

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES
North Pacific Fishery Management Council
March 26 – 31, 2007

The following members were present for all or part of the meeting:

Lisa Butzner	Bob Gunderson	Mike Martin
Joe Childers	John Henderschedt	Matt Moir
Craig Cross	Jan Jacobs	John Moller
Julianne Curry	Bob Jacobson	Ed Poulsen
Tom Enlow	Simon Kinneen	Michelle Ridgway
Duncan Fields	Tina McNamee	Lori Swanson

The AP unanimously approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

C-2 GOA Sector Split for Pacific Cod Components and Options

Component 1 – Area

Pacific cod sector split in CGOA & WGOA

Component 2 – Identify and define sectors

Trawl CP

Trawl CV

H&L CP

H&L CV

Pot CP

Pot CV

Jig

Inshore Trawl CP

Inshore H&L CP

Optional vessel length subdivision for sectors:

- a) Pot CV sector: <60 ft and >=60 ft
- b) All CP sectors: <125 ft and >=125 ft

Inshore CP sector provisions

- A) Elect annually to either be considered “inshore” or “offshore”.
- B) One time election to be considered either “inshore or “offshore”.

Multiple Endorsement Provisions

- A) CV’s operating with a qualifying catch history in both the “trawl” and the “non trawl” sectors shall elect annually sector participation.
- B) CV’s operating with a qualifying catch history in both the “trawl” and “non trawl” sectors shall have a one time election of sector participation
- C) CV’s operating with a qualifying catch history in both the “trawl” and “non trawl” sectors shall be able to elect to participate in both sectors in a single season.

Component 3 – Qualifying catch

Option 1) For purposes of determining catch history, “catch” means retained legal catch. A sector’s catch history includes all retained legal catch from both the Federal fishery and parallel fishery in the CGOA and WGOA. This includes retained legal catch from both LLP and non-LLP vessels.

Option 2) For purposes of determining catch history, “catch” means retained legal catch excluding fish meal. A sector’s catch history includes all retained legal catch excluding fish meal from both the Federal fishery and parallel fishery in the CGOA and WGOA. This includes retained legal catch excluding fish meal from both LLP and non-LLP vessels.

Option 3) For purposes of determining catch history, “catch” means Pcod catch retained when the Pcod fishery is open for directed catch. A sector’s catch history includes all Pcod catch retained when the Pcod fishery is open for directed catch from both the Federal fishery and parallel fishery in the CGOA and WGOA **but excluded fish meal**. This includes retained legal catch when the Pcod fishery is open for directed catch from both LLP and non LLP vessels.

The analysis will also provide each sector’s catch history based on total catch (retained and discarded) where practicable.

Component 4 – Sector catch histories

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following option for determining catch histories:

Each sector is allowed to choose their best 5 or 7 years (as a percentage of TAC **or directed catch**) from the years 1995-2005 to obtain an average % of TAC **or directed catch** for that sector. The sector split would then be based on the relative comparison of these averages.

Example

1. Trawl fleet has a 7 year average % of TAC **or directed catch** of 65%
2. Pot fleet has a 7 year average % of TAC **or directed catch** of 50%
3. Longline fleet has a 7 year average % of TAC **or directed catch** of 25%
4. Jig fleet has a 7 year average % of TAC **or directed catch** of 15%

Total % of TAC **or directed catch** is 155%

- i. Trawl sector split is 65/155 of annual TAC **or directed catch**
- ii. Pot sector split is 50/155 of annual TAC **or directed catch**
- iii. Longline sector split is 25/155 of annual TAC **or directed catch**
- iv. Jig sector split is 15/155 of annual TAC **or directed catch**

Western GOA suboption

Each sector is allowed to choose their best 3 or 5 years as a percentage of TAC or directed catch from the years 2000 through 2006 to obtain an average % of TAC or directed catch for that sector. The sector split would then be based on the relative comparison of these averages.

~~**Decrease the trawl allocation by the allocation to the CGOA rockfish pilot program (during the tenure of that program).~~

** The CGOA trawl sector allocation will be decreased by the amount of p. cod that is allocated to the trawl rockfish pilot program during the tenure of the program.

Component 5 – Allocation to Sectors: Allocations to sectors are to be based on catch history (Component 4) except for the jig sector.

The set aside for the jig sector shall be 1%, 3% or 5% of the GOA TAC.

