 fish. [CLARIFICATION: The intention of this recommendation is to incrementally raise the lower limit of the reverse slot to allow the largest lower limit while maintaining the projected harvest within the allocation.]
- If halibut charter allocation is at the SPR, implement a reverse slot limit (U43:O80) with no annual limit.

Motion passed 21-0.

Rationale:

- Intent is to maintain projected harvests within allocation.
- The AP remains concerned about repeated Charter overages in 3A and that harvest standards are compromised with this trend.

C2 Charter Halibut Permit Usage – Discussion Paper

The AP recommends the Council request an expanded discussion paper on this issue.

Based on information in the C2 Permit usage discussion paper, it is evident that there is a significant amount of latent capacity contained within the Guided Halibut Sector.

If latent capacity becomes active in the future, it could threaten the guided halibut sector, which is managed to a hard cap allocation and other users of the halibut resource.

In order to consider addressing this issue, more information is needed regarding usage of originally issued permits, that have not been previously sold. In addition, a finer scale of annual usage needs to be explored. Such as less than 20, 30 and 40 halibut trips per year.

In addition staff should look at the process for implementing an annual registration for CHP's. The purpose of this would be gather better information on the trends of usage for permits.

The goal of this discussion paper is to better understand the behavior of the fleet and permit holders. To identify and allow Council the opportunity to consider what steps to take on limiting future growth (latent capacity) of the charter fleet in one or both areas, if necessary in order achieve to objectives of the Halibut Catch Share Plan in the future. Staff should place priority on achieving these objectives, while minimizing constraints to existing business models.

Motion passed 21/0.

Rationale:

- The harvest of the guided halibut fishery in regulatory areas 2C and 3A is regulated by the Catch Share Plan. This includes a hard cap allocation. It has become clear the overages of the 3A charter fleet are linked to the new participation of at least 12 Coast Guard Inspected boats capable of taking 10–18 anglers each day that have joined the fleet since the CSP was passed four years ago.

- According to Figures 1 and 2 on page 8, it is clear that 667 of 965 Charter Halibut Permits are currently fishing 50 days or less in each season. Furthermore 375 permits, more than 30 percent of the fleet is fishing less than 20 days per year.
- This latent capacity, if fully utilized would double charter effort in the future.
- This is a very real threat to the viability of the existing charter fleet as well, the longline fishery, subsistence and unguided fishermen.
- Clearly allowing this kind of excess capacity when considering a fishery that is struggling to be managed to a hard cap is not acceptable.
- For this reason, we propose to the Council an expanded discussion paper that will be used to fairly and equitable limit future growth in this fishery, particularly in times of lower abundance. It is not our intent to revoke or limit existing participation.

C3 Charter Halibut RQE Program

The AP recommends the following: **The AP recommends the Council initiate another initial review draft to explore annual CHP registration, CHP purchases by the RQE, leasing of Non-transferrable permits and the ability for charter captains and crew to accrue sea time, while chartering, toward the 150 days at sea required to hold an IFQ Transfer Eligibility Certificate - as well as the Alternatives, Elements and Options below.** *[amendment passed 12-8]* Changes to original motion are shaded; additions in **bold**, deletions in ~~strikeout~~.

- Alternative 2. Establish a Recreational Quota Entity (RQE) as a qualified entity to purchase and hold (PPA) commercial halibut QS for use by the guided halibut sector
- Element 1. Number of entities
- 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 are retained if the quota is transferred back to the commercial sector.
- Option 2. Annual limit on transfers to the RQE in each regulatory area (Area 2C and 3A) of 1% ~~-3%~~ **[amendment passed 16-4]** of commercial QS units in each area (2015).
- Option 3A. Total (cumulative) limit on amount of commercial quota share held by RQE and leased under GAF. Ten percent of the 2015 commercial QS pool may be held as RQE and GAF combined in Area 2C, and **10% 15%** **[amendment passed 16-4]** of the 2015 commercial QS pool may be held as RQE and GAF combined in Area 3A. The cumulative cap will be managed annually on a sliding scale between RQE and GAF, with GAF transfers restricted to accommodate RQE QS holdings.
- Option 4. Restrictions on RQE quota share purchases (in either or both areas)
- Sub-option 1.* Restrict purchase of D class quota share
- Sub-option 2.* Restrict purchase of blocked QS by class that equates to ($\leq$ 1,500 lb or $\leq$ 2,000 lb in 2015 lb)
- 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:

Sub-option 5. 50% equally to all CQEs actively participating in Area 2C/3A and either (1) 50% equally to all catcher vessel QS holders which hold not more than 1,500 to 3,000 pounds in 2015 pounds (by area, proportional to QS holdings); or 2) equally to all catcher vessel QS holders (by area, proportional to QS holdings and based on the percent of each class of QS purchased by the RQE).

Element 4. Limit on use of RQE funds. RQE funds are limited in their use to acquisition of commercial halibut quota; halibut conservation/research; promotion of the halibut resource; and administrative costs. RQE funds shall not be used directly or indirectly to lobby local, state, or federal officials.

Option 1. RQE will be responsible for associated IFQ program fees (Observer fees and administrative fees) and fish taxes that are collectible.

Element 5. RQE Organizational Structure. The RQE organizational structure should include stakeholders from both regulatory areas and both directed fisheries.

Option 4. The RQE shall file an annual report to the Council and NMFS detailing RQE activities during the prior year.

The final motion as amended passed 14-6

The following substitute motion failed 8-13:

The AP recommends that the Council table C3 “allowing a recreational quota entity to hold commercial halibut quota share for use by halibut charter anglers” until CHP issues such as, latent licenses and transferability, the leasing of non-transferable permits [friendly amendment] are addressed, before considering this potential amendment to the Halibut IFQ plan.

