

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dan Hull, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Executive Director



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

Telephone (907) 271-2809

Fax (907) 271-2817

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

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES January 31 – February 3, 2017 Seattle, WA

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

Carroll, Shannon	Kauffman, Jeff	Sobic, John
Christiansen, Ruth	Kwachka, Alexis	Stephan, Jeff
Cochran, Kurt	Lowenberg, Craig	Stevens, Ben
Crowley, John	McCallum, Chuck	Upton, Matt (Co-Vice Chair)
Downing, Jerry	Nelson, Art	Weiss, Ernie (Chair)
Drobnica, Angel (Co-Vice Chair)	Nichols, Carina	Wilt, Sinclair
Donich, Daniel	O'Donnell, Paddy	
Gruver, John	Peterson, Joel	

The AP unanimously elected Ernie Weiss as Chair and Angel Drobnica and Matt Upton as Co-Vice Chairs.

C1 CDQ Ownership Caps

The AP recommends that the Council initiate final action to revise regulations in the AFA Program, Crab Rationalization program and the Fishery Management Plan for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab (Crab FMP) to reflect changes in the 2006 amendment of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that monitors excessive use cap of CDQ groups by attributing ownership using the “individual and collective rule”.

Motion passed 19-0.

Rationale:

- This is a housekeeping measure that formally aligns regulations with current practices and the MSA.
- The action is not expected to result in any changes in practical effects for CDQ groups.

C2 Mixing of Guided and Unguided Halibut– Discussion Paper

The AP recommends the Council consider moving the C2 document forward to initial review. In addition, the Council should consider adding to the Initial Review document the mechanics of a Rental fishing boat registration and a recording requirement as part of the normal State of Alaska guide and guide business registration process.

Motion passed 18-1.

Rationale:

- In recent written and public testimony, we have heard of significant growth in the rental boat portion of the for-hire sector.
- There is no data available on the number of new entrants, how much they catch or their distribution.
- A vessel registration with reporting requirements will provide a mechanism to track the harvest, distribution, and growth of this hybrid sector.

An amendment to replace the second sentence with the following, failed 2-17.

In addition, the Council should examine the option to add a registration and reporting requirement for rental boats when guided and unguided fishing occurs from the same platform.

C3 Area 4 Halibut IFQ Leasing by CDQ Groups

The AP recommends that the initial review on Halibut IFQ Leasing by CDQ groups be released for public review and scheduled for final action with the following preferred alternative and options:

(preliminary preferred alternatives in bold; new language underlined in bold; amendments shaded & underlined in bold)

Alternative 2: Allow CDQ groups to lease halibut IFQ in Areas 4B, 4C and 4D in years of low halibut catch limits in regulatory Areas 4B and 4CDE. Any IFQ transferred to a CDQ group under this provision would be added to their available halibut CDQ, intended **to be leased from non-residents** for use **only** by residents **of a CDQ community** with a halibut CDQ permit and a CDQ hired master permit. No vessel over 51 feet LOA would be eligible to harvest the leased IFQ and vessels would have to comply with IFQ use restrictions. *[Amendment passed 19-0.]*

Option 1: Defining 'low catch limits' for the purpose of allowing leases. Designation of low catch limits is independently determined for Areas 4B and 4CDE. The threshold for designating a year of low halibut catch limit in each area is less than:

Sub-option 1: 1 million pounds for area 4B

Sub-option 2: 1.3 million pounds

Sub-option 3: 1.5 million pounds for area 4CDE

Option 2: Leased Area 4D IFQ may be fished in Area 4E. **This provision would also allow Area 4D applies to 4D A share IFQ owned by CDQ groups to be fished in Area 4E when the abundance threshold in area 4CDE is triggered.** *[Amendment 19-0 with 1 abstention.]*

Option 3: Any Area 4B, 4C, or 4D catcher vessel QS transferred after December 14, 2015 may not be leased as IFQ to CDQ groups under this action for a period of:

