

**Central Gulf of Alaska Rockfish Demonstration Program  
Discussion paper - Report on progress and clarifications  
October 2004**

At its April 2004 meeting, the Council adopted for analysis two alternatives, each with several options that would establish a demonstration program to rationalize the Central Gulf of Alaska (CGOA) rockfish fishery. The demonstration program is being developed in consultation with NOAA Fisheries, who was directed by Congressional legislation to establish a pilot rationalization program for the CGOA rockfish fishery. At its June 2004 meeting, the Council made minor amendments to the alternatives. A complete copy of the alternatives, as defined to date, is Attachment 1 to this document.

For this meeting, staff has prepared this document, which briefly outlines the issues in need of clarification or further development for staff to develop the analysis of alternatives requested by the Council.

**Inclusion of the non-trawl catcher vessel sector in the primary program**

At its June 2004 meeting, the Council expanded the options for defining sectors to include non-trawl catcher vessels as a sector in the primary program. In preliminary analyses, staff has noted that non-trawl participants have very little history in the fisheries. Table 1 below shows the participation of non-trawl vessels between 1996 and 2002, the qualifying years for this program.

Table 1. Participation of non-trawl catcher vessels in the CGOA rockfish fisheries

Year	Pacific Ocean perch		Northern rockfish		Pelagic shelf rockfish	
	Metric tons	Number of vessels	Metric tons	Number of vessels	Metric tons	Number of vessels
1996					*	2
1997			*	1	*	3
1998					*	2
1999					*	2
2000					*	2
2001					4.0	6
2002					2.1	8
Total			*	1	16.8	21
Percent of all catch	0.0		*		0.10	
Total (all participants)	44,847.6	70	18,286.2	68	16,417.6	89

Source: NPFMC Rockfish Database 2004, Version 1

\* withheld for confidentiality

The distribution of non-trawl participation over the qualifying period show very few harvesters participating in the rockfish fisheries, with some increase in recent years in the pelagic shelf rockfish fishery. Based on historic participation, if non-trawl catcher vessels are included in the primary program, persons eligible for that sector (at most 21 persons) would share a historic allocation of approximately one-tenth of one percent of the pelagic shelf rockfish fishery, none of the Pacific Ocean perch fishery, and a small amount of the northern rockfish fishery.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Although the amount of the northern rockfish allocation cannot be displayed, the allocation is likely to be very small since only a single non-trawl vessel participated in this fishery and only in one of the seven qualifying years.

Under the legislation authorizing this program, any participant that is eligible for the primary program cannot participate in the entry level program. Options proposed for the entry level fishery would allocate a portion of the 3 percent and 5 percent of the rockfish to the entry level program, with a portion that allocated to the non-trawl sector (see 1.2 of the Council motion). So, if non-trawl catcher vessels are included in the primary program, eligible participants (likely the members of the sector with the most experience in the rockfish fisheries) would be precluded from participating in the entry level fishery. The Council might consider whether the minor participation of non-trawl catcher vessels justifies their inclusion in the primary program. The Council might exclude the sector from the primary program, if the allocation to the sector under the entry level program is adequate to support their future participation in these fisheries.

If the Council decides to remove the non-trawl sector from the primary program the following two changes to the motion will accomplish that end:

- 1) delete “Option 3. Non-trawl catcher vessel” from section 3.1.
- 2) delete the words “by any gear type” from the third bullet in section 3.3.

### **Sideboards**

At its June meeting, staff presented the Council with a document that included a discussion of historic participation of harvesters eligible for the rockfish pilot program in other fisheries during the month of July, when the rockfish fisheries are prosecuted. A copy of that portion of the discussion paper and its addendum is Attachment 2 to this document. At the request of industry members, the Council did not specify sideboards to limit participation of rockfish eligible harvesters’ activities in other fisheries, instead delaying the definition of specific options for this meeting. To enable staff to complete the analysis, sideboard options should be specified.

In developing sideboards as a part of rationalization programs, the Council typically considers:

- identifying fisheries that are likely to experience increased effort as a result of the rationalization program
- identifying participants with no or minimal history in an identified fishery that should be excluded from the identified fishery
- identifying participants with minimal rockfish history and/or substantial history in an identified fishery, who should be exempt from the sideboard
- determining historic participation in an identified fishery by participants that will be subject to the sideboard, to set the level of the sideboard

Depending on the objectives of the Council, one or more of these considerations could be applied to sideboard activity of rockfish eligible harvesters in other fisheries.

### **Cooperative formation under alternative 2**

In section 5.4 of the Council motion, the minimum number of LLPs necessary for cooperative formation under alternative 2 is not specified. The Council should consider establishing this minimum (or options for establishing the minimum).

Under this alternative, eligible harvesters are required to form a cooperative to participate in the rationalized fishery. Cooperatives must be associated with a licensed processor. The ability of harvesters to use a cooperative formation threshold to assert negotiating leverage over others is likely to be limited provided the threshold is not set so high that only a few cooperatives can form in the sector. A threshold that limits the number of cooperatives that can form could also lead to a licensed processor being precluded from associating with a cooperative, if there are more licenses than possible cooperatives.

The Council could consider limiting the number of cooperatives that may associate with a single processor, as under alternative 3. This limitation could lead a processor to delay its commitment to associate with a cooperative to attract additional members. The limitation could limit flexibility of participants to specify terms in their agreements, however, given that this program pertains to a limited number of species, the loss of flexibility is limited.

#### **Additional clarifications**

In addition to the issues above a few other issues should be clarified at this time.

First, in section 5.4 of the Council motion (concerning catcher vessel cooperatives under alternative 2), the provision concerning processor associations in the last bullet should be removed since processor associations are not a part of that alternative.

Second, in section 2.1, Option 3 specifies that the division of the sector allocations between trawl and non-trawl could be proportional to the number of applications received taking into account the harvest capability of the different gear types. The method for implementing this provision is not provided. The provision could be interpreted in several ways, each of which would take substantial effort to analyze. For example, observer data could be analyzed basing the allocations on targeted effort. The data for these analyses are likely to be very limited given the absence of observer requirements on vessels under 60 feet and the very limited participation of the non-trawl sector in the rockfish fisheries. Given that the non-trawl sector has no landings of Pacific Ocean perch and very limited participation in the entry level fishery, a method of administering this provision is not apparent. An alternative approach, to some of which is already included in the motion, would be for the Council to specify weighting for allocations by gear type, basing the allocation to a gear on the number of applications received, and rely on the rollover provision contained in 1.2 to redistribute a portion of the unharvested allocation from non-trawl gear to trawl gear (if necessary).



