

Eric A. Olson  
Chairman  
Chris Oliver  
Executive Director

605 W 4th, Ste 306  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
(907) 271-2809  
(907) 271-2817

[www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc](http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc)



# News & Notes

## North Pacific Fishery Management Council

June 2010

## Thank you, Sitka

The Council held its June meeting in Sitka, Alaska. The Sitka Chamber of Commerce held a welcome reception for the public and the Council family at the Raptor Recovery Center. The catered event was well attended, and Sampson Tug and Barge and other sponsors had door prizes for those who were lucky. On Saturday during the meeting, the Sitka Sound Science Center held a fund raiser dinner and raffle at the Aquarium. Those who attended were treated to seafood donated by various fishermen, seafood associations and companies. A good time was had by all.

## Plan Team Nominations

The Council appointed Ms. Peggy Murphy to replace Gretchen Harrington on the Council's Scallop Plan Team, and Mr. Chris Lunsford to replace Jeff Fujioika on the GOA Groundfish Plan Team. Ms. Murphy works in the Sustainable Fisheries Division of NMFS. Mr. Lunsford works for the Alaska Fisheries Science Center at the Lena Point facility, and is a research fishery biologist. We look forward to working with them in the future.



Photo: P Kircher

## GOA Rockfish Catch Share Program

At its June meeting, the Council took final action defining a catch share program for the Central Gulf of Alaska directed rockfish fisheries. The program is intended to replace the pilot program under which the fisheries are currently managed, as that pilot program expires after the 2011 season. In addition to target rockfish species (Pacific ocean perch, northern rockfish, and pelagic shelf rockfish), the program allocates Pacific cod, sablefish, shorttraker rockfish, roughey rockfish, thornyhead rockfish, and halibut prohibited species catch to program participants. The Council's action would establish cooperative programs for both catcher processors and catcher vessels. Licenses qualifying for the program would annually form cooperatives that would receive allocations based on the catch histories of members. Catcher vessel cooperatives would be required to associate with a shore-based processor in Kodiak, but members may change cooperatives and cooperatives may change processor associations annually without penalty. All deliveries of catcher vessel catch are required to be made in Kodiak. Licenses used to participate in the trawl entry level fishery under the pilot program would receive an allocation of 2.5 percent of the total allocation to the program, which would be divided among participants in that fishery in proportion to the number of years they participated. Program allocations are otherwise based on catch histories from 2000 to 2006, with each license dropping the two years of its lowest catches. To

conserve the species, halibut prohibited species catch allocations are reduced by 12.5 percent of historic levels. In addition, halibut savings may also be realized through a reduction of the rollover of unused halibut from the program to the fifth season trawl apportionment to 55 percent of that unused halibut. Caps limit the percentage of the various allocations that may be held by any person or harvested by a vessel and that may be received or processed by any processor. A program review is provided for after the third year of the program, in addition to any other reviews that may be required by the Magnuson Stevens Act. Sideboards limit the activities of program participants in other fisheries. The new program expires 10 years after implementation.

The action also includes a set aside to establish an entry level fishery for fixed gear vessels. The initial allocation to the entry level fishery would be 5 metric tons of Pacific ocean perch, 5 metric tons of northern rockfish, and 30 tons of pelagic shelf rockfish, and would be increased for a species, each time the sector harvested in excess of 90 percent of that species allocation. Growth of the entry level fishery is limited to 1 percent of the Pacific ocean perch total allowable catch, 2 percent of the northern rockfish total allowable catch, and 5 percent of the pelagic shelf rockfish total allowable catch.

The Council will receive a report outlining progress on the draft regulations at its October meeting, at which time it will assess whether to undertake a full review of those regulations. Staff contact is Mark Fina.

## AFA Preliminary Report Removal

At its June 2010 meeting, the Council took initial/final action selecting a preferred alternative that would remove the requirement for AFA cooperatives participating in the directed pollock fishery to prepare and submit the preliminary annual report. This action would not affect the timing of the final report, which is due by February 1 of the following year. Currently, a preliminary AFA cooperative report is due to the Council by December 1 of the year in which the pollock fishing occurred. The Council originally recommended a preliminary report, because it wanted to have this report available for its December Council meeting when it adopts annual groundfish harvest specifications for the upcoming fishing year. However, the Council was not relying on the preliminary cooperative annual report to develop its recommendations on final groundfish specifications as much as it originally thought it would, so the Council voted to remove the requirement for the preliminary annual report. Staff contact is Jon McCracken.