Sub-option 1: 3 years

Sub-option 2: 4 years

Sub-option 3: 5 years

Option 4: No individual halibut QS holder may lease **catcher vessel** halibut IFQ to any CDQ group, on a consecutive basis, for more than:

Sub-option 1: 2 years

Sub-option 2: 3 years

Sub-option 3: 4 years

Option 5: Limit the ability to lease Area 4B **catcher vessel** halibut IFQ to CDQ groups under this action to quota holders that own less than the following **total area 4B holdings, inclusive of all class and blocked or unblocked categories**:

Sub-option 1: 2,000 lbs

Sub-option 2: 5,000 lbs

Sub-option 3: 7,500 lbs

The AP seeks additional analysis on the tradeoffs of establishing these limits at a static 7,500 lb limit from the 1 million abundance trigger in area 4B and using a QS conversion that would fluctuate with abundance.

The AP recommends that the Council examine options to monitor the types of transactions that occur under this action to determine whether the action is carried out in a way that is consistent with the intent of the Council, as well as the goals of the IFQ and CDQ programs. This analysis should consider the added costs of reporting and whether existing reporting requirements, such as annual IRS 990 reports, can be a sufficient monitoring tool for the Council to understand if the intent of the action, as well as the IFQ and CDQ programs, has been satisfied. [Amendment passed 19-0 with 1 abstention.]

Final motion as amended passed 18-1 with 1 abstention.

Rationale in Favor:

- This program could provide important temporary relief measures to halibut dependent CDQ community residents and IFQ holders in times of low abundance.
- The new language under alternative 2 is meant to clarify the intent of the program to provide additive benefits to the community in times of low abundance by indicating that the lessor should be from outside of the community and that leased IFQ should be made available only to resident community members.
- The abundance triggers identified in the PPA are appropriate. While recent quotas have stabilized with halibut biomass, they represent historically low amounts in area 4B and area 4CDE. IFQ and CDQ participants in both areas consider the current quota the minimum necessary to sustain a healthy fishery.
- Retaining area 4B in the action would make the program available to all CDQ communities. Omitting 4B would close off access for Atka, a community that has significant historical harvesting and processing participation in the fishery.
- Allowing area 4D IFQ to be fished in area 4E would allow leased quota to be used near coastal communities in times of low abundance and would maximize the effectiveness of the program. Area 4CDE is considered a single stock and the IPHC finds no biological basis for separate catch limits in these areas. The inclusion of area 4D A class already owned by CDQ could provide additional flexibility under the program for local small boat fleets to access waters in closer proximity to their communities than the more exposed and remote waters of area 4D.
- Restricting the consecutive years on leasing limits the amount of relief under this action to a quota holder so as to not prevent a permanent transfer that would otherwise occur; potentially providing an opportunity for a new entrant.
- Limiting the eligibility of the program to QS holders who possess small amounts of quota in area 4B is intended to minimize the impact on or displacement of existing walk on businesses in Adak. The most liberal option of 7500 lbs would make available only 17.5% of the total quota

pool, but would provide access to a large number of individual small quota holders, representing 45 individual QS holders and 55% of the total ownership pool.

- A reporting requirement may allow the Council to monitor whether the action meets its intent, as well as the goals of the IFQ and CDQ programs. It is unclear what costs would be associated with such a requirement, however, we should endeavor to avoid an overly burdensome requirement for NMFS or the CDQ participants.

Rationale Against: This motion goes against the intent of the foundation of the IFQ program.

C4 IFQ Committee Report

The AP supports the ongoing work of the IFQ Committee and recognizes that the committee provides a valuable forum for exploring issues and concerns associated with the halibut/sablefish QS program. The AP endorses the committee's recommendations (contained in their January 27th minutes) and highlights as a priority the need for a workshop or committee meeting focused on QS ownership trends and strategies to facilitate entry to the halibut/sablefish fisheries.