## **ATTACHMENT 1 – OCTOBER 2004**

### **NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL CENTRAL GULF OF ALASKA ROCKFISH PILOT PROGRAM Council Motion Updated to June 12, 2004**

#### **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The present management structure of the CGOA rockfish fishery continues to exacerbate the race for fish with:

- Increased catching and processing capacity entering the fishery,
- Reduced economic viability of the historical harvesters (both catcher vessels and catcher processors) and processors,
- Decreased safety,
- Economic instability of the residential processor labor force,
- Reduced product value and utilization,
- Jeopardy to historical groundfish community stability,
- Limited ability to adapt to Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) requirements to minimize bycatch and protect habitat.

While the Council is formulating GOA comprehensive rationalization to address similar problems in other fisheries, a short-term solution is needed to stabilize the community of Kodiak. Kodiak has experienced multiple processing plant closures, its residential work force is at risk due to shorter and shorter processing seasons and the community fish tax revenues continue to decrease as fish prices and port landings decrease. Congress recognized these problems and directed the Secretary in consultation with the Council, to implement a pilot rockfish program with the following legislation:

SEC. 802. GULF OF ALASKA ROCKFISH DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM. The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, shall establish a pilot program that recognizes the historic participation of fishing vessels (1996 to 2002, best 5 of 7 years) and historic participation of fish processors (1996 to 2000, best 4 of 5 years) for pacific ocean perch, northern rockfish, and pelagic shelf rockfish harvested in Central Gulf of Alaska. Such a pilot program shall (1) provide for a set-aside of up to 5 percent for the total allowable catch of such fisheries for catcher vessels not eligible to participate in the pilot program, which shall be delivered to shore-based fish processors not eligible to participate in the pilot program; (2) establish catch limits for non-rockfish species and non-target rockfish species currently harvested with pacific ocean perch, northern rockfish, and pelagic shelf rockfish, which shall be based on historical harvesting of such bycatch species. The pilot program will sunset when a Gulf of Alaska Groundfish comprehensive rationalization plan is authorized by the Council and implemented by the Secretary, or 2 years from date of implementation, whichever is earlier.

The fishing fleets have had little experience with cooperative fishery management and needs to begin the educational process. For the fishery to be rationalized all aspects of the economic portfolio of the fishery needs to be recognized. To stabilize the fishery economy all the historical players – harvesters (both catcher vessels and catcher processors) and processors need to be recognized in a meaningful way. The demonstration program is designed as a short-term program for immediate economic relief until comprehensive GOA rationalization can be implemented.

## Alternatives, Elements and Options

The Council recommends the following elements and options for the CGOA Rockfish Pilot program be included for analysis:

### Catcher Vessel Alternatives

- 1) Status Quo
- 2) Cooperative program with license limitation program for processors
- 3) Cooperative program with cooperative/processor associations

### Catcher Processor Alternatives

- 1) Status Quo
- 2) Cooperative Program
- 3) Sector Allocation

Alternatives 2 and 3 are defined by the following elements and options. Differences in the elements and options between the two alternatives and across the two sectors are noted.

## 1 Set-asides

Prior to allocation of catch history to the sectors, NMFS shall set aside:

- 1.1 ICA: An Incidental Catch Allocation (ICA) of POP, Northern rockfish and pelagic shelf rockfish to meet the incidental catch needs of fisheries not included in the pilot program
- 1.2 Entry Level Fishery: A percentage of POP, Northern rockfish and pelagic shelf rockfish for catcher vessels not eligible to participate in the program, as mandated in the Congressional language. For the first year of this program, this set-aside will be: a) 3% b) 4% c) 5% percent of each of these target rockfish species. If this amount is less than 5% and is taken in the first year, the set-aside will be increased to 5% in the second year.
  - o Allocations shall be apportioned between trawl and non-trawl gear:
    - Option 1. 50/50
    - Option 2. proportional to the number of applications received
    - Option 3. proportional to the number of applications received taking into account the harvest capability of the different gear types.
  - o The Council will develop a method for rolling over an allocation to the other entry level sector, in the event a sector is unable to harvest its allocation.
    - Suboption: The rollover from non-trawl to trawl will occur at the end of the third quarter.
  - o Prosecution of the entry level fishery will be supported by general allocations of PSC to the gear type not allocated under 3.3.1.3 and the general allocations of secondary species not allocated under 3.3.1.2

## 2 Entry-Level Fishery

### 2.1 Catcher Vessel Participation:

Vessels that can participate in the Entry Level fishery are those vessels that did not qualify for the CGOA rockfish pilot program.

## 2.2 Processor Participation:

Processors who purchase and process the entry level rockfish quota must be non-qualified processors.

## 2.3 Fishery participation:

Before the beginning of each fishing year an application must be filed with NMFS by the interested vessel that includes a statement from a non-qualified processor confirming an available market.

## 2.4 NMFS will determine:

- Whether limits need to be imposed on vessel participation
- If limits need to be imposed, determine the appropriate number of vessel that would be allowed to fish in the entry level fishery
  - Suboption: Equal shares distributions to the vessel applicants
  - Suboption: Limited access competitive fishery
- Entry permits are non-transferable and must be fished by the named vessel

## 3 Sector Allocations

### 3.1 Sector Definitions

Option 1. Trawl catcher vessel

Option 2. Trawl catcher processor

A trawl catcher-processor is a trawl vessel that has a CP LLP license and that processes its catch on board.

Option 3. Non-trawl catcher vessel

### 3.2 Rationalized Areas

- History is allocated for the CGOA only (NMFS statistical areas 620 and 630)

### 3.3 Sector Allocations

- Catch history is determined by the sector qualified catch in pounds as a proportion of the total qualified catch in pounds.
- Sector allocation is based on individual qualified vessel histories with the drop-2 provision at the vessel level.
- The eligibility for entry into the program is one targeted landing of POP, Northern rockfish or PSR caught in CGOA during the qualifying period by any gear type.
- The CP catch history will be based on WPR data.

#### 3.3.1 Each sector is allocated catch history based on:

Option 1. The sum of all catch history of vessels in that sector for the years 1996-2002, drop two, whether the vessels earned a CGOA LLP endorsement or not.