## Halibut PSC Limits

The Council briefly reviewed a discussion paper and associated tables which presented information that is required by the GOA Groundfish FMP to amend halibut prohibited species catch limits. The Council identified additional information to be included in the paper and scheduled review of the revised discussion paper in October. At that time the Council will identify whether any further action is needed. Contact Jane DiCosimo for more information.

## Crab OFLs

The SSC recommended OFLs for 4 crab stocks at this meeting, and made recommendations on tier levels and appropriate model parameters for the remaining 6 stocks. Those 6 stocks will have final OFLs established in the fall after incorporation of the summer trawl data into the final stock assessments. All 10 crab stocks now have 'total catch' OFL meaning that all catch (directed and non-directed crab, groundfish and scallop) accrues towards the OFL. Two stocks remain under rebuilding plans (snow crab and Pribilof Island blue king crab) and both plans require revision. In October, the Council will take initial review of the Pribilof Island blue king crab rebuilding plan, final action on the snow crab rebuilding plan and will be provided the final Crab SAFE report including OFLs and stock status determination for all stocks.

## Crab Annual Catch Limits and Snow Crab Rebuilding

The Council took initial review of a combined analysis of crab annual catch limits (ACLs) and revised snow crab rebuilding plan. Two actions are included in the analysis to amend the BSAI Crab FMP. The first action (Action 1) would amend the FMP to specify the method by which the Council will establish annual catch limits (ACLs) to meet the requirements of the revised Magnuson-Stevens Act. The MSRA and National Standard 1 guidelines specify that ACLs are to be established based upon an acceptable biological catch (ABC) control rule which will be set forth in the FMP and will account for the uncertainty in the overfishing limit (OFL) point estimate. No ABC control rule currently exists in the FMP for BSAI crab stocks, nor a process by which an annual SSC recommendation on ABCs could be made to the Council. Two alternative means of establishing the ABC control rule are considered: 1) a constant buffer approach where the ABC for each stock would be set by application of a constant pre-specified buffer value below the OFL; and 2) a variable buffer approach where the ABC would be established based upon a pre-specified percentile of the distribution for the OFL which accounts for scientific uncertainty regarding the OFL. A range of constant buffers and probabilities are considered under each alternative approach.

The SSC recommended a P\* approach for establishing an ABC control rule as it directly accounts for uncertainty in setting ACLs below OFL and is responsive to changes in understanding of uncertainty related to the OFL to meet the requirements. The SSC also recommended that the default values for the additional uncertainty

correction ( $\sigma$ -b) be established as 0.2., 0.3, 0.4 for low, medium and high thresholds.

The Council identified status quo (no action) as their preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) and requested that staff amplify the discussion in the analysis to indicate where (or whether) current management meets regulatory requirements. Staff is further requested to provide an indication as to whether minor modifications to the current management rather than alternatives 2 and 3 would address any potential deficiencies in meeting these requirements. The Council also requested the inclusion of an additional uncertainty value of 0.1.

The second action in the analysis (Action 2) is to prepare and implement an amended plan to rebuild the snow crab stock as the stock did not rebuild in the time frame specified under the previous rebuilding plan. A range of alternative time frames from 2014/15 to 2019/20 are considered for rebuilding the stock with options to allow for increased probability of rebuilding the stock by target year-ending dates. The probability of rebuilding may be increased, either by directed fishery harvest constraints above that which achieves a 50% probability of rebuilding (option 2 at 75% and option 3 at 90%) or by extending the time frame for rebuilding to achieve a higher probability of rebuilding as initially projected (option 1 at 70%). Under each alternative, it is explicit that the F rates will be adjusted annually to maintain the schedule of rebuilding by achieving either the mature male biomass that is projected by year for the alternative or the specific probability of rebuilding listed for the alternative.

The Council did not indicate a PPA for Action 2 but did indicate a preference for the option to consider the stock rebuilt the first year it is above its  $B_{MSY}$  estimate. Currently the stock is not considered rebuilt until the second consecutive year above  $B_{MSY}$ . The analysis of ACLs and snow crab rebuilding will be released for public review after addressing SSC comments and the Council's motion. A public review draft of the analysis will be available on the Council's website in late August. Staff contact is Diana Stram.



Waiting for raffle results at the Aquarium.