In addition, the AP recommends the staff assemble the following data for the IFQ Committee to evaluate at their next convening:

- Charts that show QS costs and ex-vessel prices by area (1995-present).
- Data on crew shares as a percentage of total ex-vessel revenues and changes over time (1990-present).
- Provide a graph that charts halibut IFQ price along with amendments to the IFQ program and other fisheries that have been rationalized within the timeframe of the IFQ program.

[Amendment to add third bullet passed 14-6.]

Rationale For bullet amendment:

- Public testimony indicated that management actions to IFQ program have had effects on the price of IFQ price.
- Rationalization of other fisheries in the North Pacific may have also had an effect on IFQ price.
- The intent is not to imply that there is or is not a correlation between management actions and quota price; the intent is to provide the IFQ Committee and the public with the opportunity to infer whether there are causes and effects from management actions.
- The intent is not for the IFQ Committee to consider changes to other fisheries; the intent is for the IFQ Committee to have all available data in front of them prior to considering changes to the IFQ program.
- This data is publicly available but not collected in one place. Having this information available in a chart may prove useful to the IFQ Committee as it considers making changes to the IFQ program.

Rationale Against bullet amendment: It is an unsuitable request for the IFQ Committee, made up of experts in the halibut and sablefish fisheries, to look into the operations of other rationalized fisheries. The fundamentals of each of the rationalized fisheries under the Council's purview are highly different from one another and it is not appropriate for a single Committee with a specific charge to explore and draw conclusions regarding other rationalized fisheries. If this is a concept the Council wishes to explore, then it would be appropriate for the membership on the IFQ Committee to be expanded to include representatives from other rationalized fisheries.

The following amendment passed 17-2:

The AP recommends the Council ask staff to develop a discussion paper which describes the loss of quota share holdings of coastal communities in areas 2C, 3A and 3B.

The paper should include information on movement of quota from coastal communities and determine whether the quota was sold or the quota holder moved from the coastal community.

The discussion paper should explore means for coastal communities to access quota through a suite of solutions with the intent of providing access to the halibut fishery for coastal communities that augment purchasing opportunities.

Possible solutions to explore include:

- The Iceland model, the coastal fishing program, which allows residents of coastal communities in particular regions to participate in day fisheries without purchasing quota.
- A transfer quota tax on quota shares that are transferred. This could be a percentage of quota share transferred that goes into a pool to be redistributed to coastal communities.
- Each year coastal communities are awarded quota shares as a percentage (10-30%) of any increase in IFQ for that year in the area where the coastal community is located (2C, 3A, 3B).

Rationale For Discussion Paper amendment:

- One of the goals of the IFQ program was to provide widespread benefits to coastal communities. While larger rural communities, Kodiak, Sitka and Petersburg, for example, have remained relatively stable in quota holdings since the inception of the program, smaller rural communities are masked by the relative success of the larger rural communities.
- The value of quota in a community is more than economics, the access serves as a cultural thread and the issue is deeper. Village fisheries serve many different functions in supporting a fishing way of life and providing the opportunity for intergenerational exchange of fishing knowledge. While the individual may have been compensated, the loss to the community as a whole is difficult to capture we know enough to understand the ripple down effects when a fishing community loses the right to fish. When we see a 70% decrease in historical fishing communities in a place like Kodiak, situated right in the middle of some of the richest fishing grounds in the world, it's time to act, before it's too late for small rural communities in Alaska.
- The information indicated in the requested discussion paper is relevant for consideration by the IFQ Committee at their October meeting.

Final motion as amended passed 15-4.

Rationale For entire C4 motion as amended:

The committee is encouraged to continue to explore and bring out other possible data gaps in the 20-year review.

Rationale Against entire C4 motion as amended:

The final amendment to the motion is out of place with the remainder of the motion as it requests staff to develop a discussion paper for Council review with the majority of the motion requesting the IFQ Committee to explore and provide feedback on specific topics.