Option 2. The sum of all catch history of vessels in that sector for which it earned a valid, permanent, fully transferable CGOA LLP endorsement, for the years 1996-2002 drop two.

Suboption: include history of vessels which hold a valid interim endorsement on implementation of the program

#### 3.3.1.1 Target species:

- Qualified target species history is allocated based on retained catch (excluding meal)

- History will be allocated to each sector for POP, Northern rockfish and PSR caught in CGOA based on retained catch during the open season
- Different years may be used for determining the history of each of the three rockfish species.
- Full retention of the target rockfish species required

### 3.3.1.2 Secondary species:

- Secondary species history is allocated based on
  - a) total catch
  - b) retained catch
 while targeting the primary rockfish species listed above.
- History will be allocated to each sector for sablefish, shortraker/rougheye rockfish, thornyheads and Pacific cod.
 

Participants must retain all allocated secondary species and stop fishing when cap is reached.

Options for Pacific cod.

Option 1. Allocations of Pacific cod as a secondary species will be at the following rate of harvest history:

  - a. 100 percent
  - b. 90 percent
  - c. 80 percent
  - d. 70 percent

Option 2. Pacific cod history will be managed by MRA for vessels that fish on the offshore pcod quota
- All non-allocated secondary species will be managed by MRA, as in the current regime. This includes Arrowtooth flounder, deep water flatfish, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole, rex sole, pollock, other species, Atka mackerel and other rockfish.
- Secondary species allocations will be based on:
 

Option 1) Catch by sector of the secondary species caught while targeting rockfish divided by the catch of secondary species by all sectors over the qualifying period. The calculated percentage is multiplied by the secondary species quota for that fishery year and allocated to each sector in the pilot program. (analyze total and retained catch)

Option 2) Percentage of catch by sector of the secondary species within the rockfish target fisheries divided by the total number of years in the qualifying period. The calculated percentage is multiplied by the secondary species quota for that fishery year and allocated to each sector in the pilot program. (analyze total and retained catch)

### 3.3.1.3 Prohibited species (halibut mortality):

- Allocation to the pilot program will be based on historic average usage, calculated by dividing the total number of metric tons of halibut mortality in the CGOA rockfish target fisheries during the years '96-'02 by the number of years (7). This allocation will be divided between sectors based on:
  - Option 1) The actual usage of each sector
  - Option 2) The relative amount of target rockfish species allocated to each sector.



#### 4 Allocation from Sector to Vessel

- 4.1 Within each sector, history will be assigned to LLP holders with CGOA endorsement that qualify for a sector under the 'sector allocations' above. The allocations will be to the current owner of the LLP of the vessel which earned the history.
- 4.2 Basis for the distribution to the LLP license holder is: the catch history of the vessel on which the LLP license is based and shall be on a fishery-by-fishery basis. The underlying principle of this program is one history per license. In cases where the fishing privileges (i.e., moratorium qualification or LLP license) of an LLP qualifying vessel have been transferred, the distribution of harvest shares to the LLP shall be based on the aggregate catch histories of (1) the vessel on which LLP license was based up to the date of transfer, and (2) the vessel owned or controlled by the LLP license holder and identified by the license holder as having been operated under the fishing privileges of the LLP qualifying vessel after the date of transfer. (Only one catch history per LLP license.)
- 4.2.1 Persons who have purchased an LLP, with a CGOA endorsement to remain in the fishery may obtain a distribution of harvest share on the history of either the vessel on which the LLP is based or on which the LLP is used, not both. License transfers for purposes of combining LLPs must have occurred by April 2, 2004.
- 4.3 Target species:  
Each LLP holder will receive an allocation of history equivalent to their proportion of the total of the sector qualifying history.
- 4.4 Secondary species:  
Each LLP holder will receive an allocation of sector history proportional to their allocation of target rockfish history
- 4.5 PSC (halibut mortality)
- Each LLP holder will receive an allocation of halibut mortality equivalent to their proportion of the sector rockfish history
- 4.6 Allocations of secondary species:
- Option 1) Must be fished in conjunction with the primary species allocations.  
(Compliance monitored at offload)
- Option 2) May be fished independently of the primary species allocations.

#### 5 Co-op provisions

5.1 Duration of cooperative agreements is 2 years.

5.2 For all sectors

- The co-op membership agreement and the Contract will be filed with the RAM Division. The Contract must contain a fishing plan for the harvest of all co-op fish.
- Co-op members shall internally allocate and manage the co-op's allocation per the Contract.
- Subject to any harvesting caps that may be adopted, allocated history may be transferred and consolidated within the co-op to the extent permitted under the Contract.
- The Contract must have a monitoring program. Co-op members are jointly and severally responsible for co-op vessels harvesting in the aggregate no more than their co-op's allocation of

rockfish species, secondary species and PSC mortality, as may be adjusted by inter-co-op transfers.

- Co-ops may adopt and enforce fishing practice codes of conduct as part of their membership agreement.
- Co-op membership agreements shall allow for the entry of other eligible harvesters into the co-op under the same terms and conditions as agreed to by the original agreement.
- Co-ops will report annually to the Council as per AFA.

### 5.3 CP sector:

History is allocated to the current owner of the LLP of the vessel that earned the history.

- Owners may fish their allocation independently if the LLP has a CGOA endorsement, or may enter into a cooperative arrangement with other owners.
- More than one co-op may form within the sector
- Any number of eligible LLPs may form a co-op
- Allocations may be transferred between co-ops of at least:
  - Option 1: two LLPs
  - Option 2: three LLPs

### 5.4 CV sector:

For Alternative 2:

- Voluntary co-ops may form between eligible harvesters.
- All cooperative harvests under this program must be delivered to eligible processors.
- Harvesters may elect not to join a co-op, and continue to fish in an LLP/Open Access fishery. Those LLPs that opt out of the cooperative portion of the pilot program will be penalized 0 to 20% of their historical share (annual allocation). The penalty share will be left with the CV cooperative portion of the rockfish fishery and will be prorated among CV cooperatives based on cooperative share holdings. The LLP's remaining share will be fished in a competitive fishery open to rockfish qualified vessels who are not members of a cooperative and must be delivered to one of the qualified processors.
- An eligible processor is a processing facility that has purchased 250 MT of aggregate Pacific Ocean Perch, Northern Rockfish, and Pelagic Shelf rockfish harvest per year, for 4 years, from 1996 to 2000. Eligible processors will be issued a license under this program. Licenses are not transferable.
- If a processing facility has closed down and another processing facility has acquired that processing history through purchase, for the purpose of determining processor eligibility the history belongs to the facility that purchased that history. That history can only be credited to another facility in the community that it was generated in for purposes of establishing eligibility under this program.
  - Option. When owner and operator are not affiliated, the license will be issued to the owner and operator, but the operator will receive the right to vessel coop linkages.
- The harvesters that enter into a co-op membership agreement shall be the members of the co-op.
- A pre-season Contract between eligible, willing harvesters is a pre-requisite to a cooperative receiving an annual allocation.
- Co-op membership agreements will specify that processor affiliated harvesters cannot participate in price setting negotiations except as permitted by general antitrust law.
- Catcher vessel cooperatives are required to have at least:
  - \_\_\_ eligible LLPs
- Co-ops may engage in inter-cooperative transfers of annual allocations to other cooperatives with agreement of the associated qualified processor.

