

**IFQ Implementation Team  
Anchorage Alaska  
September 30, 2009**

The IFQ Implementation Team convened at 9 am on Wednesday, September 30, 2009. Jeff Stephan (Chair), along with committee members Kris Norosz, Paul Peyton, Bob Alverson, Julianne Curry, Tim Henkel, Don Iverson, Don Lane (by phone) welcomed new members: Phil Wyman, Jeff Kaufmann, and Rick Berns. Staff included Jane DiCosimo, Jay Ginter, Jessica Gharrett, Peggy Murphy, Nicole Kimball, Stefanie Moreland, Brad Robbins, along with Heather Gilroy, Susan Auer, and Tom Meyer by phone. About ten members of the public (including those who submitted proposals) attended. The team approved the agenda.

Jay Ginter reviewed the status of all halibut regulatory projects since the committee last met in December 2004. Subsistence, commercial, and halibut actions have been a major work load for NMFS AKRO staff.

Jessie Gharrett reviewed a RAM report on the status of use of IFQ emergency medical transfer provisions. In summary, 54 percent of 96 persons using medical transfers appear unlikely to resume fishing and 76 percent of 68 persons reporting “chronic” medical conditions are unlikely to do so. However the number and percent of medical transfers are very small, but are expected to increase over time as QS holders age. This information will be included in the Report to the Fleet, so that the Council can monitor the status of these transfers.

Jeff Stephan asked if RAM also could report the percentage of QS that is represented by medical transfers. Jessie responded that this program was intended to aid second generation QS holders (who are prohibited from hiring skippers), but initial recipients also may use it. In 2008 and 2009, 34 and 29 percent of those awarded medical transfers were initial recipients. She reported that some initial QS recipients who use a medical transfer choose not to hire a skipper. Also, some initial QS recipients (e.g., Area 2C QS holders) are prohibited from hiring a skipper.

The team discussed how these program features have made conditions harder for new entrants. Jay commented that the Council may not have anticipated that QS would become as expensive as it has become.

Jessie reported that the Financial Services loan authority increased from \$5M to \$8M to accommodate higher QS prices and new crab QS. Tim Henkel added that halibut, sablefish, and crab would all come out of the common fund. In regards to an IFQ proposal, Jessie noted that FS does not have the authority to change its own regulations’ it likely would require Congressional action. The IFQ loan program is extremely successful; it has a negative default subsidy. The program does not have defaults due to strict credit requirements. Dropping the down payment in half, as proposed, might increase quota prices because it would be cheaper to get into the fishery.

**Proposal deadline** Nine proposals were submitted for consideration by the team prior to the June 1, 2009 deadline that was identified by the Council in February 2009. Jeff noted that five additional proposals were received since September 1, 2009. Jeff reviewed the public notices that were announced for the call for proposals. Each newsletter since December 2009 announced that the team would meet to review proposals prior to the October meeting. The committee discussed its dilemma of whether to review late proposals. After a brief discussion, the team agreed to review all proposals in the order in which they were submitted in the time allowed. The chair will seek Council guidance on how to address late proposals in the future. The deadline may lead some stakeholders into not submitting late proposals, while those that ignore the deadline could be reviewed. A deadline of at least two weeks prior to the meeting would allow members to review all proposals with their memberships and allow staff sufficient time to review proposals for administrative, enforcement, and legal issues. Members also expressed concern that some stakeholders may bypass the proposal process and submit IFQ/CQE proposals directly to the Council, as has occurred in the past.

The team briefly discussed how to make recommendations to the Council, since the team was not recommending action by the Council, but rather recommending that some proposals merited consideration by the Council for further development in an analysis, while others did not warrant the Council's review. Jane DiCosimo responded that an appropriate format for the team would be to recommend specific proposals for the Council to consider for tasking to staff to prepare a regulatory analysis. Jane reported that frequently the Council requests that staff first develop a discussion paper before tasking a full regulatory analysis to further evaluate the merits of the proposals, and to incorporate comments by staffs of the Council, NMFS AKRO Sustainable Fisheries Division and Restricted access Management Division, NOAA General Counsel, IPHC, and USCG.

In summary, the team recommended that the following seven proposals be considered by the Council for analysis (in the order in which the team reviewed the proposal).