- a. Shall be taken from the A season allocation
- b. shall be taken from the B season allocation
- c. shall be taken from a and b seasonal allocations

The jig allocation shall be available for harvest by other sectors on August 1, Sept. 1, October 1.

Component 6—Allowing harvest of an allocation by other sectors

Trawl sector – when the trawl sectors reach their final allocation of halibut PSC for the year

1. CV trawl sector allocation available to other CV sectors
2.
 - a. CP trawl sector allocation available to other CP sectors
 - b. CP trawl sector allocation available to both CP and CV sectors (CV sector catch accounts to other CV sector allocations first before accounting to the CP sectors allocation)

Longline sector – when the longline sectors reach their final allocation of halibut PSC for the year

1. CV longline sector allocation available to other CV sectors
2.
 - a. CP longline sector allocation available to other CP sectors
 - b. CP longline sector allocation available to both CP and CV sectors (CV sector catch accounts to other CV sector allocations first before accounting to the CP sectors allocation)

Year end harvests by other sectors

Quota not caught by the CV sector by November 1, 15th or December 1st shall become available to:

1. all CV sectors
2. all sectors

Quota not caught by the CP sector by November 1, 15 or December 1st shall become available to:

1. all CP sectors
2. all sectors

Component 7 Program Review

Sector split allocations may be reviewed on the basis of:

- a. New or improved bycatch information
- b. ability to catch quota allocation
- c. fisheries management policy issues

Motion passed 16/0

GOA Sideboards

AP requests that the Council direct NMFS sustainable fisheries to provide the following:

- (1) A list of sideboard limits by fishery and area for the different rationalization programs and describe which sideboard limits have been historically closed preseason to directed fishing and which sideboard limits have been open to directed fishing.
- (2) Describe potential conflicts between the CGOA rockfish pilot program and amendment 80. Do sideboard limits overlap for specific fisheries and if so could some sideboard limits be combined, removed or otherwise modified to maintain the intent of the limits.

The AP request that the Council consider the following possible changes to the present suite of sideboard policies and provisions:

AFA sideboards:

Option 1: Maintain the GOA AFA exempted fleet sideboard policy that requires vessels to fish their BSAI Pollock allocation to maintain their exempted status.

Option 2: For GOA AFA exempted fleet allow leasing of BSAI Pollock allocations only during the B season BSAI Pollock fishery (June 10 to November 1).

CGOA rockfish pilot program sideboards:

For the CP CGOA rockfish vessels that participate in the CGOA pilot program and also form cooperatives in the BSAI fisheries under amendment 80, will be exempted from the July 1 to July 14 stand down period before entering the BSAI fisheries.

Crab rationalization sideboards:

On November 1st of each year if the B season Pacific cod quota in the WGOA or CGOA will not be reached by the participating vessels by December 31st then Non-AFA side-boarded crab vessels would be exempt from the B season sideboard provisions for that sub-area and can fully participate.

Crab rationalization sideboards changes to exempted vessel status for Pacific cod:

Option 1: No changes to the exempted status requirements

Option 2: Exempt Non-AFA crab vessels from GOA Pacific cod sideboards if the vessel's Bering Sea Opilio allocation is less than 0.22% and the vessel landed more than 500 MT of GOA Pacific cod from 1996 to 2000.

Sub-option a: To receive exempted status vessel/LLP would forfeit their BS Opilio crab shares

Sub-option b: To receive exempted status vessel/LLP would forfeit their BS Opilio crab shares that are in excess of the 100,000 pound landing threshold during the qualifying years 1996 to 2000.

Crab rationalization sideboards create an exempted vessel status for Pollock;

Option 1: No exempted status

Option 2: Exempt Non-AFA crab vessels from GOA Pollock sideboards if the vessel's Bering Sea Opilio allocation is less than 0.22% and the vessel had 1) 5 Pollock deliveries 2) 10 Pollock deliveries or 3) 20 Pollock deliveries from 1996 to 2000.

Motion passed 16/0

The AP recommends the Council advance for analysis in an EA, the alternatives contained in the discussion paper regarding a 300,000lb trip limit for WGOA pollock. *Motion passed 17/0.*

The AP also recommends the Council request staff expand the 'Gulf fixed gear LLP' discussion paper to include additional tables and information to enable the public to provide testimony at the June council meeting in anticipation of Council clarifying issues and options in a subsequent staff analysis. *Motion passed 16/0.*

The AP reviewed the draft problem statements for cod sector splits and LLP recency and received public comment on those drafts. The AP commends the staff on the development of these problem statements. *Motion passed 15/0.*

C-3 Trawl LLP Recency

The AP recommends the Council delete Alternatives 3 and 5 and make Alternatives 2 and 4 applicable only to trawl LLP endorsements.