Rationale in favor of substitute motion:

- The AP heard broadly from both the charter and commercial sectors that issues with CHPs are fundamental to address charter sector allocation management. The purpose and need statement for the RQE amendment is best met through a solution that controls capacity in the guided sport sector and manages that capacity to meet the guided sport allocation under the Catch Sharing Plan.*
- Better alternatives are available that would benefit both sectors such as controlling capacity and properly administering the CHP program (e.g., stopping the transfer of non-transferable permits) prior to considering mechanisms to reallocate quota and disrupt historic halibut sectors. Without such alternatives, this action is not ready for final action.*
- The analysis should specify the RQE structure and funding mechanism for RQE purchase of commercial quota. Without this information neither the Council nor the public can fully evaluate the impact of the proposed action on historic halibut users.*

Following amendment to Element 4 failed 7-13:

Element 4. Limit on use of RQE funds. RQE funds are limited in their use to acquisition of commercial halibut quota; acquisition of charter halibut permits; halibut conservation/research;

promotion of the halibut resource; and administrative costs. RQE funds shall not be used directly or indirectly to lobby local, state, or federal officials.

The following amendment to add Suboption 1 under Element 2, Option 3A, failed 7-13:

Suboption 1. GAF shall not be reduced below a range of 1% - 3% of the 2015 commercial QS pool for Area 2C and 3A.

Rationale in Favor:

- Original motion is based on work of the RQE Committee reached by consensus.
- Support for the opening statement was based on concerns that there was significant uncertainty regarding latent effort and the unauthorized use of nontransferable CHPs; there was concern that this uncertainty potentially undermined the strength of the RQE analysis and therefore the ability of the AP to make a fully informed decision.

Rationale in Opposition:

- The concerns brought up in the amended opening statement of the motion would be better suited as a trailing amendment or brought up in staff tasking. Development of the RQE will be a several year process, it is not necessary to delay final action at this time in order to evaluate concerns raised with transferable and non-transferable charter halibut permits. The Public Review Draft analysis is ready for final action as presented. Development of the RQE program has been done in a deliberative manner that worked to balance both the needs of the charter halibut fleet and the commercial fishery. The multiple Elements and Options under Alternative 2 were created to address both the concerns voiced and needs articulated by both sectors throughout the analytical process.
- By reducing the annual limits on annual transfers, in Element 2 option 2, the program is made too restrictive and could make it ineffective. The program would become dysfunctional and not do what it was intended to do originally. Additionally, it would take way too long to achieve the goal of the RQE.
- Support additional analysis of the RQE amendment prior to final action, but opposed the AP motion because the purchase of commercial quota by a RQE undermines goals of the IFQ program to: preserve the owner operator nature of the halibut fishery, maintain existing characteristics of the fleet, and provide an affordable entry level. The RQE amendment imposes unjustified cost to historic halibut sectors, which is inconsistent with the purpose and need statement, and fails to include an alternative (reducing capacity in the charter sector), which is a reasonable and important alternative. Finally, the analysis does not identify the RQE structure or the funding mechanism for RQE purchase of QS.

C4 Am. 80 Halibut PSC Measures – Industry Report

The Advisory Panel received a report. No action was taken.

C5 Halibut Deck Sorting EFP – Interim Report

The Advisory Panel received a report. No action was taken.

C6 BSAI Groundfish Harvest Specifications and SAFE

The AP recommends the Council adopt the OFLs, ABCs, and TACs for 2017 and 2018 groundfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, as shown in **Attachment 1**. *Motion passed 21-0.*

Rationale: The OFLs and ABCs are SSC recommendations. The TACs are recommended by industry collectively.

The AP recommends the Council adopt Tables 13, 14, 16, and 17 (**Attachment 2**) for 2017 and 2018 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands groundfish PSC limits and apportionments contained in C6 item 7.

Motion passed 21-0.

Rationale: This is in line with what the AP does every year

The AP recommends the Council adopt the adjusted herring PSC allowances in Table 15 as provided by industry (**Attachment 2**) for 2017-18 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands groundfish trawl sectors.

Motion passed 21-0.

Rationale: The pollock industry is impacted greatly by the low herring PSC limits. During B season, herring bycatch can be very problematic due to sudden encounters of high herring concentrations that the pollock fleet have a difficult time avoiding despite daily monitoring. The area of high herring bycatch located on the steep edge of the north-south tow of the Horseshoe, is also the area of high pollock concentrations and typically has significantly lower chum salmon bycatch. Avoiding herring can result in the pollock fleet experiencing higher rates of salmon bycatch.

The AP recommends the Council approve the 2016 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish SAFE report.

Motion passed 21-0.

Rationale: The AP agrees with the 2016 SAFE report.

C7 GOA Groundfish Harvest Specifications and SAFE

The AP recommends the Council adopt, for the Gulf of Alaska, the 2017 and 2018 OFLs and ABCs as recommended by the SSC, and TACs for groundfish as shown in **Attachment 3**. The recommended TACs for both GOA Pacific cod and pollock have been adjusted to account for the State water GHF fisheries as shown in the C7 action memo (Item 3: Pacific cod and pollock adjustments).

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale: SSC set the OFLs and ABCs and public testimony spoke to the TACs that fall in line with the ABCs. The AP raised the TAC for Atka mackerel 1,000 tons, from 2,000 to 3,000, well below the 4,700-ton ABC. The fleet is encountering more mackerel on the fishing grounds.

The AP recommends the Council adopt the 2017 and 2018 GOA halibut PSC limits and apportionments contained in the C7 action memo (Item 4: PSC limits and Seasonal apportionments; **Attachment 4**). These include 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.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale: This is in line with what the AP does every year and it sets the seasonal apportionment and sets trawl halibut PSC between shallow water and deep water species and hook and line fisheries.

The AP recommends the Council approve the BSAI and GOA Halibut DMRs as recommended by the SSC for in-season management in 2017-2018 (Item 5: Halibut DMR table; **Attachment 4**).

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale: The AP likes the new DMR program with transparency and the three-year rolling average.

The AP recommends the Council approve the 2016 GOA Groundfish and ecosystem SAFE reports.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale: The AP agrees with the 2016 safe report.

The AP recommends the DMR workgroup look into how the GOLDEN FLEECE may need a different DMR than other Am80 CPs because they have always been allowed to deck sort.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale: The GOLDEN FLEECE has a distinct layout that makes applying a CP DMR potentially inaccurate. The observer program could collect more accurate data from the vessel to help improve the DMR.