C5 NSRKC Harvest Specifications

The AP recommends the Council approve the Norton Sound Red King Crab chapter of the SAFE and also recommends the Council adopt the SSC's recommended specifications for Norton Sound Red King Crab: OFL at 0.67 million lbs and an ABC of 0.54 million lbs.

Motion passed 16-0.

Rationale: The AP noted that the plan team agreed with the author of the NSRKC chapter of the SAFE to use model 3 for the OFL which was 0.67 million pounds. In tier 4, at an 80% rate, this leads to an ABC of 0.54 million pounds.

C6 BSAI Yellowfin Sole Trawl Limited Access Fishery

The final motion with approved amendments reads as follows:

The AP recommends the Council release the BSAI Yellowfin Sole Trawl Limited Access Fishery for public review as presented below:

Alternative 1: No Action – Status Quo

Alternative 2: A catcher vessel may target the BSAI trawl limited access yellowfin sole fishery and deliver its catch to a mothership or catcher/processor only if that catcher vessel is assigned an LLP that is credited with at least one trip target landing in the BSAI yellowfin sole limited access fishery made to a mothership or catcher/processor between 2000-2016.

Suboption 2.1: in any year

Suboption 2.2: in any two years

Option 2.1: The limits on access to catcher vessels are relieved if the TAC assigned to the BSAI trawl yellowfin sole limited access fishery is equal to or greater than:

Suboption 2.1.1: 15,000 mt

Suboption 2.1.2: 20,000 mt

Suboption 2.1.3: 25,000 mt

Additionally, the AP requests the Council have staff analyze number of non-AFA CVs that are Bering Sea endorsed and can participate in the BS YFS trawl limited access fishery.

The AP recommends the Council request that the analysis capture the current mothership sector in the TLAS fishery as well as potential future participants.

The AP recommends the Council analyze halibut bycatch implications resulting from each of the suboptions.

Motion as amended passed 19-1.

Rationale in Support:

- The BSAI yellowfin sole trawl limited access fishery is experiencing a combination of decreased TAC, increased participation, a shortened season, and relatively high halibut bycatch rates. These factors indicate there may be a “race for fish” that requires changes to the management structure.
- Considering a catcher vessels’ targeted trips in the BSAI yellowfin sole trawl limited access fishery from 2000 to 2016 will more fully capture the scope of historic, sustained, and recent participation in the fishery that may be helpful for making decisions about any restrictions that may be necessary.
- If the suite of qualifying years restricts access to only a few vessels, for example under 10, then the ability to manage bycatch may become restricted as well. Having a larger number of vessels to choose from allows for the potential ability to remove bad players and replace them with other participants.
- Sub-options that relieve limits on access to catcher vessels at increased BSAI yellowfin sole TAC levels will preserve access for vessels with historic participation in the fishery at low TAC levels while also allowing wider access for trawl vessels should TAC levels increase.
- Concerns over a “knife edge” issue during TAC setting, if the restrictions on access to trawl vessels are all or nothing, led to a discussion and failed motion that included threshold solutions that would have prioritized access but proved more complicated than the risk the original TAC knife edge issue posed.
- The number of non-AFA vessels that are endorsed in the Bering Sea was not discussed in the analysis. It would be helpful to understand the number of vessels in this category and the potential impacts to eligible LLP holders. Non-AFA catcher vessels may have more dependency on the BSAI yellowfin sole limited access fishery given their lack of access to any secure harvest allocations.

Rationale in Opposition: Changing the years under consideration for any limitations on catcher vessel access from 2008-2015 to 2000-2016 is too expansive and may not adequately protect the vessels that are historically dependent on the fishery from being displaced by new entrants. The ability of vessels in the fishery to act cooperatively to extend the fishing season and harvest the TAC with optimal halibut rates may be compromised as the number of vessels increases within the fishery.