Further, the AP recommends the addition of a suboption under component 3, Option 1 to exclude AFA vessels from LLP qualification requirements for the BS and AI only.

Motion passed 16/0/1

Additionally, the AP recommends that January 2006 be added to the appropriate components and alternatives based on comments from the owner of the F/V Ocean Hunter. *Motion passed 14/2/1.*

C-4 BSAI Crab Management

C-4 (a) Crab Rationalization 18 month review

The AP requests Council direct staff to draft a discussion paper analyzing how B shares are being used and whether their uses are consistent with the original intent.

The AP also requests the Council initiate staff analysis to allow C shares to remain open-access shares, without regional designation and A and B share splits. Analysis needs to be initiated now, or the C shares will defacto become designated to the regions and the 90/10 A/B split will occur automatically at the three year anniversary of the program's implementation. Also, include options in the analysis for extension of the three year sunset date on leasing of C shares and present it at the June meeting.

Additionally, the AP recommends the Council move ahead with analysis for change of the non-controversial aspects of the program identified in the NPFMC February Newsletter, page 3, for presentation at the October meeting. These issues are primarily regulatory in nature and they should take minimal staff time.

Additionally, the AP request the Council take action to provide legal immunity for the arbitration organizations and arbitrators. *Motion passed 16/1*

The AP recommends the Council appoint a BSAI crab advisory committee to address the regulatory issues identified in the 18 month review. *Motion passed 17/0*

Minority Report: The language in the first paragraph was an amendment to the original motion that carried with a 9/7 vote.

This minority report disagree with the motion that passed for the following reasons:

- There is very little information available to analyze as we are not yet through 2 years of rationalized fishery data. Delaying action until October will not provide any new fishery interaction.*
- The crab rationalization program is extremely complicated and finely balanced. However, the program also provides flexibility for the different sectors to work out issues privately. We believe that at this time it is more appropriate to provide the incentive to the industry to work out issues privately.*
- It is unfortunate that the Nickerson report was not ready for this meeting. However, it does not seem to be appropriate to delay action until the report is ready since the report may never be released and is also being funded by one sector of the industry.*
- Finally, analysis on post-delivery transfers is directly being worked on which will provide the necessary tools to use B shares in the manner in which they were intended.*

Signed: Ed Poulsen, Tom Enlow, John Henderschedt, Craig Cross, Joe Childers.

C-4 (b) Crab Data Collection

The AP recommends the processes contained in the confidentiality and data quality protocols for BSAI Crab Economic Data paper be followed. *Motion passed 14/0*

C-5 Observer program

The AP recommends the Council:

1. Follow through on plans for an OAC meeting on May 21 and 22;
2. Encourage NMFS to reiterate its request to the Department of Labor for clarification regarding fair labor standards as they apply to groundfish observers;
3. Encourage NMFS to continue its efforts to develop a "contract debriefer" program to increase its debriefing capacity during peak periods.

Motion passes 13/0

C-7 Socioeconomic Data

The AP recommends the workgroup continue with the work requested by the Council including development of surveys for the different sectors, a draft problem statement, additional discussion regarding confidentiality under FOIA and authority for collection, and finally cost to agency and industry. In addition, the AP recommends the workgroup be expanded to include all members of the industry that participate in the federal fisheries, including the charter halibut fisheries. *Motion passed 14/0.*

D-1 Scallop Management

The AP recommends that the weathervane scallop SAFE report be approved. The AP commends the Plan Team and stock assessment authors for improvements in the quality of the SAFE, appreciates the State of Alaska fishery managers for developing video survey technology to improve stock assessments, and commends the scallop fleet for allowing their data to be shared with the public.

The AP recommends continued efforts to improve the quality of the economic portion of the SAFE and for further in depth analysis of data that is collected in this fishery. Finally, the AP requests the Council write a letter to the University of Alaska and ADF&G encouraging them to continue to support research and analysis of scallop stocks, product quality issues, and the ecosystem associated with scallop stocks.

Motion passed 18/0.