C9 EM Integration

MOTION #1

The AP recommends that the Council adopt Alternative 2 - Integrating EM into the Observer Program. We further recommend the Council adopt Option A to utilize EM as a monitoring tool when vessels are fishing multiple IFQ areas.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale:

- Alternative 2 Option A is preferred as it aligns best with the Purpose and Need Statement and Council objectives and is the preferred alternative recommended by the EM work group and public testimony.
- Alternative 2 Option A most closely aligns with current partial coverage stratum.

MOTION #2

The AP also recognizes the value of the collaborative effort of the EM Workgroup amongst agencies, Council staff and Industry representatives and recommends that the Council continue the EM Workgroup process and provide staff support to develop the analytical tools necessary to address cost, monitoring strategies, and enforcement concerns.

The AP recommends that the Council clarify their intent of integrating EM in the fixed-gear fleet is to optimize coverage for fixed-gear vessels and should not diminish coverage in other sectors.

The AP concurs with the Workgroup recommendation to initiate a Discussion Paper in order to identify key aspects and the practicality of moving vessels <40 ft fleet out of the zero selection pool. The AP is concerned about the impact of shifting 500- 600 vessels from the zero selection pool with no additional fees reducing the effectiveness of the Program.

The AP finds it important to continue developing the EM program with cost effectiveness in mind and recommends that the Council express their intent in that development to explore the utility of cost-saving measures such as: multiple service providers and local data review.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale:

- These recommendations from the AP and EM work group are essential to further advancement of EM and the North Pacific Observer Program.

C10 GOA Trawl Bycatch Management – Preliminary Analysis

MOTION #1

The AP recommends the Council make the following revisions to Alternative 2:

1. Confirm staff's assumption that allocated groundfish target species taken in the Central Gulf of Alaska (CGOA or CG) may be delivered to a processing facility that is a member of a Western Gulf of Alaska (WGOA or WG) cooperative (or vice versa), as long as it is permitted with the regionalization or port of landing requirements the Council selects at final action.
2. Revise Alternative 2, Element 3b as follows:

Element 3. Allocated species (more than one option can be selected)

a. Target species:

- Option 1. Pollock (610/620/630/640) and Pacific cod (WGOA/CGOA)
- Option 2. WGOA rockfish (northern, dusky, and Pacific ocean perch) and Western Yakutat (WY) rockfish (dusky and Pacific ocean perch)

b. Secondary species (**full retention of secondary species under Options 1 and 2 is required**):

- Option 1. Sablefish (WG, CG, WY). Allocations of Central GOA sablefish under the Central GOA Rockfish Program are maintained.
- Option 2. Thornyhead rockfish, shortraker rockfish, rougheye/blackspotted rockfish, other rockfish (WG, CG). Allocations of CG rockfish under the CG Rockfish Program are maintained.
Suboption: Big skates and longnose skates
- Option 3. (Mutually exclusive with Options 1 and 2) Cooperative measures are required to manage secondary species under maximum retainable amounts (MRAs), as opposed to cooperative allocations.

3. Revise Alternative 2, Element 6b as follows:

Option: Each processor controls a portion of the annual PSC within a cooperative [options: 10% - 40%]. Each processor would assign the incremental PSC to vessels in the cooperative under the terms of the cooperative agreement. PSC made available by these agreements cannot be used by vessels owned by the processor (**i.e., a processor can provide PSC quota available by these agreements to a vessel if it has no more than a 10% ownership stake in that vessel** a vessel with more than 10% ownership by a processor using individual and collective rules for determining ownership).

4. Insert the following language under Alternative 2, Element 6d, to accommodate stacked licenses:

For the purposes of initial cooperative formation, in situations in which eligible catch history is derived from multiple licenses used on one vessel, allow owners to choose to 1) belong to more than one cooperative in the same area if the majority of eligible catch history on each license was delivered to different processors; 2) belong to one cooperative to which the majority of one of their license's eligible catch history was delivered.

5. Add an option under Alternative 2, Element 8a: **Option: Use caps do not apply to the catcher vessel WG and WY rockfish fisheries, if any WG or WY rockfish species are allocated to the catcher vessel sector under the program.**

The AP also recommends the following revisions/additions to the analysis:

1. The analysis in Tables 1-76 and 1-78 (p. 113-115) incorrectly interprets the current Council motion relative to harvest use (ownership) caps under Alt 2, Element 8. The analysis should be revised to reflect the current motion which states that allocated target species caps are applied at the WG and CG/WY levels (e.g. not separate pollock caps for 610, 620, 630, 640).
2. Continue to bring forward in the analysis the list of potential reporting elements outlined on p. 179 for future Council selection and add two requirements to the list: (1) *description of inter-and intra-cooperative leases by cooperative members*; and (2) *a description of incentives to increase landings of under-utilized flatfish species*.
3. Section 1.4.1.2.3 (Secondary Species under Alternative 2) needs to be more comprehensive to include:
 - Description of how/whether the co-op management system provides effective management tools for high value MRA secondary species.
 - Description of the potential conflict with MRA management versus bycatch management objectives, in terms of PSC use and groundfish discards.
 - A table that shows the bycatch/PSC status of these secondary species.
 - Data that show total catch (mt) of secondary species by gear type and operational mode for the most current eligibility years (2008 – 2012) and through 2015.
 - Report same information as above, but using retained catch.
4. The analysis should include a broader range of years than 2013 – 2015 to represent status quo average halibut PSC use, against which the analysis evaluates impacts to harvesters and processors of further PSC reduction options.
5. The analysis should provide data on GOA groundfish dependency for the CV (by AFA and non-AFA) and CP sectors.
6. Include data (heat map) to indicate trawl LLP activity in the GOA, by year, 2003 through 2015.

Motion passed 16-3.

Rationale in Favor:

- The bold and underlined revisions to Alternative 2 are in response to staff questions presented in the analytical document. The additional six items are those that the industry would like to see in the next iteration of the document to help inform better decision-making. It is critical for this document to continue moving forward through the analytical process.