Original motion with amendment process

Motion 1

The AP recommends the Council release the BSAI Yellowfin Sole Trawl Limited Access Fishery for public review with the following modifications (deletions ~~stricken~~; additions **underlined in bold**; final amendments are shaded grey):

Alternative 1: No Action – Status Quo

Alternative 2: A catcher vessel may ~~directed fish~~ **target** the BSAI trawl limited access yellowfin sole fishery and deliver its catch to a mothership or catcher/processor only if that catcher vessel is assigned an LLP that is credited with at least **one trip target** ~~directed fishery~~ landing in the **BSAI** yellowfin sole limited access fishery made to a mothership or catcher/processor between ~~2008-2015~~ **2000-2016**.

Suboption 2.1: in any year
Suboption 2.2: in any two years

Option 2.1: The limits on access to catcher vessels are relieved if the TAC assigned to the **BSAI** trawl yellowfin sole limited access fishery is equal to or greater than:

Suboption 2.1.1: 15,000 mt
Suboption 2.1.2: 20,000 mt
Suboption 2.1.3: 25,000 mt

~~**Option 2.2: The limits on access to catcher vessels are relieved to the extent that the TAC assigned to the BSAI trawl yellowfin sole limited access fishery is greater than:**~~

~~**Suboption 2.2.1: 15,000 mt**~~
~~**Suboption 2.2.2: 20,000 mt**~~
~~**Suboption 2.2.3: 25,000 mt**~~

[The following language (in blue) was offered as an amendment and passed 10-9.]

Add the following sub-option under the new Option 2.2:

The halibut PSC allocated to the TLAS YFS fishery shall be divided in proportion to the ratio between the threshold fishery and the above threshold fishery.

If the threshold fishery harvests its entire threshold Yellowfin amount, any unused halibut

- a. Rolls to the above threshold fishery, or**
- b. Does not roll to the above threshold fishery and shall remain unharvested.**

If the threshold fishery harvests its entire halibut allocation, threshold qualified vessels may not continue fishing in the above threshold fishery.

Rationale: Suboption 2.2 is intended to provide above-threshold vessels with adequate access to halibut PSC to prosecute the TLAS YFS fishery. Without a proportional PSC split, the potential exists for the threshold fishers to utilize the full allowance of halibut PSC, therefore pre-empting harvest opportunities to the above-threshold vessels. If the threshold fishers utilize their full proportion of the PSC allocation, they should not be able to harvest the TLAS YFS allocation above the threshold

[An amendment (in grey) to change the range of years in Alternative 2 and strike all of Option 2.2 passed 14-5 with 1 abstention.]

Motion 2

Additionally, the AP requests the Council have staff analyze number of non-AFA CVs that are Bering Sea endorsed and can participate in the BS YFS trawl limited access fishery.

Amendment to motion passed 20-0.

Rationale: The number of non AFA vessels that are endorsed in the Bering Sea was not discussed in the analysis. It would be helpful to understand the number of vessels in this category and the potential impacts to eligible LLP holders.

Motion 3

The AP recommends the Council request that the analysis capture the current mothership sector in the TLAS fishery as well as potential future participants.

Amendment to motion passed 19-1.

Motion 4

The AP recommends the Council analyze halibut bycatch implications resulting from each of the suboptions.

Amendment to the motion passed 20-0.

C7 AFA 10-Year Program Review

The AP appreciates the document and felt through discussion that Northern Economics noted concerns that took place and recommends the Council approve the document as written.

Motion passed 12-8.

Rationale In Support:

- The intent of the review is to evaluate how the program has met its objectives and how it has evolved since its inception, the resulting document does a good job of capturing this intent.
- Additional points of clarification and areas where existing data points can be inserted in the document have been captured in discussion with staff.
- Reports on leasing should clarify, that the quota is intra-cooperative and not inter-cooperatives. The current report references to leasing may cause some confusion.
- The additional information requested within the original motion (included below) would be a significant departure from a focused report to “describe the progression of the BS pollock fishery under the AFA program.” For example, AK tax revenues are not under the purview of the Council and additional data will not help inform future BS pollock fisheries management.