D-2 (a) Other Species management

The AP recommends the issue of management of other species be given to the Council's non-target species committee for further recommendation on Council action. This committee was instituted to address non-target species and innovative measures to manage them.

Motion passed 18/0.

D-2 (b) Dark Rockfish

For the GOA:

The AP recommends that the Council adopt Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. This will remove dark rockfish from the GOA FMP (PSR complex) and turn it over to State management. *Motion passed 15/0/2.*

For the BSAI:

Additionally, the AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 2. This will remove dark rockfish from the BSAI FMP and turn it over to the State for management. *Motion passed 16/0/1.*

D-3 (c) EFH AI Open Area Adjustment

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 2: Modify the latitude and longitude definitions for open areas for the AIHCA. *Motion passes 13/0.*

D-3 (a) Bering Sea Habitat Conservation Measures

The AP recommends the Council modify options 2, 3 and 4 to reflect the boundary around Nunivak Island, the south end of Etolin Strait, and Kuskokwim Bay agreed to through negotiations between the flatfish industry and the AVCP. A map describing this line is attached to this report. *Motion passed 12/0.*

The AP encourages the Council to provide staff resources between industry and tribal leaders to share scientific knowledge in the area around Nunivak Island. Additionally, the AP recommends staff make the recommended change of changing the text "fish species" to "council managed species." *Motion passed 12/0*

D-6 Staff Tasking

The AP recommends the Council develop a discussion paper that reviews the creation of subareas in area 3A for Charter halibut GHM management. *Motion passed 12/0.*

The AP recognizes that the charter industry is facing acute crisis that affect business and the coastal communities that depend on them. For this reason, the AP recommends that the Council encourage staff to focus on this issue by establishing the halibut charter moratorium package as a very high priority for implementation by 2008 if possible. *Motion passed 12/0.*

C-1 Charter Halibut Management

C-1 (e) Halibut Allocations

The AP recommends the Council initiate and fast track a distinct amendment package that is limited to the issues of the allocation of halibut and the compensated transfer of commercial halibut quota share/IFQ between the commercial halibut and the halibut charter sector. The AP further recommends the Council consider the following elements and options for staff analysis:

Element 1 Establish an allocation to the halibut charter sector that includes sector accountability

Formula	Area 2C	Area 3A
a. 125% of average harvest of 2000-2004, translated to %	16%	15%
b. equal to the 1995-99 GHM, translated to %	13%	14%
c. percentage of combined 2004 commercial/charter catch	14%	13%
d. convert current GHM into percentage based on 2004	12%	13%
e. equal to 2005 charter harvest, translated to %	15%	13%

suboption: Sub-area allocations may be considered

suboption: Allow overages/underages to be transferred between commercial and charter sectors

Element 2 Amend existing halibut IFQ regulations to allow transfer of commercial QS/IFQ for use in the guided sport halibut fishery to: (council may select one or a combination of all options)

- Option 1.
 - a. State of Alaska
 - b. Persons holding a guided sport business license (GSBL) from the state
 - c. Persons holding a guided sport halibut moratorium license (upon implementation)
 - d. Federal government
- Option 2. Regional private non-profit (PNP) charter associations

Element 3 Funding/management plans for compensated re-allocation (elements of various options may be mixed)

- Option 1. Modify NMFS IFQ loan program to allow qualifying entities and/or individuals qualifying under element 2, to qualify for federal loans to lease or purchase commercial quota
- Option 2. KACO plan
- Option 3. Crossover plan
- Option 4. Rasmuson plan

The AP appreciates that the analysis would be limited to the Federal regulatory changes necessary to enable sector transferability and that any legislative changes, state, or federal, would be identified but are beyond the scope of the analysis.

Motion passed 16/2

C-1 (c) State Management

The AP supports the amendment of the Halibut Act that would allow the delegation of authority for management of the halibut charter fishery to the State of Alaska. This recommendation is not intended to speak in support of or against actual delegation of authority to the State. *Motion passed 16/0.*

C-1 (f) Halibut Charter Moratorium

The AP recommends the following changes to the February 2007 Council preliminary preferred alternative (additions are underlined, deletions are struck out)

*Alternative 2. **Implement a moratorium on entry into the charter halibut fisheries in Areas 2C and 3A using a control date of December 9, 2005.***

Features of the proposed moratorium (limited entry) program:¹

Issue 1. Permits² may be held by U.S. citizens or U.S. businesses with 75 percent U.S. ownership of the business. Businesses³ may receive multiple permits due to charter halibut activity by vessels reported by the businesses in ADF&G logbooks. Initial permit recipients may be “grandfathered” below the U.S. ownership level and above proposed use caps until any change in ownership of the business occurs.⁴

Issue 2. Permit would be designated for Area 2C or Area 3A. If a business owner qualifies for a permit in both areas based on the history from a single vessel, he would be issued a separate permit for both areas. Only one permit could be used on any given trip.