1. Allow Area 4A halibut to be retained while targeting sablefish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands regulatory areas;
2. Allow the use of pots in the Gulf of Alaska Southeast area sablefish fishery
3. Allow 4B category D shares to be fished on Category C vessels
4. Sunset the hired skipper provisions of transferred halibut and sablefish QS by (*individual?*) initial recipients, exempting leased (A) shares
5. Eliminate vessel limits for CQEs
6. Exempt A shares from the overall sablefish use cap and apply a use cap at between 1.25% to 1.5% of the current use cap for vessels that ONLY fish A shares
7. Exempt vessels less than 26 ft delivering 500 lb or less of halibut would be required provide 1-hour notice to deliver for qualified vessel deliveries

**1. Allow the retention of coincidentally harvested halibut during the Bering Sea sablefish pot fishery (Mr Hebert)**

Paul Peyton reported that a skipper on a boat that BBEDC owns is one of many Area 4B QS holders who are negatively affected by whale depredation. Paul noted that all the vessels affected by this proposal would be subject to 30 percent observer coverage and data would be available for use in an analysis. He did not support changing sablefish pot regulations because of potential impacts on the sablefish fishery.

Julianne Curry reported on the concerns of Southeast fishermen that the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) assumes 100% mortality of those halibut that are not allowed to be retained due to the prohibition on the use of pots for the halibut IFQ fishery.

Don Lane raised concerns about gear selectivity for halibut in sablefish pots, regarding whether small halibut are more vulnerable to longer soak times and if there were release mechanisms on sablefish pots. Paul responded that you would see smaller halibut in these pots.

Heather Gilroy reiterated issues that are raised in the IPHC staff comment letter dated 24 September 2009. IPHC staff is not opposed to allowing pot gear to be allowed in Area 4A. IPHC staff would need to develop a new selectivity curve for this gear to account for those removals and recommends a vessel monitoring system for vessels using this gear. She reported that halibut release mortality in the sablefish CDQ (pot) fishery in the last ten years is 34% and is counted in the assessment.

Heather agreed that the allowance has a percent limit of halibut per sablefish. Bob asked if this was intended as bycatch or to create a targeted fishery. Paul replied that his boat is 10:1 sablefish to halibut. It would be for incidental harvest, mostly a sablefish pot fishery. Phil suggested that pot size limits could be modified.

Kris Norosz asked what the bycatch rate of halibut is in the sablefish pot fishery and the mortality rate used by the IPHC for this gear. Heather added that only full retention of legal sized fish would be required. She suggested that changes to the tunnel size might further limit halibut bycatch since wastage is a primary concern.

Phil Wyman reported that most ALFA members are opposed to the proposal.

Bob noted that he could support the proposal for incidental harvest only, so long as the definitions of the tunnel openings are not changed. He would not support the use of pots for directed halibut fishing.

Don Iverson commented that the tunnel design is critical to this discussion because halibut still get in the pots.

Jane DiCosimo referenced 50 CFR 679.2 Definitions for groundfish gear.

*(12) Pot gear means a portable structure designed and constructed to capture and retain fish alive in the water. This gear type includes longline pot and pot-and- line gear. Each groundfish pot must comply with the following:*

*(i) Biodegradable panel. Each pot used to fish for groundfish must be equipped with a biodegradable panel at least 18 inches (45.72 cm) in length that is parallel to, and within 6 inches (15.24 cm) of, the bottom of the pot, and that is sewn up with untreated cotton thread of no larger size than No. 30.*

*(ii) Tunnel opening. Each pot used to fish for groundfish must be equipped with rigid tunnel openings that are no wider than 9 inches (22.86 cm) and no higher than 9 inches (22.86 cm), or soft tunnel openings with dimensions that are no wider than 9 inches (22.86 cm).*

She mentioned that State of Alaska regulations (AAC 39.145) define escape mechanism for shellfish and bottomfish pots for state waters.

Jeff Kaufmann expressed concern about wastage of halibut and sablefish that occurs in nearly all of Area 4. He supports a test fishery in Area 4A.

*Motion: Recommend that this proposal be analyzed, with no proposed changes to the regulations for tunnel requirements, so that Area 4A halibut could be retained while targeting sablefish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands regulatory areas.*

*Passed unanimously*

The team cautioned about increasing the targeting of halibut in sablefish pots and recommended some mechanism to ensure that sablefish was the main target (e.g., set percentage limits of overall target (ratio of sablefish IFQs to halibut IFQs) or a maximum retainable allowance. The IPHC letter identified staff opposition to expanding the allowance of pot gear to all areas and recommended that the Council consider 1) gear conflicts, 2) creation of a new halibut fishery, 3) redistribution of catch by gear, 4) fish quality, and 5) the potential for expanding halibut retention to winter cod fisheries.