Rationale Opposed:

- The public would benefit from the added information that the original motion requested, including AFA non-exempt vessel sideboards in the GOA pollock fishery compared to local GOA vessels participation in the GOA pollock fishery, and increased GOA community dependency on those fisheries.
- The substitute motion did not adequately address many relevant and appropriate issues that otherwise should have been addressed in this essential and timely report on AFA. Many important and pertinent issues that were either absent from or inadequately developed in the report were otherwise suggested in the original motion that was superseded by the Substitute Motion.

Minority Report: *A minority of the AP did not support the substitute motion that was adopted by a majority of the AP, instead supporting the original motion, included below. Signed by: Jeff Stephan, Daniel Donich, Jeff Kauffman, Alexis Kwachka, Art Nelson, Carina Nichols, Ben Stevens, Ernie Weiss.*

The AP recommends that the Council prepare a revised Initial Review Draft of the AFA 10-Year Program Review that addresses the following issues:

I. Tax Revenues (To be included in the “8.2 Fishing Communities” section).

A. An enumerative review of tax revenues that have been received by communities and the State of Alaska that are attributed to AFA activities. This information should include:

1. Tax revenues that have been received by communities since the implementation of AFA (including a demonstration of how revenues have changed over time, and the source of such revenues).

II. Economic Impacts to Vessel and Fleets.

A. An historical review and summary of bargaining agreements and co-op contracts between CV fishermen and processors in co-ops that have occurred since the implementation of the AFA fishery.

This information should include:

1. Percentage of the first wholesale value received by CVs (i.e., a review of the variance in the percentage of first wholesale value and ex-vessel prices received by CVs since AFA implementation).

2. A historical review of the number of independently-owned vessels, as compared to the number of processor owned-and-controlled vessels, that have participated in the AFA fishery since AFA implementation.

3. Other information related to changes in ownership of AFA vessels since AFA implementation).

III. Market Power and Impacts On Other Fishery Participants.

What effects and impacts, if any, may have occurred to other fishery participants as a result of AFA (e.g., GOA groundfish, salmon, non-AFA processors, etc.)?

IV. Value Of The Fishery & Community Dependency Issues.

A. Explore how the 'value of fishery' has increased/decreased in the program as it is related to a) ex-vessel value, b) value-added opportunity, c) community tax revenue and other metrics.

B. Include an expanded GOA sideboard Table 17 to include, by area, WGOA & CGOA.

C. Calculate/ explore GOA community dependency on GOA fisheries related to non-exempt and exempt AFA vessel dependency.

V. Other Possible Revisions to C7 AFA 10-Year Program Review.

A. Include some context for pre-AFA conditions in the narrative of the document and reference the first document published on the AFA program.

B. Capture ownership migration trends more accurately than by permit address. Specifically reference the CDQ ownership table in this section.

C. Other Suggestions.

C8 Squid to Ecosystem Component

The AP recommends the Council move the Squid to Ecosystem Component Initial Review document forward for public review, selecting Alternative 2, Option 3 (MRA of 20%) as the preliminary preferred alternative. [underlined amendment passed 18-0.]

Amended motion passed 18-0.

Rationale:

- The document is complete and ready for public review. Moving squid into an ecosystem component reflects priorities with managing for herring and Chinook bycatch and avoids unnecessarily constraining the Pollock fleet.
- The current squid biomass is healthy and there is no conservation concern.

C9 GOA Skate MRAs

The AP recommends the Council direct staff to prepare an expanded discussion paper regarding sector specific MRAs for all GOA skates for all GOA sectors, and to include a discussion of changing the MRA enforcement period for GOA skates from instantaneous to time of offload.

The discussion paper shall include information for all GOA sectors (CPs and CVs by gear type) for encounter rates of GOA skates during periods when retention is allowed and when retention is prohibited – in a more expanded time series, to the extent practicable.

The AP recommends the discussion paper also include additional information such as GOA skate biomass trends, encounter rates in GOA surveys (IPHC, AFSC), and other information as appropriate.