Issue 3. Permit would be issued to an ADF&G licensed fishing guide business owner.

Issue 4. Permit applicant would be required to sign an affidavit attesting that all legal requirements were met.⁵

Issue 5. Transfers of permits (permanent) for vessels that qualified at trip levels of 15 and above in area 2C and 10 and above in area 3A would be allowed up to use caps. Permits issued below trip levels of 15 would be non-transferable.

Issue 6. Leasing of permits would not be allowed.⁶

Issue 7. Permit Endorsement for Number of Halibut Clients on Board

Highest number on any trip in 2004 or 2005, ~~but:~~

Area 3A: Minimum endorsement is 4, ~~maximum endorsement is 20~~

Area 2C: Minimum endorsement is 4, ~~maximum endorsement is 8~~

~~Suboption 2: Permit holders can be issued a permit endorsement for the number of clients on board equal to the highest number on any trip in 2004 or 2005. Permits above the cap are grandfathered at that level until a~~

¹ Military (Morale, Welfare, and Recreational) boats are not required to meet the qualification requirements of the program, but harvests still count against the GHL.

² Through initial issuance and transfers.

³ A business means a business licensed by the State of Alaska as a sport fish guide operator.

⁴ Transferred permits would not be grandfathered below the US ownership cap, even upon sale of a business, but would be grandfathered above the use cap upon sale of the entire business (see Issue 11).

⁵ The only tangible evidence is the ADF&G logbook, which requires meeting all State legal requirements.

⁶ Halibut charter permit holders may only use their permit onboard a vessel that is identified on an ADF&G saltwater logbook assigned to the person holding the permit. If the permit holder wishes to use the permit on a different vessel, they must obtain an ADF&G logbook for the new vessel before the permit may be used on that vessel. The permit number must be recorded on the logbook for each trip.

permanent transfer⁷ of the permit occurs; the permit is then subject to the cap on client endorsements in Suboption 1.

Issue 8. Permits may be stacked up to use caps.⁸

Issue 9. Evidence of participation is ADF&G saltwater logbook entry with bottomfish statistical area, rods, or boat hours.

Issue 10. Qualification period

Option 10.1. Each licensed guide business owner(s) who reported a minimum of 5 ~~{10 or 15}~~ bottomfish logbook trips during 2004 or 2005 and year prior to implementation⁹ would be issued a permit(s) based on the number of trips summed for all vessels in his best year of the qualification period, unless an unavoidable circumstance¹⁰ occurred. A business would be limited to the number of permits equal to the highest number of vessels used in any one year during the qualifying period.

Example: a business owner operated 3 vessels with 6, 10, and 8 trips, respectively (summed trips = 24) in his best year. He would be issued 1 permit under a 20 trip minimum (24/20 = 1); 2 permits under a 10 trip minimum (24/10 = 2); or 3 permits under a 5 trip minimum (24/5 = 4, but the maximum number of vessels in that year is 3).

Issue 11. Use caps, with grandfather¹¹ provision. The AFA 10% ownership rule for affiliation¹² will be applied to determine the number of permits associated with an entity under the use cap.

~~Option 2. 5 permits~~
Option: 3 permits

Issue 12. Community provisions for Area 2C and 3A communities previously identified under GOA FMP Amendment 66

A Community Quota Entity (CQE), representing a community in which 10 or fewer active¹³ charter businesses terminated trips in the community in each of the years 2004 and 2005 may request limited entry permits.

Area 2C – use cap of ~~4 or 5~~ requested permits per eligible community.

Area 3A – use cap of ~~4, 5, 7, or 10~~ requested permits per eligible community.

Overall use caps for all CQEs in a management area are 2 times those selected for the qualifying CQE requested permit use cap for each area. Different use caps may be selected for CQEs representing communities in Area 2C and 3A.