For Alternative 3:

- Voluntary co-ops may form between eligible harvesters in association with processors.
- Catcher vessel co-ops must be associated with an eligible processor.
- An eligible processor is a processing facility that has purchased 250 MT of aggregate Pacific Ocean Perch, Northern Rockfish, and Pelagic Shelf rockfish harvest per year, for 4 years, from 1996 to 2000.
- A harvester is eligible to join a cooperative in association with the processing facility to which the harvester delivered the most pounds of the three rockfish species combined during the year's 1996 – 2000 drop 1 year (processor chooses the year to drop, same year for all LLPs)
- Harvesters may elect not to join a co-op, and continue to fish in an LLP/Open Access fishery. Those LLPs that opt out of the cooperative portion of the pilot program will be penalized 0 to 20% of their historical share (annual allocation). The penalty share will be left with the LLP's associated cooperative. The LLP's remaining share will be fished in a competitive fishery open to rockfish qualified vessels who are not members of a cooperative and must be delivered to one of the qualified processors.
- If a processing facility has closed down and another processing facility has acquired that processing history through purchase, the history belongs to the facility that purchased that history. That history must remain in the community that it was generated in.
  - Option. When owner and operator are not affiliated, the license will be issued to the owner and operator, but the operator will receive the right to vessel coop linkages.
- The harvesters that enter into a co-op membership agreement shall be the members of the co-op. The processor will be an associate of the cooperative but will not be a cooperative member.
- A pre-season Contract between eligible, willing harvesters in association with a processor is a pre-requisite to a cooperative receiving an annual allocation.
- Co-op membership agreements will specify that processor affiliated harvesters cannot participate in price setting negotiations except as permitted by general antitrust law.
- Processors are limited to 1 co-op per plant.
- Catcher vessel cooperatives are required to have at least:
  - a) 50-75 percent of the eligible historical shares for each co-op associated with its processor
  - b) Any number of eligible harvesters (allows single person co-op)
- Co-ops may engage in inter-cooperative transfers of annual allocations to other cooperatives with agreement of the associated qualified processor.

#### 5.5 CP Transfer provisions

CP annual allocations may be transferred within co-ops and between co-ops with at least:

- Option 1: two LLPs each (with CGOA endorsements)
- Option 2: three LLPs each (with CGOA endorsements)

#### 5.6 Sector Transfer provisions

CP annual allocations may be transferred to CV cooperatives. CV annual allocations may not be transferred to CP cooperatives.

All transfers of annual allocations would be temporary and history would revert to the original LLP at the beginning of the next year.

A person holding an LLP that is eligible for this program may transfer that LLP. That transfer will effectively transfer all history associated with the LLP and any privilege to participate in this program that might be derived from the LLP.

## 6 Co-op harvest use caps

### 6.1 CV co-ops:

Control of harvest share by a CV co-op shall be capped at:

- Option 1. 30% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 2. 40% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 3. 50% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 4. No cap

### 6.2 CPs:

Control of harvest share by a CP shall be capped at:

- Option 1: 50% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CP sector
- Option 2: 60% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CP sector
- Option 3: 75% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CP sector
- Option 4: No cap

Eligible CPs will be grandfathered at the current level

## 7 Shoreside processor use caps

Shoreside processors shall be capped at the entity level.

No processor shall process more than:

- Option 1. 30% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 2. 40% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 3. 50% of aggregate POP, Northern Rockfish and PSR for the CV sector
- Option 4. No cap

Eligible Processors will be grandfathered.

## 8 Program Review

Program review the first and second year after implementation to objectively measure the success of the program, including benefits and impacts to harvesters, processors and communities. Conservation benefits of the program would also be accessed.

## 9 Sideboards

Sideboard provisions will apply to all gear types under all alternatives.

Opt out provision: Qualifying LLPs may choose to opt out of the program on an annual basis. The history of these LLPs will stay with the sector. LLPs which opt out of the program will not be sideboarded in other fisheries if their allocation is less than a) xx b)xx c)xx d)xx (a series of appropriate numbers provided by staff based on catch distribution).

Exemptions from sideboards:

Vessels with rockfish allocations less than the following percentages are exempt from sideboards:  
a) xx b)xx c)xx d)xx (a series of appropriate numbers provided by staff based on catch distribution).

- o Allocations may not be leased

Qualifying LLPs which participate in the CGOA rockfish pilot program are limited, in July, in the following fisheries:

CGOA flatfish (all), AI POP, BSAI other flatfish, BSAI yellowfin sole, BSAI pacific cod, WGOA rockfish, WYAK rockfish

1) To fisheries in which the LLP participated in July from 1996 to 2002 for:

- a) Any one year
- b) Any two years
- c) Any four years
- d) Any six years

2) To

1. maximum percentage
2. average percentage

of

1. total catch
2. retained catch

by target, and PSC by target (BSAI) or deep or shallow water complex (GOA) during the month of July in any one year from 1996-2002

Additionally, the Council requests the following:

- Vessels (by name) that made landings in the CGOA target rockfish fishery from 1996-2002 with current endorsement status
- Estimates of TH and RE/SR incidental catch requirements in the sablefish, halibut and pcod LL fisheries. The Council recommends using observer and IPHC data
- Natural divisions in the level of history awarded within each sector (i.e. between vessels with minimal, moderate and high participation)
- For the following fisheries: GOA flatfish (all), AI POP, BSAI other flatfish, BSAI yellowfin sole, BSAI pacific cod, WGOA rockfish, WYAK rockfish:

Participation patterns in these fisheries during the month of July by LLP holders who will receive allocations

Percentage of total catch, by species complex, in the month of July for each year 96-02 by sector

GOA: Deep complex=rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder

Shallow complex=shallow water flatfish, flathead sole

BSAI: Other flatfish=rocksole, flathead sole, arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish

The Council encourages the CP fleet to work with NMFS and NPFMC staff to develop a data format using confidentiality waivers to analyze sideboards. Additionally, include participation data broken out by the three rockfish species based on WPR.