- Alternative 2 is the only alternative that has something to benefit all sectors in the Gulf of Alaska — processors, groundfish harvesters, the waterfront workforce, the community, as well as directed salmon and halibut IFQ fishermen. Alternative 2 is the only alternative that adequately meets the Council’s Purpose and Need Statement and multiple goals and objectives.
- Alternative 2, with its multiple options, is a direct reflection of the many lessons learned from some of the undesirable outcomes experienced in previous rationalization programs. In this way, Alternative 2 is a proactive approach to minimizing any potential negative outcomes from this new management regime.
- Under status quo, without the proper tools, the GOA groundfish trawl industry will continue to operate in an inefficient and dysfunctional manner. The recent reduction to halibut and Chinook salmon PSC will continue to result in detrimental effects as happened in 2016 when the industry lost 120 days of fishing. It is unfair to continually criticize the groundfish trawl industry for these types of results when they are repeatedly and persistently asking for the tools to help them avoid such unfortunate scenarios, while simultaneously increasing the value of their fishery.

Rationale Opposed:

- Privatization of the fishery or allocating quota for a virtually unlimited duration is not the only answer to bycatch management. Based on passed rationalization experiences, it is anticipated that a catch share program like the one proposed in Alternative 2 will harm communities and potentially prohibit new entrants, including future fishermen and processors.
- Alternative 2 will promote concentrations of economic power and control in the GOA groundfish processing and harvesting sectors, which will impair competition and artificially limit the effectiveness of private enterprise to provide favorable opportunities for employment, labor and capital, and the equitable distribution of income, earnings and opportunity in the very economically thin economies of GOA Alaska coastal communities.

MOTION #2

The AP recommends the Council remove Alternative 3 from analysis for no further action.

Motion passed 14-5.

Rationale in Favor:

- The analysis clearly shows that Alternative 3 does not work to meet the Council’s Purpose and Need Statement and goals and objectives. Under this Alternative, the only way to control and reduce PSC is to lower the cap. The GOA groundfish industry is already suffering economically with the last PSC reductions implemented, which would be further exacerbated under this approach.
- While there were comments that addressed general elements of Alternative 3, there were no comments that specifically supported Alternative 3 (or a bycatch management program that allocates only PSC) as a viable management option. Any bycatch management program that allocates only PSC would not end the race for fish nor would it promote individual accountability for PSC reduction.
- There were no letters of support in EIS Scoping.
- The state has not come up with any more additions to Alternative 3.
- It is a waste of Council and staff time.

Rationale Opposed:

- It is not appropriate to remove any of alternatives at this stage of the analysis. It is important to include as many Alternatives as possible in the analysis to address the challenges in the GOA groundfish fisheries that have been identified as needing Council action.
- The recent Council review of the BSAI crab rationalization program clearly demonstrates that it is very important to clearly and thoroughly understand in advance the economic and social dislocation, and the artificial and significant limitations on economic diversity, employment and business opportunities, that may result from the privatization of the GOA groundfish resources.
- The recent Council review of both the Halibut IFQ and BSAI crab rationalization programs demonstrates that there is little opportunity, interest, potential, or ability to address the negative nature of those social and economic impacts that may have been inadvertently or poorly-anticipated when the multitude of regulatory and economic reviews and analyses were originally conducted prior to Council approval and federal implementation of these programs.

D1 EFH Fishing Effects of Fishing

The AP recommends that the Council approve the SSC Subcommittee's proposed methods to evaluate the effects of fishing on EFH for the BSAI and GOA groundfish and crab resources.

Motion passed 18-0.

Rationale: The AP joins with the SSC in commending the EFH Workgroup for having developed an analytical framework that facilitates the subject EFH impact assessments.

D2 Non-Fishing Effects EFH

The Advisory Panel received a report. No action was taken.

E1 Staff Tasking

The AP recommends that the role of the Charter Halibut Management Committee be expanded beyond the recommendation of charter allocations. ~~The AP requests that the Council consider whether the Charter Halibut Management Committee could or should address other issues that affect charter halibut management.~~ *[Amendment to strike second sentence passed 18-0.]* **Specifically, the AP recommends that the Council expand the Charter Halibut Management Committee scope to include addressing latent capacity in the charter sector, ending leasing of non-transferable CHPs, the ability of the RQE to purchase or freeze CHPs, and other issues that directly affect the charter halibut sector.** *[Amendment to add sentence passed 18-0]*

Motion as amended passed 17-0.

Rationale:

The original motion came up under Agenda item C1; the AP voted unanimously to table it and bring it back up under Staff Tasking for consideration.

The following agenda items (C8 and D3) were dropped from the AP agenda due to lack of time.

- C8 Bristol Bay Red King Crab Savings Area EFP
- D3 Salmon Excluder EFP - Final Report

The AP approved the minutes from the October 2016 meeting.

Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish Specifications: AP recommended TACs and SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for 2017 and 2018 (metric tons).