Provisions for CQE requested permits:

- Designated for the area in which the community represented by the CQE is located
- Endorsed for 6 clients

⁷ A permanent transfer is defined as either a transfer of the permit through NMFS RAM Division to an unrelated entity or when persons are added to an existing entity. Removing a person from a corporation or partnership would not be considered a permanent transfer.

⁸ A business can use, for example, two licenses (each endorsed for 6 clients) on one vessel.

⁹ “Year prior to implementation” could also mean two years prior to implementation, depending on the starting date of the application period for permits; e.g., the threshold would also need to be met in either 2007 or 2008, for implementation in 2009. Actual halibut statistical area, rods, or boat hours are required for year prior to implementation.

¹⁰ Acceptable circumstances will be adjudicated on a case by case basis through the NMFS Appeals Division, but includes medical emergencies, military exemptions, constructive losses. An individual who was assigned to active military duty during 2004 or 2005 and who qualifies as “active” during the year prior to implementation⁷ and who demonstrated an intent to participate in the charter fishery in Area 2C or 3A.(prior to the qualifying period) shall be eligible for a moratorium permit.

¹¹ A business whose permit is endorsed in excess of the use cap maintains that exemption for those permits that remain in its control after other permits are sold, but those sold permits lose that grandfather status in perpetuity. Grandfathered permits that are sold in total when a business owner sells his entire business/fleet maintain that grandfathered status. Grandfathered status refers to permits, not to vessels.

¹² Any entity in which 10 percent or more of the interest is owned or controlled by another individual or entity shall be considered to be the same entity as the other individual or entity.

¹³ “Active” is defined as it is under Issue 10.

- Not allowed to be sold (i.e., transferred)
- Under reporting requirements, the CQE must identify the recipient of the permit prior to issuance.
- The requested CQE permit must be used in the community represented by the CQE (the trip must originate or terminate in the CQE community).

Motion passed 17/0

The AP recommends the Council should instruct the agency to issue interim permits to someone appealing their permit status. *Motion passed 14/3*

C-1 (g) Area 2C GHL

The AP recommends the Council send out the analysis for final review with the following revisions:

- Option 1. No more than one trip per vessel per day
Suboption: Trip defined as beginning a new fishing trip with a different group of halibut anglers
- Option 2. No harvest by skipper and crew
- Option 3. Annual limits of 4, 5, 6, or 8 fish per angler
- Option 4. Reduced bag limits of one fish per day in May, June, July, August or for the entire season
- Option 5. A one fish bag limit with the option to harvest a second fish larger than 40, 45, 50, 55, 60 inches
- Option 6. Closing the season after August 15, September 1, or September 15.
- Option 7. Closing one or more days during the week to halibut fishing.
- Option 8. A minimum size limit of 32 inches
- Option 9. One fish any size with an option for a second fish at under 32" with demand reduction analysis
- Option 11. Limit the number of lines to the number of halibut angling clients onboard.

Additionally, the AP recommends Council further analyze the following management options in combination with demand reduction impacts.

- Suboption 1. 1, 2, 11 and 9
- Suboption 2. 1, 2, 11, 5 and 9
- Suboption 3. 1, 2, 11 and 5
- Suboption 4. 1, 2, 11, 3 and 9

Motion passed 16/0

Include in the analysis a discussion of the possibility that the GHL stepdown provisions may be triggered in 2008 as a result of declining CEY in area 2C and better inform the public that the Council may select management measures to achieve a harvest of either the current GHL of 1.432 m lbs or the stepdown of 1.2172 m lbs. *Motion passed 16/0.*

Area 3A GHL

Additionally, the AP recommends the Council initiate analysis of the following options for management measures to constrain charter halibut harvests to the GHL in Area 3A.

- 1. One trip per vessel per day
Suboption: Trip defined as beginning a new fishing trip with a different group of halibut anglers
- 2. No retention by skipper and crew
- 3. Limit lines fished to the number of halibut clients on board
- 4. 2 Fish bag limit with 1 fish any size, 1 fish under 32", 34" or 36"
- 5. 2 fish bag limit with 1 fish any size, 1 fish over 45", 50"
- 6. 2 fish bag limit with 1 fish any size, 1 fish under 32" or 1 fish over 45", 50"
- 7. Annual limit of 5, 6, 8 or 10 fish per angler
- 8. One fish bag limit per angler per day in May, June, July, August, September, or for the entire season

Motion passes 16/0