In the event this program has a duration of more than 2 years, the Council will reconsider the issue of use/ownership caps for companies and vessels.

### Alternative 3 for the CP Sector

As a separate alternative, the CP sector could choose to fish its sector allocation under the current management regime, with the rockfish fishery starting on July 1<sup>st</sup>.



## **Attachment 2 to October 2004 Discussion Paper**

### **Report on Sideboards Central Gulf of Alaska Rockfish Pilot Program June 2004**

At its April 2004 meeting the Council requested staff to provide the several items at this meeting to assist the Council in the development of options for sideboards to restrain participants in the Central Gulf of Alaska rockfish pilot program from encroaching on other fisheries. Specifically, the Council requested the following:

- 1) Vessels (by name) that made landings in the CGOA target rockfish fishery from 1996-2002 with current endorsement status
- 2) Estimates of TH and RE/SR incidental catch requirements in the sablefish, halibut and pcod LL fisheries. The Council recommends using observer and IPHC data
- 3) Natural divisions in the level of history awarded within each sector (i.e. between vessels with minimal, moderate and high participation)
- 4) For the following fisheries: GOA flatfish (all), AI POP, BSAI other flatfish, BSAI yellowfin sole, BSAI pacific cod, WGOA rockfish, WYAK rockfish:
- 5) Participation patterns in these fisheries during the month of July by LLP holders who will receive allocations
- 6) Percentage of total catch, by species complex, in the month of July for each year 96-02 by sector  
GOA: Deep complex=rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder  
Shallow complex=shallow water flatfish, flathead sole  
BSAI: Other flatfish=rocksole, flathead sole, arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish

In response to this request, staff has developed this report, which provides the information requested in 1), 3), 4), and 5). Also, this report provides the percentage of retained catch for possible sideboard fisheries identified in 6). Staff was unable to develop total catch estimates, necessary to provide the information requested in 6). In addition to the information requested by the Council, staff has included a description of landings inside of State waters, intended to verify the extent to which State water issues could arise in the management of these fisheries.

### **Vessel List for the Pilot Rockfish Program for the Central Gulf**

Following is a list of vessels with target rockfish history that may be eligibility for the Central Gulf of Alaska rockfish pilot program. For purposes of generating this list, eligibility for the program is assumed to be based on having one or more targeted landings in the Central Gulf rockfish fishery (i.e., Pacific Ocean perch, northern rockfish, and pelagic shelf rockfish) between 1996 and 2002 and a valid LLP with trawl and Central Gulf endorsements. For catcher vessels, fish ticket data were assigned a weekly target based on retained fish only (not including fish destined for meal production). For catcher/processors, NMFS Blend data weekly target determinations were used.

The list was developed by identifying vessels that:

- 1) have one or more targeted rockfish landings in the CGOA in the month of July in at least one of the years 1996 to 2002, inclusive; and
- 2) received a CGOA trawl endorsed LLP license by
  - a) meeting the requirements for that license; or
  - b) transfer.

For each license/vessel meeting these requirements, the most recent vessel associated with the LLP license is identified below. In the case of licenses that have been transferred, the original vessel is also referenced in parentheses. LLP data, current to May 7, 2004, were used to assess LLP license/vessel associations. If no vessel is currently associated with the LLP, then the original vessel, which generated the LLP license is included on the list. Only vessels that are either currently associated with an LLP license or the original vessel that generated the LLP are included on the list. Only one LLP per vessel is shown; some vessels have more than one Gulf trawl LLP. Also, note that the Intrepid Explorer, received both CV and C/P LLPs through transfer, and is included on both the catcher vessel and the catcher/processor lists.

**Note: The list is being produced solely for analytical purposes and to assist industry members in coordinating discussions of the program. The presence or absence of your vessel on these lists does not establish your eligibility for the program. The methodology used is admittedly incomplete, in that it does not capture all transfers or transfer history. Eligibility for the program will be determined by NOAA Fisheries after adoption by the Council and approval by the Secretary of Commerce. Due to confidentiality requirements that protect catch data, this list will not be revised in the analysis, as doing so could compromise some data released concerning landings.**

QUALIFIED CATCHER VESSELS

ALASKA BEAUTY	LLG1590
ALASKA DAWN	LLG1905
ALASKAN	LLG3764
AMBER DAWN	LLG2608
BAY ISLANDER	LLG3504
CAPE KIWANDA	LLG2636
CAPT'N ART	LLG2148
CARAVELLE	LLG2973
COHO	LLG4851
COLLIER BROTHERS	LLG1523
COMMODORE	LLG3904
DAWN	LLG2487
DEFIANT	LLG3496
DUSK	LLG2165
ELIZABETH F	LLG1273
EXCALIBUR II	LLG3521
FORUM STAR	LLG2394
GOLD RUSH	LLG3987
GREEN HOPE	LLG2188
GRUMPY J	LLG3604
HAZEL LORRAINE	LLG2567
HICKORY WIND	LLG3600
INTREPID EXPLORER	LLG3756 (NORDIC EXPLORER)
LADY JOANNE	LLG2222
LAURA	LLG3665
LESLIE LEE	LLG1183
MAR DEL NORTE	LLG1841
MAR PACIFICO	LLG2696
MARATHON	LLG2882
MARCY J	LLG2278
MICHELLE RENEE	LLG2550
MISS LEONA	LLG1710
MORNING STAR	LLG2164 (OCEAN HOPE I)
MUIR MILACH	LLG2554
NEW LIFE	LLG1367 (DOMINION)
OCEAN HOPE 3	LLG2683
PACIFIC RAM	LLG3144
PACIFIC STAR	LLG4852



PEGGY JO	LLG3594
PROGRESS	LLG3896
PROVISION	LLG2319
ROSELLA	LLG2364
TAASINGE	LLG2603
TOPAZ	LLG2535
TRAVELER	LLG3463
VANGUARD	LLG2565
WALTER N	LLG1271
WINONA J	LLG2653