Species	Area	OFL	2016 ABC	TAC	Catch as of 11/5/2016	OFL	2017 ABC	TAC	OFL	2018 ABC	TAC
Pollock	EBS	3,910,000	2,090,000	1,340,000	1,349,724	3,640,000	2,800,000	1,345,000	4,360,000	2,979,000	1,345,000
	AI	39,075	32,227	19,000	1,288	43,650	36,061	19,000	49,291	40,788	19,000
	Bogoslof	31,906	23,850	500	1,005	130,428	60,800	500	130,428	97,428	500
Pacific cod	BS	390,000	255,000	238,680	210,110	284,000	239,000	223,704	302,000	255,000	223,704
	AI	23,400	17,600	12,839	12,357	28,700	21,500	15,695	28,700	21,500	15,695
Sablefish	BS	1,304	1,151	1,151	518	1,499	1,274	1,274	1,519	1,291	1,274
	AI	1,766	1,557	1,557	349	2,044	1,735	1,735	2,072	1,758	1,735
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	228,100	211,700	144,000	128,236	287,000	260,800	154,000	276,000	250,800	154,000
Greenland turbot	BSAI	4,194	3,462	2,873	2,205	11,615	6,644	4,500	12,831	10,864	4,500
	BS	n/a	2,673	2,673	2,084	n/a	5,800	4,375	n/a	9,484	4,375
	AI	n/a	789	200	121	n/a	844	125	n/a	1,380	125
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	94,035	80,701	14,000	10,346	76,100	65,371	14,000	67,023	58,633	14,000
Kamchatka flounder	BSAI	11,100	9,500	5,000	4,762	10,360	8,880	5,000	10,700	9,200	5,000
Northern rock sole	BSAI	165,900	161,000	57,100	44,873	159,700	155,100	47,100	147,300	143,100	47,100
Flathead sole	BSAI	79,562	66,250	21,000	9,655	81,654	68,278	14,500	79,136	66,164	14,500
Alaska plaice	BSAI	49,000	41,000	14,500	12,957	42,800	36,000	13,000	36,900	32,100	13,000
Other flatfish	BSAI	17,414	13,061	2,500	2,810	17,591	13,193	2,500	17,591	13,193	2,500
Pacific Ocean perch	BSAI	40,529	33,320	31,900	30,408	53,152	43,723	34,900	51,950	42,735	34,900
	BS	n/a	8,353	8,000	7,186	n/a	12,199	11,000	n/a	11,924	11,000
	EAI	n/a	7,916	7,900	7,569	n/a	10,307	7,900	n/a	10,074	7,900
	CAI	n/a	7,355	7,000	6,765	n/a	8,009	7,000	n/a	7,828	7,000
	WAI	n/a	9,696	9,000	8,888	n/a	13,208	9,000	n/a	12,909	9,000
Northern rockfish	BSAI	14,689	11,960	4,500	4,532	16,242	13,264	5,000	15,854	12,947	5,000
Blackspotted/Roughe rockfish	BSAI	693	561	300	157	612	501	225	750	614	225
	EBS/EAI	n/a	179	100	70	n/a	306	100	n/a	374	100
	CAI/WAI	n/a	382	200	87	n/a	195	125	n/a	240	125
Shortraker rockfish	BSAI	690	518	200	103	666	499	125	666	499	125
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,667	1,250	875	791	1,816	1,362	875	1,816	1,362	875
	BS	n/a	695	325	278	n/a	791	325	n/a	791	325
	AI	n/a	555	550	513	n/a	571	550	n/a	571	550
Atka mackerel	BSAI	104,749	90,340	55,000	54,293	102,700	87,200	65,000	99,900	85,000	65,000
	EAI/BS	n/a	30,832	28,500	28,168	n/a	34,890	34,500	n/a	34,000	34,000
	CAI	n/a	27,216	16,000	15,795	n/a	30,330	18,000	n/a	29,600	18,500
	WAI	n/a	32,292	10,500	10,330	n/a	21,980	12,500	n/a	21,400	12,500
Skates	BSAI	50,215	42,134	26,000	25,624	49,063	41,144	26,000	46,583	39,008	26,000
Sculpins	BSAI	52,365	39,725	4,500	4,476	56,582	42,387	4,500	56,582	42,387	4,500
Sharks	BSAI	1,363	1,022	125	121	689	517	125	689	517	125
Squids	BSAI	6,912	5,184	1,500	1,281	6,912	5,184	1,342	6,912	5,184	1,342
Octopuses	BSAI	3,452	2,589	400	426	4,769	3,576	400	4,769	3,576	400
Total	BSAI	5,324,080	3,236,662	2,000,000	1,913,407	5,110,344	4,013,993	2,000,000	5,807,962	4,214,648	2,000,000

Sources: 2016 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs and 2016 OFLs and ABCs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2015; 2016 catches through November 5, 2016 from AKR Catch Accounting.

TABLE 13–FINAL 2017 AND 2018 ABC SURPLUS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA (CDQ) ABC RESERVES, AND AMENDMENT 80 ABC RESERVES IN THE BSAI FOR FLATHEAD SOLE, ROCK SOLE, AND YELLOWFIN SOLE [amounts are in metric tons]

Sector	2017			2018		
	Flathead sole	Rock sole	Yellowfin sole	Flathead sole	Rock sole	Yellowfin sole
ABC	68,278	155,100	260,800	66,164	143,100	250,800
TAC	14,500	47,100	154,000	14,500	47,100	154,000
ABC surplus	53,778	108,000	106,800	51,664	96,000	96,800
ABC reserve	53,778	108,000	106,800	51,664	96,000	96,800
CDQ ABC reserve	5,754	11,556	11,428	5,528	10,272	10,358
Amendment 80 ABC reserve	48,024	96,444	95,372	46,136	85,728	86,442
Alaska Groundfish Cooperative for 2016 ^{1/}	4,926	23,857	37,891	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alaska Seafood Cooperative for 2016 ^{1/}	43,098	72,587	57,481	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.

TABLE 14-FINAL 2017 AND 2018 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	Total trawl PSC	Trawl PSC remaining after CDQ PSQ	CDQ PSQ reserve ^{2/}	Amendment 80 sector	BSAI trawl limited access fishery
Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	710	2,805	n/a	315	1,745	745
Herring (mt) BSAI	n/a	2,013	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
<i>C. opilio</i> (animals) COBLZ	n/a	9,105,477	8,131,191	974,286	3,996,480	2,613,365
<i>C. bairdi</i> crab (animals) Zone 1	n/a	830,000	741,190	88,810	312,115	348,285
<i>C. bairdi</i> crab (animals) Zone 2	n/a	2,070,000	1,848,510	221,490	437,542	865,288

^{1/} Refer to § 679.2 for definitions of zones.

^{2/} The PSQ reserve for crab species is 10.7 percent of each crab PSC limit.

TABLE 15-FINAL 2017 AND 2018 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	100	n/a
Rock sole/flathead sole/other flatfish ^{1/}	43	n/a
Greenland turbot/arrowtooth flounder/ Kamchatka flounder/sablefish	5	n/a
Rockfish	5	n/a
Pacific cod	10	n/a
Midwater trawl pollock	1,800	n/a
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species ^{2,3/}	50	n/a
Red king crab savings subarea non-pelagic trawl gear ^{4/}	n/a	24,250
Total trawl PSC	2,013	97,000

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

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

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

^{4/} In December 2016 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)).