## **2. Allow the use of pots in the Gulf of Alaska Southeast area sablefish fishery (Michael Douville)**

Phil Wyman reported that the ALFA membership was neutral on this proposal, but that if the Council approved it for analysis, he suggested that the Council consider the following: expand the proposal to the entire GOA, require escape rings, prohibit pots during 1 July thru August 31 and cycle pots off the fishing grounds on some set schedule to avoid grounds preemption and safety issues. Bol Alverson agreed.

Jay Ginter reminded the team of GOA Amendment 14, which prohibited the use of pots in the GOA. He posed the question of what has changed in the fishery to warrant the Council to change its policy. Team members noted that IFQ program and increased whale depredation are new since the OA pot prohibition was implemented.

Rick Berns supported moving the proposal for Council consideration, noting the concerns identified by team members.

Kris Norosz noted that the proposal does not address halibut retention and that it could result in unintended halibut wastage as it addressed seabird and whale interactions. Don Iverson responded that not much halibut is caught in pots compared to longline gear.

Don Lane questioned whether seabird bycatch continues to be a serious problem or whether past Council actions have resulted in decreased interactions. He has heard that whale depredation is an issue Gulf-wide and has potential for gear conflicts. Julianne Curry responded that there are extreme sperm whale interactions with the fleet in the GOA. Minimizing seabird interactions also could be improved but she agreed that this is no longer a serious concern. Don recommended that the action define pot gear usage by depth (inside v outside 200 fathom line).

Don Iverson recommended that the window for pot use could also be when longliners are not as active (early spring or late fall).

*Motion: Recommend that the proposal has merit for Council review and analysis. If the Council adopts this proposal for analysis the team recommended that the proposal be expanded to the GOA, and the analysis should address the following issues: 1) restrictions to gear usage (a) single v longline pots, b) pots retained on grounds for long soaks v retrieved during deliveries, c) pot storage, d) gear configuration requirements; e) gear conflicts, f) use the 200 fathom depth contour to mark open areas, g) pot soak time slot; 2) area management (SE v GOA); 3) exacerbation of halibut mortality; 4) dynamic(social/economic) effects, including a) small vessels could not safely use pots, b) crew employment, c) QS prices; d) ongoing acoustic research for avoiding whale depredation.*

*Passed 10:1*

### **3. Allow Area 4B Category D quota shares to be fished on Category C vessels (Frank Miles)**

Jeff Kaufmann supported expansion of the fish down program to Area 4B. He reminded the team that the proposed action is similar to action approved for Area 4C and 3B for smaller vessels. It addressed safety issues and accounted for only about 3 percent of the TAC. He noted that delivery options for small vessels are limited to Dutch Harbor, which can be a several day run from the fishing grounds.

Phil Wyman reported that ALFA is opposed to the proposal because it would set a precedent. Others pointed out that the precedent already had been set and that there are very little D shares in Area B anyway. Area 4B IFQ typically goes unharvested each year. The proposer may have the only active Area 4B Category D vessel.

In response to a question of what has changed in the fishery to warrant the Council to change its policy, Paul Peyton noted that APICDA opposed this proposal when it was last considered by the Council under Omnibus IV due to concerns of out migration of QS from the area but that it supports the proposal now. Adak was no longer available for offloading halibut.

*Motion: Recommend this proposal for Council consideration, noting that the proposed action to allow 4B category D shares to be fished on Category C vessels is similar to action that was implemented for Area 4C and 3B.*

*Passed unanimously*

**4. Amend grandfather/hired skipper privileges in the halibut/sablefish fishery to sunset these rights, on any future quota which is bought/traded/gifted (Frank Miles)**

Jane clarified that the QS holder has the privilege for use of hired skippers, such that the privilege is not tracked to individual QS units. Jessie confirmed that the proposal does not conform to how the program is administered by RAM, and that, while it was not impossible to change, it would be a significant staff work load. Another complicating factor depends on who is holding the QS and when for being under the hired skipper allowance. Once QS is transferred, no one could hire a master to fish it.

Jane recalled a conversation she had with the proposer. He was concerned principally that initial QS recipients could transfer away all his/her QS, then years later purchase new QS and still have the hired skipper privilege.

