

Report from the PRT scoring sub committee

SSLMCPRTSSC?

What did we do?

- Read through all proposals
- Wrote down questions for presenters
- Broke down proposals into model components (where possible)
- recorded our best guess at model fit for both the action and its status quo

What did we NOT do?

- Generate proposal scores
- Make a rigorous list of “outside the model considerations” – though we did try to note the OtMC that proposers identified.

How did we fit proposals?

- Remember the structure of the PRT

SSLMC Proposal Ranking Tool

Effects of fishing on fish

Effects of fishing on SSL

How does fishing alter the prey field?

How sensitive are SSL to fishing? spatial/temporal

How sensitive are SSL to fishing? diet composition

Season Summer
Winter
Summer-Winter
Winter-Summer

Site-type Summer Rookery
Summer Haulout
Summer Other
Winter Rookery
Winter Haulout
Winter Other

Season Summer
Winter

Sub-region EGOA
CGOA
WGOA
EAI/BS
CAI
WAI
Pribs

% TAC 1-5%
6-10%
>10%
No change

Proximity 0-3 nm
3-10 nm
10-20 nm
20+ nm
Not CH

Duration Shorter
Longer
Same duration

% sites 1-10%
11-25%
26-50%
51-75%
76-100%

Target Pacific cod
Pollock
Atka mackerel
Other

Does this proposal shift TAC or change the length of a season?

- Yes? -Goes into the first arm of the model
- No? –Nothing in first arm of model – if there is no change from SQ then there is no addition to the model.

Does this proposal open or close areas proximate to sea lion sites?

- Yes? -Goes into second arm of model
- No? –Nothing in the second arm

Does this proposal shift TAC from one season to another?

- Yes? – Goes into the third arm of the model – why? Fish may have different “value” to SSL in different seasons.
- No? Move on...
- This was the least useful arm of the model as no proposal suggested shifting TAC from one species to another.

Examples

FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN or REGULATORY AMENDMENT PROPOSAL
North Pacific Fishery Management Council – Steller Sea Lion Mitigation Committee
Provide the following information – attach additional pages as necessary:

Name of Proposer: Aleutians East Borough

Date:

Address: 3380 C st. #205
Anchorage, Ak. 99577

Telephone:(907) 274-7555

Fishery Management Plan: Gulf of Alaska

Brief Statement of Proposal: Change the closure radius of the Jude Island haul out from the current 20 miles to 10 miles

Objectives of Proposal (What is the problem?):

The objective would be to re-open a portion of Pavlov bay to Pollock trawling

Proposal 12

- TAC or season shift? No
- Proximity change? Yes
- TAC/season shift? No
- Triggers
 - Action: Summer HO / 10 – 20 nm / 11-25% of sites (1 of 9 rookeries in WGOA)
 - SQ: Summer HO / 20 + nm / 11-25% of sites
- OtMC - ?

Examples

Brief Statement of Proposal: Allow hook and line CP sector to harvest 70% of its Amendment 85 BSAI P. cod allocation during the “A” season, 30% during the “B” season (51%/49% under A. 85). Increase to be taken twenty nautical miles or more from SSL rookeries and major haulouts, outside of the Seguam no fishing area for listed species, and the Bogoslof Foraging Area – in other words, outside Critical Habitat. Please see attached chart. Note that if the BSAI cod TAC is split, the AI Critical Habitat closures in this proposal would have to be relaxed to allow this sector to harvest that portion of the increase required to be taken in the AI (a small amount in any event).

Objectives of Proposal: Increase economic efficiency, improve safety, reduce halibut bycatch and seabird incidental take.

Need and Justification for Council Action: Only the Council can recommend this change.

Foreseeable Impacts of Proposal: Improved economic efficiency would be realized by the freezer-longliner fleet through higher CPUE, lower fuel costs, reduced time at sea. Safety would be improved by reducing time at sea in winter weather. Halibut bycatch and seabird incidental take would be reduced. Other sectors would retain their Amendment 85 seasonal allocations. Sea lions would be further protected by closure of Critical Habitat. Please see supporting information.

Proposal 4

- Is there a TAC/season shift? Yes
 - Action: Sum – Winter / $> 10\%$ / same
 - SQ: Summer / no change / same
- Is there a proximity change? No.
- Is there a TAC/season shift? Yes
 - Action: Winter / EAI – BS / cod
 - SQ: Summer / EAI – BS / cod
- OtMC – all taken outside CH

Examples

Brief Statement of Proposal: Aggregate A and B season or C and D season pollock quotas when seasonal apportionments are small. Pollock quotas would be aggregated into one quota (either roe or non-roe) by regulatory area when a regulatory quarterly seasonal quota is at or below 3,000 MT. When pollock quotas are aggregated the fisheries will open on January 20th for the A season and September 1st for the C season.

Objectives of Proposal: (What is the problem?) The goal of this proposal is to aggregate small seasonal pollock quotas into one roe or non-roe quota. Presently season apportionments are difficult for NMFS to manage because of the small quotas. These small quotas require the agency to pre-announce fishery closures because the available quotas are too small to allow the fishery to be managed inseason using actual fishery catch performance. Since actual catch information cannot be used to manage the fishery, it has created a series of opening and closures. The start and stop nature of the fishery has increasing harvest costs and processing costs for industry. During the 2006 B season pollock fishery in the Kodiak area (area 630), the agency chose not to open the fishery because they felt that the available quota was unmanageable when compared to the fleet catching capacity. In Chirikof area (area 620) weather can be a real barrier to meeting available harvest levels especially with all the rookery and haulout closures during the month of October. Allowing the quota to be taken during September when the quotas are small will increase safety for the fleet.

Need and Justification for Council Action: (Why can't the problem be resolved through other channels?) The Council and NMFS are the only bodies that have control over the fishery management structure making adjustments to the Pollock seasonal allocation and start dates.

Foreseeable Impacts of Proposal: (Who wins, who loses?)

Trawl pollock fishermen, processors and GOA coastal communities would win under this proposal.

Proposal 14

- Is there a TAC season shift? Yes. In fact there are 2 actions suggested here... so
- We split it
- 14 A (combine A & B)
 - action: winter / >10% / shorter
 - SQ: winter / no change / same
- 14 B (combine C & D)
 - action: summer / >10% / shorter
 - SQ: summer / no change / same

Proposal 14 Cont...

- Is there a proximity change? No.
- Is there a TAC season shift? No.
- OtMC - ?