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

TABLE 16—FINAL 2017 AND 2018 PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH ALLOWANCES FOR THE BSAI TRAWL LIMITED ACCESS SECTOR

BSAI trawl limited access fisheries	Prohibited species and area ^{1/}				
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Red king crab (animals) Zone 1	<i>C. opilio</i> (animals) COBLZ	<i>C. bairdi</i> (animals)	
				Zone 1	Zone 2
Yellowfin sole	150	23,338	2,463,587	293,234	826,258
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	4,069	0	697
Pacific cod	391	2,954	105,008	50,816	34,848
Pollock/Atka mackerel/other species ^{3/}	200	197	40,701	4,235	3,485
Total BSAI trawl limited access PSC	745	26,489	2,613,365	348,285	865,288

^{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 2017 AND 2018 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
	August 15-December 31	98	2	n/a
Non-Pacific cod non-trawl-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.

Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Specifications: AP recommended TACs and SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for 2017 and 2018 (metric tons).

12/9/16 -- Page 1

Species	Area	2016			Catch 11/5/2016	2017			2018		
		OFL	ABC	TAC		OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pollock	State GHL	n/a	6,358	-	-		5,094	n/a		3,937	n/a
	W (610)	n/a	56,494	56,494	61,222	n/a	43,602	43,602	n/a	33,701	33,701
	C (620)	n/a	124,927	124,927	46,968	n/a	98,652	98,652	n/a	76,249	76,249
	C (630)	n/a	57,183	57,183	64,605	n/a	48,929	48,929	n/a	37,818	37,818
	WYAK	n/a	9,348	9,348	132	n/a	7,492	7,492	n/a	5,791	5,791
	Subtotal	322,858	254,310	247,952	172,927	235,807	203,769	198,675	182,204	157,496	153,559
	EYAK/SEO	13,226	9,920	9,920	-	13,226	9,920	9,920	13,226	9,920	9,920
	Total	336,084	264,230	257,872	172,927	249,033	213,689	208,595	195,430	167,416	163,479
Pacific Cod	W	n/a	40,503	28,352	17,539	n/a	36,291	25,404	n/a	32,565	22,795
	C	n/a	49,312	36,984	21,939	n/a	44,180	33,135	n/a	39,644	29,733
	E	n/a	8,785	6,589	66	n/a	7,871	5,903	n/a	7,063	5,297
	Total	116,700	98,600	71,925	39,544	105,378	88,342	64,442	94,188	79,272	57,825
Sablefish	W	n/a	1,272	1,272	1,037	n/a	1,349	1,349	n/a	1,367	1,367
	C	n/a	4,023	4,023	4,147	n/a	4,514	4,514	n/a	4,574	4,574
	WYAK	n/a	1,475	1,475	1,640	n/a	1,605	1,605	n/a	1,626	1,626
	SEO	n/a	2,317	2,317	2,457	n/a	2,606	2,606	n/a	2,640	2,640
	Total	10,326	9,087	9,087	9,281	11,885	10,074	10,074	12,045	10,207	10,207
Shallow-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	20,851	13,250	145	n/a	20,921	13,250	n/a	21,042	13,250
	C	n/a	19,242	19,242	3,445	n/a	19,306	19,306	n/a	19,418	19,418
	WYAK	n/a	3,177	3,177	-	n/a	3,188	3,188	n/a	3,206	3,206
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	1,094	1,094	1	n/a	1,099	1,099	n/a	1,105	1,105
	Total	54,520	44,364	36,763	3,591	54,583	44,514	36,843	54,893	44,771	36,979
Deep-Water Flatfish	W	n/a	186	186	4	n/a	256	256	n/a	257	257
	C	n/a	3,495	3,495	161	n/a	3,454	3,454	n/a	3,488	3,488
	WYAK	n/a	2,997	2,997	9	n/a	3,017	3,017	n/a	3,047	3,047
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	2,548	2,548	5	n/a	2,565	2,565	n/a	2,590	2,590
	Total	11,102	9,226	9,226	179	11,182	9,292	9,292	11,290	9,382	9,382
Rex Sole	W	n/a	1,315	1,315	169	n/a	1,459	1,459	n/a	1,478	1,478
	C	n/a	4,445	4,445	1,492	n/a	4,930	4,930	n/a	4,995	4,995
	WYAK	n/a	766	766	1	n/a	850	850	n/a	861	861
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	967	967	-	n/a	1,072	1,072	n/a	1,087	1,087
	Total	9,791	7,493	7,493	1,662	10,860	8,311	8,311	11,004	8,421	8,421
Arrowtooth Flounder	W	n/a	28,183	14,500	985	n/a	28,100	14,500	n/a	25,747	14,500
	C	n/a	107,981	75,000	17,970	n/a	107,934	75,000	n/a	98,895	75,000
	WYAK	n/a	37,368	6,900	25	n/a	37,405	6,900	n/a	34,273	6,900
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	12,656	6,900	13	n/a	12,654	6,900	n/a	11,595	6,900
	Total	219,430	186,188	103,300	18,993	219,327	186,093	103,300	196,635	170,510	103,300
Flathead Sole	W	n/a	11,027	8,650	214	n/a	11,098	8,650	n/a	11,282	8,650
	C	n/a	20,211	15,400	2,069	n/a	20,339	15,400	n/a	20,677	15,400
	WYAK	n/a	2,930	2,930	-	n/a	2,949	2,949	n/a	2,998	2,998
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	852	852	-	n/a	857	857	n/a	872	872
	Total	42,840	35,020	27,832	2,283	43,128	35,243	27,856	43,872	35,829	27,920

Sources: 2016 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2015; 2016 catches through November 5, 2016 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Specifications: AP recommended TACs and SSC recommended OFLs and ABCs for 2017 and 2018 (metric tons).**12/9/16 -- Page 2**