Phil Wyman and Tim Henkel suggested that the team identify that perceived abuses of the hired skipper warrants further consideration by the Council in the form of a staff discussion paper, and examine a wider range of alternatives 1) eliminate hired skipper provisions or 2) modify hired skipper privileges for transferred QS. Jane responded that the Council has developed at least 4 analyses/actions to address perceived abuses of the hired skipper privileges, so there was a long record from which to draw.

Don Lane agrees that the proposal addresses interest in moving towards an owner/operator fleet. Bob Alverson reminded the team that the Council also wrote into the program continuation of the hired skipper business model for both corporations and individuals and some would oppose any attempts to end the program. He opposed additional Council efforts on this topic.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider sunseting the hired skipper provisions for halibut and sablefish QS transferred by individual initial recipients, excluding leased (A) shares (rewritten proposal).*

Passed 9:1:1

**5. Amend IFQ halibut/sablefish loan program to reduce 20% down payment requirement to 10% down payment requirement (Robert Snell)**

Jane reported that the Council does not have the authority to amend the loan program regulations.

The committee took *no action* because staff reported that the Council does not have the authority to amend these regulations.

**6. Allow Adak to use its crab royalties to buy Area 4B halibut IFQ and Aleutian Islands area sablefish IFQ for use by local fishermen (add Adak to the CQE program) (Michael Swetzof)**

The team felt that a specific proposal for Council action was not received. Bob Alverson asked if this would be for only Area 4 CQE and what caps would apply. Nicole Kimball responded that the proposal was vague and the analysis could apply the current CQE provisions for GOA communities to an Adak CQE. Bob suggested that Adak should not have more liberal privileges to buy any more QS than any current GOA CQE. He pointed out that ACDC can now use their royalties to buy Area 4B halibut IFQ and AI sablefish IFQ for community members and a regulatory regime was not necessary.

*The team unanimously agreed to recommend that the Council take no action since a specific proposal was not received.*

**7. Eliminate vessel limitations for CQEs (GOACCC)**

The chair invited representatives from GOACCC to speak to their proposals. Gail Vick and Chuck McCallum spoke in support of three proposals submitted by GOACCC. They first spoke to the proposal to eliminate vessel limits for CQEs. A double restriction of an individual IFQ limit and vessel limit was intended by the Council so that multiple persons would benefit from CQE communities and avoid consolidation of entry level fishing opportunities into too few hands. Gail noted that very few vessels in a community are willing to fish for CQEs because the CQE vessel limit of 50,000 lb effectively limits the

vessel to that limit for non-CQE IFQs. One pound of CQE fish puts that vessel under the 50,000 lb cap for CQEs and limits those willing to fish CQEs. She noted that the individual CQE use cap, along with the standard IFQ vessel cap, would be sufficient to limit consolidation, since the IFQ holder would be required to be aboard the vessel. The team reviewed other features of the CQE program, in which the individual CQE limit is the same as individual IFQ limits, and the overall CQE limit of 3 percent per year for each year of the program, with a maximum of 21 percent of QS for each area.

Paul Peyton spoke in favor of the proposal from his perspective managing CDQ fisheries. He noted that CQEs have the further issue of debt service on the purchase of QS, in addition to safety and entry level access.

Jeff Kaufmann recalled that both limits were intended by the Council to be used in tandem. He did not think that lifting the CQE vessel cap, and going back the IFQ vessel limit, would not negate the overall benefits. Nicole answered that the analysis, if recommended by the Council, would look at the effects of lifting the CQE vessel limit. The team noted that if the number of vessels that are willing to fish CQEs were limited, than new entrants would be limited. Nicole reminded the team that one of the main points to consider is that a CQE participant did not have to own a vessel to lease CQEs. Lifting the vessel cap would help that access.

When asked what was different in the fishery for the Council to reverse its previous decision, Paul pointed out that differences include the debt payments associated with IFQ holdings by CQEs, which must be purchased. The team recommended that the analysis examine differences between communities v. GOA-wide. It was noted that the shoulder seasons of the fisheries are different (*in what way?*).

Phil reported that ALFA, while it did not oppose the proposal, questioned whether lifting the vessel limit would result in consolidation and lessen opportunities for entry level access. Jeff Stephan noted that this proposal shifts emphasis from the individual CQE lease holder to the CQE. Paul responded that if a CQE lease holder can not find a vessel on which to fish the IFQs, then he can't fish or make his payments, which is counter to the intent of the program.

Jessie noted that a number of CQEs reported that it was hard to get started, as evidenced that only one has purchased QS.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider eliminating vessel limits for CQEs.*

*Passed* unanimously.