(Two catcher vessels have targeted landings that do not appear to have LLP licenses)

QUALIFIED CATCHER/PROCESSORS

ALASKA RANGER	LLG2083 (ALASKA WARRIOR)
ALASKA SPIRIT	LLG3043
ALASKA VICTORY	LLG2080
ALLIANCE	LLG2905
AMERICAN NO 1	LLG2028
BILLIKIN	LLG3744 (BERING ENTERPRISE)
DEFENDER	LLG3217
GOLDEN FLEECE	LLG2524
INTREPID EXPLORER	LLG3741 (HARVESTER ENTERPRISE)
LEGACY	LLG1802
SEAFISHER	LLG2014
SOVEREIGNTY	LLG3740 (AMERICAN ENTERPRISE)
U.S. INTREPID	LLG3662
UNIMAK	LLG3957
VAERDAL	LLG1402

(5 catcher processors have targeted rockfish landings that do not appear to have LLP licenses)

**“Natural Divisions” of Eligible Vessels Based on Total Targeted Rockfish Catch History**

The Council requested staff to provide information concerning “natural divisions in the level of history awarded within each sector (i.e., between vessels with minimal, moderate and high participation).” Table 1 shows the division of eligible participants into three categories, based on the amount of qualified catch history.

“Natural divisions” in the total qualified harvests of eligible vessels shown have the following characteristics:

- 1) the divisions are based on large breaks in total history of the eligible catcher processors (as no clear dividing points exist for catcher vessels); and
- 2) the divisions are based on total harvests of eligible catcher vessels (no years were dropped in determining these divisions).

Table 1. “Natural Divisions” - Number of eligible participants in each sector by amount of qualified catch history

<b>Total Catch of Targeted Rockfish 1996 to 2002</b>	<b>Catcher Processors</b>	<b>Catcher Vessels</b>
Greater than 3,500 MT	5	0
3,500 MT to 750 MT	5	21
Less than 750 MT	5	27

**Participation Patterns in the Targeted Rockfish Fishery**

Tables 2 and 3 show participation patterns of eligible catcher processor and catcher vessel participants in the targeted rockfish fishery. These tables include transfer of history that occurred through the transfer of licenses between vessels. In these instances, the combined participation of both vessels is reflected in the table. So, if the original vessel associated with the LLP participated in 1996 and 1997 and the current vessel associated with the LLP participated in 1999, the table would reflect a single vessel that participated in 1996, 1997, and 1999.

Table 2. Participation patterns in the targeted rockfish fishery of eligible catcher processor participants

1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of vessels with pattern	Cumulative number of vessels
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2	2
	X	X	X	X	X	X	1	3
	X		X	X	X	X	1	4
X	X		X		X	X	1	5
X		X	X	X		X	1	6
X				X	X		1	7
	X	X			X		1	8
	X				X		1	9
X	X	X					1	10
X	X		X				1	11
X	X						2	13
X							1	14
		X					1	15

Table 3. Participation patterns in the targeted rockfish fishery of eligible catcher vessel participants.

1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of Vessels with Pattern	Cumulative Number of Vessels
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12	12
X	X	X	X		X	X	1	13
X	X	X		X	X	X	1	14
X	X			X	X	X	1	15
	X	X	X	X	X	X	3	18
	X	X		X	X	X	1	19
X		X	X	X	X	X	2	21
X			X	X	X	X	3	24
		X	X	X	X	X	2	26
			X	X	X	X	1	27
					X	X	1	28
X	X		X	X		X	1	29
X	X					X	1	30
X			X			X	1	31
				X		X	1	32
						X	1	33
X	X	X	X	X	X		1	34
X	X	X		X	X		1	35
					X		1	36
X	X	X	X	X			1	37
X	X	X					2	39
X							1	40
		X					4	44
			X				4	48

Table 4 shows the number eligible participants of each type by number of years of participation. The table shows that consistency of participation varies significantly across eligible participants for both sectors.

Table 4. Number eligible participants in each sector by number of years of participation

	years of participation							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Number of catcher processors	2	3	4	0	3	1	2	15
Number of catcher vessels	11	2	4	1	10	8	12	48
<b>Total number of vessels</b>	13	5	8	1	13	9	14	63

### **Target Participation in Other Fisheries by Eligible for the Rockfish Pilot Program**

Tables 5 and 6 show participation patterns in possible sideboard fisheries of catcher processor and catcher vessel participants eligible for the rockfish pilot program. These patterns include all targeted participation by vessels with qualified rockfish participation that are currently associated with a valid, permanent LLP with a Gulf of Alaska trawl endorsement. As with the previous participation tables, these tables include transfer of history that occurred through the transfer of licenses between vessels. In instances when the license of an eligible participant was transferred, the combined participation of both vessels is reflected in the table. So, if the original vessel associated with the LLP participated in 1996 and 1997 and the current vessel associated with the LLP participated in 1999, the table would reflect a single vessel that participated in 1996, 1997, and 1999. Participation in the following fisheries was evaluated:

- Gulf of Alaska flatfish (rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole)
- Aleutian Islands Pacific Ocean perch
- Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands other flatfish (rocksole, flathead sole, arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish)
- Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands yellowfin sole
- Bering Sea Aleutian Islands Pacific cod
- Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish
- Western Yakutat rockfish

The tables show a variety of participation in these other fisheries by rockfish eligible participants. In the catcher processor sector, rockfish eligible participants most frequently participated in the flatfish fisheries in both the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and the Gulf. In the catcher vessel sector, rockfish eligible participants also most frequently participated in the flatfish fisheries. Eligible catcher vessel participants, however, participated primarily in the Gulf flatfish fisheries.