Species	Area	2016			Catch as of 11/5/16	2017			2018		
		OFL	ABC	TAC		OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pacific Ocean Perch	W	n/a	2,737	2,737	2,627	n/a	2,679	2,679	n/a	2,627	2,627
	C	n/a	17,033	17,033	17,566	n/a	16,671	16,671	n/a	16,347	16,347
	WYAK	n/a	2,847	2,847	2,827	n/a	2,786	2,786	n/a	2,733	2,733
	W/C/WYAK	26,313	22,617	22,617	23,020	25,753	22,136	22,136	25,252	21,707	21,707
	SEO	2,118	1,820	1,820	-	2,073	1,782	1,782	2,032	1,747	1,747
	Total	28,431	24,437	24,437	23,020	27,826	23,918	23,918	27,284	23,454	23,454
Northern Rockfish	W	n/a	457	457	115	n/a	432	432	n/a	400	400
	C	n/a	3,547	3,547	3,274	n/a	3,354	3,354	n/a	3,108	3,108
	E	n/a	4	-	-	n/a	4	-	n/a	4	-
	Total	4,783	4,008	4,004	3,389	4,522	3,790	3,786	4,175	3,512	3,508
Shortraker Rockfish	W	n/a	38	38	52	n/a	38	38	n/a	38	38
	C	n/a	301	301	395	n/a	301	301	n/a	301	301
	E	n/a	947	947	299	n/a	947	947	n/a	947	947
	Total	1,715	1,286	1,286	746	1,715	1,286	1,286	1,715	1,286	1,286
Dusky Rockfish	W	n/a	173	173	91	n/a	158	158	n/a	146	146
	C	n/a	4,147	4,147	3,184	n/a	3,786	3,786	n/a	3,499	3,499
	WYAK	n/a	275	275	7	n/a	251	251	n/a	232	232
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	91	91	8	n/a	83	83	n/a	77	77
	Total	5,733	4,686	4,686	3,290	5,233	4,278	4,278	4,837	3,954	3,954
Rougheye and Blackspotted Rockfish	W	n/a	105	105	40	n/a	105	105	n/a	104	104
	C	n/a	707	707	467	n/a	706	706	n/a	702	702
	E	n/a	516	516	114	n/a	516	516	n/a	512	512
	Total	1,596	1,328	1,328	621	1,594	1,327	1,327	1,583	1,318	1,318
Demersal shelf rockfish	Total	364	231	231	115	357	227	227	357	227	227
Thornyhead Rockfish	W	n/a	291	291	207	n/a	291	291	n/a	291	291
	C	n/a	988	988	663	n/a	988	988	n/a	988	988
	E	n/a	682	682	222	n/a	682	682	n/a	682	682
	Total	2,615	1,961	1,961	1,092	2,615	1,961	1,961	2,615	1,961	1,961
Other Rockfish	W/C	n/a	1,534	1,534	1,294	n/a	1,534	1,534	n/a	1,534	1,534
	WYAK	n/a	574	574	48	n/a	574	574	n/a	574	574
	EYAK/SEO	n/a	3,665	200	38	n/a	3,665	200	n/a	3,665	200
	Total	7,424	5,773	2,308	1,380	7,424	5,773	2,308	7,424	5,773	2,308
Atka mackerel	Total	6,200	4,700	2,000	993	6,200	4,700	3,000	6,200	4,700	3,000
Big Skate	W	n/a	908	908	134	n/a	908	908	n/a	908	908
	C	n/a	1,850	1,850	1,874	n/a	1,850	1,850	n/a	1,850	1,850
	E	n/a	1,056	1,056	44	n/a	1,056	1,056	n/a	1,056	1,056
	Total	5,086	3,814	3,814	2,052	5,086	3,814	3,814	5,086	3,814	3,814
Longnose Skate	W	n/a	61	61	131	n/a	61	61	n/a	61	61
	C	n/a	2,513	2,513	843	n/a	2,513	2,513	n/a	2,513	2,513
	E	n/a	632	632	336	n/a	632	632	n/a	632	632
	Total	4,274	3,206	3,206	1,310	4,274	3,206	3,206	4,274	3,206	3,206
Other Skates	GOA-wide	2,558	1,919	1,919	1,568	2,558	1,919	1,919	2,558	1,919	1,919
Sculpins	GOA-wide	7,338	5,591	5,591	1,293	7,338	5,591	5,591	7,338	5,591	5,591
Sharks	GOA-wide	6,020	4,514	4,514	1,841	6,020	4,514	4,514	6,020	4,514	4,514
Squids	GOA-wide	1,530	1,148	1,148	241	1,516	1,137	1,137	1,516	1,137	1,137
Octopuses	GOA-wide	6,504	4,878	4,878	323	6,504	4,878	4,878	6,504	4,878	4,878
Total		892,964	727,688	590,809	291,734	796,158	667,877	535,863	708,843	597,052	483,588

Sources: 2016 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from the harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2015; 2016 catches through November 5, 2016 from AKR Catch Accounting.

Proposed 2017 and 2018 GOA Harvest Specifications

Final 2017 and 2018 Pacific Halibut PSC Limits, Allowances, and Apportionments (Values are in metric tons)

Trawl gear			Hook-and-line gear ¹				
			Other than DSR			DSR	
Season	Percent	Amount ²	Season	Percent	Amount	Season	Amount
January 20 - April 1	27.5	469	January 1 - June 10	86	221	January 1 - December 31	9
April 1 - July 1	20	341	June 10 - September 1	2	5		
July 1 - September 1	30	512	September 1 - December 31	12	31		
September 1 - October 1	7.5	128					
October 1 - December 31	15	256					
Total		1,706			257		9

¹ The Pacific halibut PSC limit for hook-and-line gear is allocated to the demersal shelf rockfish (DSR) fishery and fisheries other than DSR. The hook-and-line IFQ sablefish fishery is exempt from halibut PSC limits, as are pot and jig gear for all groundfish fisheries.

Final 2017 and 2018 Seasonal Apportionments of the Pacific Halibut PSC Limit Apportioned Between the Trawl Gear Shallow-Water and Deep-Water Species Fisheries (Values are in metric tons)

Season	Shallow-water	Deep-water ¹	Total
January 20 - April 1	384	85	469
April 1 - July 1	85	256	341
July 1 - September 1	171	341	512
September 1 - October 1	128	Any remainder	128
Subtotal, January 20 - October 1	768	682	1,450
October 1 - December 31 ²			256
Total			1,706

¹ Vessels participating in cooperatives in the Rockfish Program will receive 191 mt of the third season (July 1 through September 1) deep-water species fishery halibut PSC apportionment.

² There is no apportionment between trawl shallow-water and deep-water species fisheries during the fifth season (October 1 through December 31).