## **8. Change in residency requirements for CQEs (GOACCC)**

Gale Vick informed the team that the intent of changing the residency requirement is to allow flexibility for former residents to have a longer window in which to move back to the community to qualify for participation in the program. She reported that the 12 month residency requirement was a barrier for potential participants to wait until they could qualify. The number of residents who had left the villages has increased since the CQE program was implemented. She suggested that the committee recommend that the Council consider a range of alternatives for a one time only waiver between 6 months and 36 months so that former residents would move back to community.

Paul moved that the proposal be considered by the Council based on its merits. He identified that creating a one-time waiver to the residency requirements could counter outmigration of residents and provide an opportunity to fish sooner and begin paying off loans taken to lease the IFQs.

Don Lane supports the idea behind the proposal, but expressed concern that potential abuses of the waivers could harm the CQE program. Paul suggested that the CQE groups assist CQE leaseholders in building a business plan that would allow them to make their debt payments. He suggested that the CQE would verify the residency of the applicant.

The team noted that the range of alternatives was not included in the proposal and Paul withdrew his motion. He moved the following alternatives for Council consideration; the motion was seconded by Don Lane.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider two alternatives for changing residency requirements for CQEs (restated proposal):*

- 1) 6 month residency requirement*
- 2) Affidavit process that applicant be a permanent resident within the community in which they are applying for a CQE permit for 12 consecutive months within 36 months of their application. If they fail the residency requirement, they forego their opportunity to get a lease in perpetuity.*

*Failed 2:8 (1 absent)*

#### **9. Allow CQE communities to purchase QS in all vessel categories (GOACCC)**

Gale Vick reviewed a CQE program feature under which CQEs are currently prohibited from purchasing D category shares in Area 2C and Area 3A. The intent is for CQEs to be allowed to transfer D category QS from community members. She clarified that the request did not include allowing category D shares to be fished on category C vessels.

Jeff Kaufmann identified that new information since the program was implemented includes the lack of competition by CQEs for entry level access than was anticipated by the Council. Jeff Stephan suggested that crab crew displaced from the Bering Sea fisheries may be looking to enter the market for category D shares. There are some other mitigating factors for small boat owners for buying D shares compared with competing with CQEs. Jeff Stephan pointed out that this creates additional competition for displaced persons from communities that are not part of the CQE program. Bob Alverson agreed that this proposal could increase competition and place additional pressure to inflate QS prices and force independent fishermen out of the program, which is counter to statements of intent by previous Councils. He noted that B class QS have been artificially inflated under the buy up program. Jane reported that the Council's preferred alternative from the 2004 call for proposals in which inactive QS will be removed from the QS pool is in the rulemaking stage at NMFS and will decrease availability of very small QS amounts.

Jeff Kaufmann moved the proposal for Council consideration. Paul Peyton seconded the motion.

Several members stated that they could not support increasing competition for D class QS. Jeff Stephan noted that in the context of Pacific cod recency requirements and other Council actions, the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the costs.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider the proposal.*

*Failed 2:7:1 (1 absent)*

#### **10. Remove block system for sablefish A shares and increase sablefish A (only) cap (Dave Little, Clipper Seafoods)**

Dave Little, Clipper Seafoods, presented his proposal to remove Category A shares from the block program and allow an exception to the sablefish vessel? cap for A category shares. The intent of the proposal is to address stranded QS, which can not be transferred by interested parties due to the cap and is not being fully harvested under the current program. Dave suggested that the use cap for sablefish could be set at 5% for Category A shares.

Kris Norosz observed that increasing the cap fivefold would be a significant departure from the original program.

*a) Motion: Recommend that the Council consider removing the block program for sablefish A shares.*

*Failed 3:7:1*

Bob recommend that the Council consider exempting Category A shares for the all area use cap at a range between 1.25% and 1.5% of the existing cap for vessels upon which ONLY A shares are fished and regardless of whether harvest was processed. His proposal was for another \$400K gross. Paul supported the motion; he observed that it would take 2 ¾ percent of the limits to make CDQ vessels economical. He noted that only about 50% of the sablefish (Category A?) TAC has been harvested under current program.