Motion passed 15-4.

Rationale in Support:

- Current discussion paper does not include encounter rate information specific to individual CP sectors. Table 1 is aggregated CV and CP by gear type; Table 2 is CV only.
- MRAs set below the normal incidental encounter rate for a sector will only increase regulatory discards without reducing mortality in the Catch Accounting System (CAS).
- Time series in each table is only three years. While CV sectors observer coverage began in 2012, CP sectors have a much longer history of observer coverage and GOA skate encounter rate information.
- Current regulations regarding skate MRA enforcement is instantaneous enforcement while the actual enforcement of skate is currently at offload.

Rationale Against:

- Reduced MRAs have only been in place for 1 year and it would be valuable to wait to see how the fleets adjust to the new rates before initiating additional action.
- The reduced 5% MRA's on Skates has only been in place for one year
- It is in season management's belief that increasing the skate MRA in the GOA above 5% will increase the total amount of skate harvest resulting in skate species being placed on prohibited retention status earlier in the year.
- Under the 5% MRA Skate TACs continue to be exceeded, although later in the year
- More time is needed under the lower MRA's to accumulate additional data relevant to understanding the effects.

D1 BBRKC PSC Discussion Paper

The AP recommends the Council request an expanded discussion paper on BBRKC prohibited species catch in the directed groundfish fisheries to include the following items:

1. An application of mortality rates to BBRKC PSC taken by the various groundfish gear types;

a. **Discussion on the appropriateness, background and assumptions of the mortality rates used by gear type.**

[Amendment adding sub-option "a" passed 18-0.]

2. Updated information on the survey distribution of BBRKC (by sex and size) in the Savings Area as was done when the Savings Area was initially adopted (Section 7.1 of the discussion paper);
3. An explanation of the rate calculations found in Table 8;
4. Maps identifying those geographic/statistical areas where the majority of BBRKC PSC is taken by the various groundfish gear types;
5. Tables containing data on BBRKC PSC taken by the various groundfish sectors by month;
6. Amplification of the amount of BBRKC PSC taken by gear type within the Savings Subarea (10 nm strip). If this is unable to be done, an explanation is needed regarding how NMFS manages PSC taken in the RKC Savings Area and Subarea;
7. Elucidation of the BBRKC PSC taken in the directed CV and CP Pacific cod pot fishery, including a companion figure to the data shown in Figure 6 that shows the sampling rate in the different groundfish fisheries;
8. **Consideration Inclusion** of the directed fishery logbook hotspot analysis work done by Leah Sloan on behalf of the Bering Sea Fisheries Research Foundation; and
[Amendment of word change, passed 18-0.]
9. A discussion on how the ADF&G harvest strategy/TAC-setting process accounts for BBRKC PSC.

Motion as amended passed 14-4.

Rationale in Support: While the current discussion paper provides a basic overview of Bristol Bay red king crab PSC in the directed groundfish fisheries, the multiple and varied components of PSC management for this species necessitates further information and detail before an appropriate purpose and need statement, with accompanying management alternatives, can be developed (if deemed appropriate at the time of review).

Rationale Against: There is no compelling reason that warrants an expanded discussion paper that will only serve to consume valuable staff time.

D2 Stock Assessment Prioritization

The AP recommends that the Council consider the SSC concerns on stock prioritization. In particular, the AP recommends the evaluation of: 1) the benefits and costs of stock prioritization; and 2) how the increased uncertainty from less frequent assessments will be treated in setting ABC/OFL.

Motion passed 17-0.

Rationale:

- A delay in stock assessments for multiple years will create an uncertainty effect which may lead to a more conservative management approach, potentially resulting in unnecessarily constraining fisheries
- It is valuable to assess whether there are benefits to stock prioritization other than monetary savings
- It is of concern that stock prioritization will shift funding out of Alaska fisheries and to other regions

E1 Staff Tasking

No action taken.

The AP approved the minutes from the December 2016 meeting.