Table 11. Proposed 2017 and 2018 Apportionments of the “Other hook-and-line fisheries” Halibut PSC Allowance Between the Hook-and-Line Gear Catcher Vessel and Catcher/Processor Sectors
(Values are in metric tons)

“Other than DSR” allowance	Hook-and-line sector	Sector annual amount	Season	Seasonal percentage	Sector seasonal amount
257	Catcher Vessel	129	January 1 - June 10	86	111
			June 10 - September 1	2	3
			September 1 - December 31	12	15
	Catcher/Processor	128	January 1 - June 10	86	110
			June 10 - September 1	2	3
			September 1 - December 31	12	15

Table 1. Joint Groundfish Plan Team - recommended Halibut Discard Mortality Rates for 2017 – 2018.

Operational Group				
Sector	Region	Gear	Target	DMR
CP	BSAI	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	all	85%
		HAL	all	8%
		POT	all	6%
	GOA	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT ^a	all	85%
		HAL	all	11%
		POT	all	10%
CV	BSAI	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	all	52%
		HAL	all	14%
		POT	all	6%
	GOA	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	Rockfish Program ^e	67%
			non-RP	65%
		HAL	all	12%
		POT	all	10%

CP = Catcher Processor or mothership

CV = Catcher Vessel

BSAI = Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands

GOA = Gulf of Alaska

PTR = pelagic trawl gear

NPT = non-pelagic trawl gear

HAL = hook and line (longline) gear

POT = pot gear

Table 2. Halibut DMR alternatives reviewed by the Joint Plan Teams.

Halibut DMR alternatives for Dec 2015 Specifications

Non-CDQ									
BSAI					GOA				
Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)	Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)
Trawl					Trawl				
Atka mack	82	80	78	82	Bottom poll	58	58	58	58
Bottom poll	81	81	81	81	Pacific cod	62	62	62	62
Pacific cod	66	66	66	66	Dpwtr flats	43	62	62	62
Other Flats	63	63	65	63	Shallwtr flats	66	67	67	66
Rockfish	83	81	78	83	Rockfish	65	65	65	65
Flathead sole	72	76	76	72	Flathead sole	67	67	68	67
Midwtr poll	88	88	88	88	Midwtr poll	59	72	75	65
Rock sole	86	86	86	86	Sablefish	59	71	52	59
Sablefish	75	66	66	66	Arr. fldr	76	76	76	76
Turbot	82	82	66	82	Rex sole	71	72	72	72
Arr. Fldr	84	84	78	84					
Yellowfin sole	84	84	84	84					
Pot					Pot				
Pacific cod	8	9	9	9	Pacific cod	17	15	15	15
Longline					Longline				
Pacific cod	9	9	9	9	Pacific cod	10	10	10	10
Rockfish	4	9	9	9	Rockfish	9	10	10	10
Turbot	11	14	9	11					

NN	0 years of data
	Change from Sept Report
	Different from IPHC

CDQ				
BSAI				
Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)
Trawl				
Atka mack	82	81	82	82
Bottom poll	86	86	86	86
Pacific cod	87	90	65	87
Rockfish	70	80	78	70
Flathead sole	79	79	79	79
Midwater poll	90	90	90	90
Rock sole	86	88	86	86
Turbot	89	89	66	89
Yellowfin sole	85	85	85	85
Pot				
Pacific cod		1	1	1
Sablefish	41	39	41	41
Longline				
Pacific cod	10	10	10	10
Turbot	4	10	10	10

Table 1. Joint Groundfish Plan Team - recommended Halibut Discard Mortality Rates for 2017 – 2018.

Operational Group				
Sector	Region	Gear	Target	DMR
CP	BSAI	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	all	85%
		HAL	all	8%
		POT	all	6%
	GOA	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT ^a	all	85%
		HAL	all	11%
		POT	all	10%
CV	BSAI	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	all	52%
		HAL	all	14%
		POT	all	6%
	GOA	PTR	pollock	100%
			non-pollock	100%
		NPT	Rockfish Program ^e	67%
			non-RP	65%
		HAL	all	12%
		POT	all	10%

CP = Catcher Processor or mothership

CV = Catcher Vessel

BSAI = Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands

GOA = Gulf of Alaska

PTR = pelagic trawl gear

NPT = non-pelagic trawl gear

HAL = hook and line (longline) gear

POT = pot gear

Table 2. Halibut DMR alternatives reviewed by the Joint Plan Teams.

Halibut DMR alternatives for Dec 2015 Specifications

Non-CDQ									
BSAI					GOA				
Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)	Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)
Trawl					Trawl				
Atka mack	82	80	78	82	Bottom poll	58	58	58	58
Bottom poll	81	81	81	81	Pacific cod	62	62	62	62
Pacific cod	66	66	66	66	Dpwtr flats	43	62	62	62
Other Flats	63	63	65	63	Shallwtr flats	66	67	67	66
Rockfish	83	81	78	83	Rockfish	65	65	65	65
Flathead sole	72	76	76	72	Flathead sole	67	67	68	67
Midwtr poll	88	88	88	88	Midwtr poll	59	72	75	65
Rock sole	86	86	86	86	Sablefish	59	71	52	59
Sablefish	75	66	66	66	Arr. fldr	76	76	76	76
Turbot	82	82	66	82	Rex sole	71	72	72	72
Arr. Fldr	84	84	78	84					
Yellowfin sole	84	84	84	84					
Pot					Pot				
Pacific cod	8	9	9	9	Pacific cod	17	15	15	15
Longline					Longline				
Pacific cod	9	9	9	9	Pacific cod	10	10	10	10
Rockfish	4	9	9	9	Rockfish	9	10	10	10
Turbot	11	14	9	11					

NN	0 years of data
	Change from Sept Report
	Different from IPHC

CDQ				
BSAI				
Gear/Target	Sept	IPHC (<50 3 yr)	(<50 all yr)	Status Quo (All years)
Trawl				
Atka mack	82	81	82	82
Bottom poll	86	86	86	86
Pacific cod	87	90	65	87
Rockfish	70	80	78	70
Flathead sole	79	79	79	79
Midwater poll	90	90	90	90
Rock sole	86	88	86	86
Turbot	89	89	66	89
Yellowfin sole	85	85	85	85
Pot				
Pacific cod		1	1	1
Sablefish	41	39	41	41
Longline				
Pacific cod	10	10	10	10
Turbot	4	10	10	10