*b) Motion: Recommend that the Council consider exempting A shares from the overall sablefish use cap and apply a use cap at between 1.25% to 1.5% of the current use cap for vessels that ONLY fish A shares (no catcher vessel QS onboard) and regardless of whether the sablefish harvest was processed.*

*Passed 9:2*

**11. Create a new category of vessel known as a heritage vessel, defined as any vessel 100 gross tons and less and more than 50 years old and which would be allowed to fish either C Class or B Class quota.** (Pert Odegaard)

Bob Alverson described the intent of the proposal as an attempt to even the playing field for old, large wooden boats.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider this proposal.*

*Failed 5:6*

**12. Exempt second generation sablefish QS holders from two block limit** (Deep Sea Fishermen's Union)

Tim Henkel spoke in favor of the proposal by DSFU; it is intended to assist second generation participants in acquiring QS by making more QS available and ultimately lowering the price of unblocked QS to ease new entry.

Bob Alverson moved that the Council consider applying current halibut and sablefish block limits to initial recipients only. He noted that the block program has not worked well in westward areas.

Jeff Kaufmann suggested that increasing the sweep up limits proportional to need could also be effective. Staff responded that sweep-up limits were raised under Omnibus IV.

Don Lane supported the current block program, and noted that any changes to block limits or sweep-up levels would increase consolidation. He did not think there is a problem in the fishery.

Paul Peyton suggested that problems do occur in different areas. He supported looking at the effects of reduced quotas by area. He noted that Area 3A is probably least impacted, and Areas 2C and 3B are the most affected by reduced quotas.

Jeff Stephan agreed that eliminating the block program may not be appropriate, but that changes to sweep up levels and block limits would be more acceptable.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider limiting the current halibut and sablefish block limits to initial recipients only.*

*Failed 3:8*

**13. Allow second generation who have actively held and fished for 10 years and hold at least 10,000 lb of halibut or sablefish IFQ to obtain first generation rights** (John Crowley)

John Crowley spoke in favor of this proposal and noted that it would grant additional hired skipper privileges to long time second generation participants. He suggested that this proposal could be used as an additional alternative to any further analyses to limit the use of hired skippers.



Jeff Kauffman moved to forward this proposal for analysis; Bob Alverson seconded the motion. Tim Henkel, Kris Norosz, and Julianne Curry stated that this proposal was counter to Council intent for the program.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider this proposal for analysis.*

*Failed 2:9.*

**14. Exempt D class vessels (or those under 26 ft) delivering less than 300, 500, or 1000 lb of halibut to be either exempt from 3-hour notice to deliver or implement a less burdensome notice to deliver (one hour) for qualified vessel deliveries (Jeff Farvour)**

Jeff Farvour spoke in support of his proposal.

Heather Gilroy stated that the IPHC would object to exempting all D class vessel, but could support 26 ft, but only if NOAA Office of Law Enforcement had no objections. She reported that the IPHC also would object to the 1,000 lb limit, but could support lower levels of 300 or 500 lb for exemptions. Jessie Gharrett identified other current exemptions for dingle bar gear and salmon trolling at 500 lb.

Don Lane stated that a problem exists in Homer with skiffs loading onto other skiffs and selling halibut on the black market. Requiring prior notice inhibits illegal sales on the road system.

Kris Norosz wanted to hear if OLE objected to the proposal. She noted that the other exemptions are still under fish ticket reporting requirements.

Rick Berns noted that the proposal still has a one hour notice requirement and that black market fish could still happen.

**Paul Peyton moved that the Council consider exempting vessels less than 26 ft delivering 500 lb or less of halibut would be required provide 1-hour notice to deliver for qualified vessel deliveries.** Julianne Curry seconded the motion. Don lane spoke against the motion, but Paul responded that the issues would be explored in the analysis.

*Motion: Recommend that the Council consider allowing vessels less than 26 ft that deliver  $\leq$  500 lb of halibut IFQ to provide 1-hour notice of delivery.*

*Passed 10:1*

**Summary** Jane reviewed the proposals that were recommended by the team for Council consideration.

Kris clarified that none of these recommendations for consideration were a recommendation for favorable action. Kris noted that these seven proposals would take considerable staff time to analyze and implement.

The team requested that if the Council considers and approves for new actions that were not considered by the Council, then the team should review the proposals or analysis prior to initial review.

In the absence of calls for proposals, the team recommended meeting no more than every other year to review the status of the program. The biennial agenda could include a review of the *Report to the Fleet*.

The team expressed its congratulations on the retirement of Jay Ginter at the end of February 2010, and thanked him for his many years of service. Jessie Gharrett reported that she will be on half time as Director of NMFS RAM Division, while she is on a detail with NMFS NWRO. Jane DiCosimo announced that she was willing to go away too.

**Adjourn** The team adjourned approximately 6 pm.