Table 5. Target participation in other fisheries by eligible catcher processor participants in the Central Gulf rockfish fishery.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of Participants
<b>Aleutian Islands</b>			X	X	X	X		2
<b>Pacific Ocean perch</b>			X	X	X			1
				X				1
<b>Total Participants</b>								4
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands other flatfish</b> (rocksole, flathead sole, arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish)		X	X	X	X	X	X	1
		X	X	X	X	X		1
		X	X	X				1
		X	X		X	X		1
		X	X		X		X	1
		X	X					1
		X		X	X	X	X	1
		X		X			X	1
			X	X		X	X	1
			X			X	1	
<b>Total Participants</b>								12
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Pacific cod</b>		X	X			X		1
		X				X	X	1
		X					X	1
					X		X	1
					X			1
						X	X	1
						X	2	
<b>Total Participants</b>								8
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands yellowfin sole</b>			X			X	X	2
						X	X	5
							X	3
<b>Total Participants</b>								10
<b>Gulf of Alaska flatfish</b> (rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2
	X	X	X		X		X	1
	X	X				X	X	1
	X	X						1
	X		X	X	X	X	X	1
	X							1
		X					X	1
				X			1	
<b>Total Participants</b>								9

Table 5. Target participation in other fisheries by eligible catcher processor participants in the Central Gulf rockfish fishery, *Cont.*

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of Participants
<b>Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		1
	X	X	X		X	X		1
	X							1
		X	X	X				1
<b>Total Participants</b>								4
<b>Western Yakutat rockfish</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		1
	X	X						2
	X							1
				X		X		1
<b>Total Participants</b>								5

Table 6. Target participation in other fisheries by eligible catcher vessel participants in the Central Gulf rockfish fishery.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of Participants	
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Pacific cod</b>			X					1	
							X	1	
	<b>Total Participants</b>								2
<b>Gulf of Alaska flatfish</b> (rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole)	X	X	X	X		X	X	1	
	X	X	X		X	X	X	3	
	X	X	X		X		X	1	
	X	X	X		X			1	
	X	X	X			X	X	1	
	X	X	X			X		1	
	X	X	X				X	2	
	X	X	X					6	
	X	X			X	X	X	1	
	X	X			X	X		1	
	X	X				X		1	
	X							3	
	X		X			X	X	1	
	X						X	1	
	X							1	
	X							6	
			X	X		X	X	X	1
			X	X					1
				X				X	1
				X					1
					X		X	1	
							X	3	
<b>Total Participants</b>								41	

Table 6. Target participation in other fisheries by eligible catcher vessel participants in the Central Gulf rockfish fishery.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Number of Participants
<b>Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish</b>		X						1
	<b>Total Participants</b>							1
<b>Western Yakutat rockfish</b>		X						1
				X				2
					X			1
						X		1
	<b>Total Participants</b>							5

Table 7 shows the number of rockfish eligible participants that participated in the various fisheries being considered for sideboards by number of years of participation. The table shows that participation in these other fisheries varies substantially across rockfish eligible participants.

Table 7. Number of rockfish eligible participants with target participation in other fisheries by years of participation.

		Years of Participation							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Aleutian Islands Pacific Ocean perch</b>	Catcher processors	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
	Catcher vessels	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands other flatfish</b>	Catcher processors	0	2	3	4	2	1	0	12
	Catcher vessels	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Pacific cod</b>	Catcher processors	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
	Catcher vessels	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands yellowfin sole</b>	Catcher processors	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	10
	Catcher vessels	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Gulf of Alaska Flatfish</b>	Catcher processors	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	9
	Catcher vessels	10	7	8	8	4	4	0	41
<b>Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish</b>	Catcher processors	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	4
	Catcher vessels	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Western Yakutat rockfish</b>	Catcher processors	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	5
	Catcher vessels	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

### State Water Harvests of Targeted Rockfish

A review of fish ticket and blend data reveal three landings in 1996 and one landing in 1999 of harvests identified as from inside State water statistical areas. These landings total 96 metric tons (taken by four vessels). The four vessels all have lengthy harvest histories and are all LLP qualified. The fish tickets that show harvest from statistical areas inside of State waters also had harvest from statistical areas outside of State waters. Possible explanations of these harvests are exploratory fishing or reporting error.

**Attachment 2 to October 2004 Discussion Paper - continued**

**Addendum to Report on Sideboards  
Central Gulf of Alaska Rockfish Pilot Program  
June 2004**

**Retained Harvests of Other Species by Rockfish Eligible Participants**

Tables 8 and 9 show retained harvest from possible sideboard fisheries by rockfish eligible catch processor participants and catcher vessel participants, respectively. To the extent possible, each table shows the percentage of the sector's retained catch and total retained catch taken by rockfish eligible participants. Transfer history is included in the tables by including both the harvests of the vessel that is currently associated with the LLP license and the vessel that was originally associated with the LLP license, in the case of transferred LLP licenses. The tables include all retained catch by eligible participants regardless of whether the species was targeted. The numbers of participants shown in Tables 6 and 7, which show target fishery participation, differ from the numbers of participants shown in Tables 8 and 9 because these latter tables do not consider targeting.

Data from the following weekending dates were used for generation of sideboard tables. These dates were chosen to estimate July harvests that were specified in the Council motion.

**Weekending Dates for Sideboarded Species Table of Retained Harvests**

<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
6-Jul	5-Jul	4-Jul	3-Jul	8-Jul	7-Jul	6-Jul
13-Jul	12-Jul	11-Jul	10-Jul	15-Jul	14-Jul	13-Jul
20-Jul	19-Jul	18-Jul	17-Jul	22-Jul	21-Jul	20-Jul
27-Jul	26-Jul	25-Jul	24-Jul	29-Jul	28-Jul	27-Jul
3-Aug	2-Aug	1-Aug	31-Jul		4-Aug	3-Aug



Table 8. Retained harvests of other species by rockfish eligible catcher processor participants

	Eligible catcher processors				Other catcher processors		All catcher processors		All vessels		
	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Percentage of catcher processor retained catch	Percentage of all retained catch	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	
<b>Aleutian Islands Pacific Ocean perch</b>	1996	5	106	100	100	0	0	5	106	5	106
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1998	3	*	*	*	2	*	5	6,851	5	6,851
	1999	5	*	*	*	1	*	6	10,258	6	10,258
	2000	3	3,873	50	50	3	3,830	6	7,702	6	7,702
	2001	3	2,068	32	32	3	4,413	6	6,481	6	6,481
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	5	18,514	59	59	4	12,884	9	31,398	9	31,398
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands other flatfish</b> (rocksole, flathead sole arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish)	1996	6	478	11	11	9	3,877	15	4,355	15	4,355
	1997	9	3,490	33	33	12	7,041	21	10,530	21	10,530
	1998	8	1,244	19	19	10	5,139	18	6,383	18	6,383
	1999	12	2,616	27	27	25	7,005	37	9,621	37	9,621
	2000	6	880	19	19	19	3,835	25	4,716	25	4,716
	2001	11	1,747	25	25	24	5,303	35	7,050	35	7,050
	2002	12	2,485	50	50	25	2,491	37	4,976	37	4,976
	Total	13	12,940	27	27	30	34,691	43	47,631	43	47,631
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Pacific cod</b>	1996	6	1,135	54	54	8	974	14	2,109	14	2,109
	1997	9	595	45	45	12	722	21	1,317	21	1,317
	1998	8	434	34	*	10	845	18	1,278	21	*
	1999	12	534	31	31	25	1,162	37	1,696	37	1,696
	2000	6	324	26	25	20	914	26	1,238	51	1,275
	2001	11	1,439	48	37	24	1,550	35	2,989	92	3,899
	2002	12	1,168	43	33	25	1,571	37	2,739	91	3,586
	Total	13	5,628	42	36	29	7,738	42	13,365	116	15,654
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands yellowfin sole</b>	1996	0	0	0	0	4	213	4	213	4	213
	1997	8	897	54	54	11	751	19	1,648	19	1,648
	1998	5	1,322	78	78	8	379	13	1,701	13	1,701
	1999	10	1,672	66	66	11	850	21	2,522	21	2,522
	2000	2	*	*	*	4	*	6	340	6	340
	2001	10	2,077	73	73	8	764	18	2,842	18	2,842
	2002	11	7,796	51	51	22	7,482	33	15,279	33	15,279
	Total	12	13,911	57	57	24	10,632	36	24,543	36	24,543

\* Withheld for confidentiality

Table 8. Retained harvests of other species by rockfish eligible catcher processor participants (continued)

	Eligible catcher processors				Other catcher processors		All catcher processors		All vessels		
	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Percentage of catcher processor retained catch	Percentage of all retained catch	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	
<b>Gulf of Alaska flatfish</b> (rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole)	1996	16	1,567	*	24	7	*	23	*	58	6,451
	1997	14	325	60	10	4	216	18	540	46	3,275
	1998	11	1,110	66	39	5	560	16	1,669	42	2,815
	1999	10	1,138	81	77	5	262	15	1,400	38	1,481
	2000	10	1,754	58	48	5	1,290	15	3,044	33	3,633
	2001	10	861	*	35	3	*	13	*	34	2,441
	2002	5	*	*	*	2	*	7	1,453	30	2,468
	Total	16	7,817	61	35	11	4,900	27	12,717	75	22,564
<b>Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish</b>	1996	7	421	50	50	4	414	11	835	11	835
	1997	4	991	56	*	3	764	7	1,755	9	*
	1998	5	773	86	86	3	126	8	899	8	899
	1999	6	*	*	*	2	*	8	2,468	8	2,468
	2000	5	1,390	76	76	4	444	9	1,835	9	1,835
	2001	5	793	65	65	3	432	8	1,225	8	1,225
	2002	3	*	*	*	2	*	5	48	5	48
	Total	10	6,720	74	*	8	*	18	9,064	20	*
<b>Western Yakutat rockfish</b>	1996	4	*	*	*	1	*	5	2,094	9	2,098
	1997	3	1,293	100	88	0	0	3	1,293	8	1,471
	1998	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	5	*
	1999	3	*	*	*	1	*	4	1,297	6	1,374
	2000	1	*	*	*	0	0	1	*	2	*
	2001	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	3	*
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	5	*	*	*	2	*	7	8,357	21	8,638

\* Withheld for confidentiality

Table 8. Retained harvests of other species by rockfish eligible catcher vessel participants

		Eligible catcher vessels				Other catcher vessels		All catcher vessels		All vessels	
		Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Percentage of catcher vessel retained catch	Percentage of all retained catch	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)
<b>Aleutian Islands Pacific Ocean perch</b>	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	106	
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6,851	
	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10,258	
	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7,702	
	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6,481	
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	31,398	
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands other flatfish</b> (rocksole, flathead sole arrowtooth flounder, Alaska plaice, other flatfish)	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4,355	
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	10,530	
	1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	6,383	
	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	9,621	
	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	4,716	
	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	7,050	
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	4,976	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	47,631	
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Pacific cod</b>	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	2,109	
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	1,317	
	1998	1	*	*	*	2	*	3	21	*	
	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	1,696	
	2000	5	10	26	1	20	27	25	51	1,275	
	2001	10	15	2	0	47	896	57	92	3,899	
	2002	8	156	18	4	46	691	54	91	3,586	
	Total	13	290	13	2	61	1,998	74	116	15,654	
<b>Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands yellowfin sole</b>	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	213	
	1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1,648	
	1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1,701	
	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	2,522	
	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	340	
	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	2,842	
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15,279	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	24,543	

\* Withheld for confidentiality

Table 8. Retained harvests of other species by rockfish eligible catcher vessel participants (continued)

		Eligible catcher vessels				Other catcher vessels		All catcher vessels		All vessels	
		Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Percentage of catcher vessel retained catch	Percentage of all retained catch	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)	Participants	Retained catch (MT)
<b>Gulf of Alaska flatfish</b> (rex sole, deep water flatfish, arrowtooth flounder, shallow water flatfish, flathead sole)	1996	33	2,769	*	43	2	*	35	*	58	6,451
	1997	27	2,722	*	83	1	*	28	*	46	3,275
	1998	26	1,145	100	41	0	0	26	1,145	42	2,815
	1999	23	81	100	5	0	0	23	81	38	1,481
	2000	18	589	100	16	0	0	18	589	33	3,633
	2001	19	1,357	*	56	2	*	21	*	34	2,441
	2002	23	1,015	100	41	0	0	23	1,015	30	2,468
	Total	44	9,678	98	43	4	169	48	9,847	75	22,564
<b>Western Gulf of Alaska rockfish</b>	1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	835
	1997	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	9	*
	1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	899
	1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2,468
	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1,835
	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1,225
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	48
	Total	1	*	*	*	1	*	2	*	20	*
<b>Western Yakutat rockfish</b>	1996	4	4	100	0	0	4	4	9	2,098	
	1997	5	178	100	12	0	5	178	8	1,471	
	1998	3	*	*	*	0	0	3	*	5	*
	1999	2	*	*	*	0	0	2	77	6	1,374
	2000	1	*	*	*	0	0	1	*	2	*
	2001	1	*	*	*	0	0	1	*	3	*
	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	14	282	100	3	0	0	14	282	21	8,638

\* Withheld for confidentiality