## Crab Bycatch

The Council reviewed a discussion paper on crab bycatch in the BSAI groundfish and scallop fisheries. Following approval of Amendment 24 to the BSAI Crab FMP, all crab stocks now have annually-specified overfishing limits (OFLs). For all stocks in 2010/11, these OFLs are intended to cover total removals from the stock, including bycatch in groundfish and scallop fisheries. There is currently no explicit linkage between OFL restrictions in the Crab FMP and bycatch by crab stock under the BSAI groundfish FMP. Additional requirements for catch removals for crab stocks will be necessary to comply with Annual Catch Limits (ACLs). The ACL analysis notes that an annually specified ACL or OFL by crab stock could be exceeded due to catch outside of the directed crab fisheries but that absent an amendment to establish PSC limits in groundfish fisheries, any overage would be borne by the directed crab fishery only.

The Council moved to initiate an analysis to establish PSC limits in the BSAI groundfish fisheries for all 10 crab stocks. Both fixed and annually-varying limits are to be considered. Additional components to be considered include existing or expanded closure areas, application of limits and closures by trawl and fixed gear and changes to current accounting time frames. Council staff will confer with the Crab Plan Team to provide additional details on individual components and limits. The Council may modify alternatives and components during preliminary review. No specific timing was noted for preliminary review of this analysis. The full Council motion is posted on the website. Staff contact is Diana Stram.

## Steller Sea Lion Update

In June, the Council received an update from NMFS on the schedule for preparation and release of the draft *status quo* Biological Opinion on Steller sea lions. NMFS indicated that it is the agency's intent to release the draft BiOp by late July 2010. In order to provide the Council the opportunity to review the BiOp, and potentially provide input to the agency on management measures (if necessary) for the 2011 fishing year, the Council will hold a special meeting in August. There will be no time for independent review by the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) as originally envisioned, but the Council has requested SSC review of the BiOp, and could use the August meeting to comment on the BiOp as well as provide input to NMFS on any necessary management measures. **The August meeting has been scheduled for the week of August 16-19 at the Captain Cook Hotel in Anchorage, with the SSC meeting August 16-17, the AP meeting August 17-18, and the Council meeting August 18-19.**

Following the August meeting, NMFS would complete an analysis of alternative management measures, and those would be available for potential Council final action at the October meeting. This is a very compressed schedule but would allow for measures, if needed, to be in place for the 2011 fishing year. Given the extremely compressed schedule, it became apparent that there is little merit in attempting to engage the

Council's SSL Mitigation Committee in this process. That question was discussed by the Council in June, and at this time, the SSLMC is not scheduled to meet prior to the August Council meeting. After the draft BiOp is released, the role of the SSLMC will continue to be explored. The SSLMC or a more focused advisory group could potentially meet after the Council reviews the draft BiOp in August and provide input on any necessary management measures to the Council at the October meeting. Staff Contact is Jeannie Heltzel.

## GOA Exemption for BSAI Crab Vessels

At its June meeting, the Council reviewed an initial draft of an amendment package to exempt crab vessels from GOA Pacific cod sideboards from November 1 to December 31 of each year. At the meeting, the Council voted to take no further action until such time as the GOA fixed gear LLP recency action and GOA Pacific cod sector split regulations are published. The GOA fixed gear LLP recency action would limit entry into the directed Pacific cod fisheries in the Western and Central GOA, while the GOA Pacific cod sector split action would allocate Western and Central Pacific cod TACs among the many sectors operating in the GOA. Once published, the Council can better assess the available GOA Pacific cod TAC during November 1 to December 31 to determine the need to exempt crab vessels from GOA Pacific cod sideboards. Staff contact is Jon McCracken.

## BSAI Arrowtooth Flounder MRA Adjustment

At its June 2010 meeting, the Council reviewed and released for public review a proposed action to revise the maximum retainable amounts (MRAs) of groundfish in the BSAI arrowtooth flounder fishery. The Council also added a new suboption to Alternatives 2 and 3 that would set the MRA for Greenland turbot at 15 percent. The Council, in December 2009, initiated an analysis to consider changes to the MRAs of groundfish in the arrowtooth flounder fishery in the BSAI given the growing market demand for the species. The proposed action considers three alternatives. Alternative 1 (no action) would leave the MRAs for groundfish in the arrowtooth fishery unchanged from those in current regulations. Alternative 2 would set the MRAs for incidental catch species at the current Pacific cod level. Alternative 3 would set the MRAs for incidental catch species at the current flathead sole level. The Council is scheduled to take final action at its October 2010 meeting. Staff contact is Jon McCracken.

## Scallop ACLs

The Council took initial review of an analysis of ACLs for bringing the Scallop FMP into compliance with statutory requirements.

Primary deficiencies identified in the Scallop FMP to meet ACL requirements are the lack of an annually specified ABC recommended by the SSC to the Council and the management of non-target scallop stocks.

Alternatives contained in the analysis would establish an ABC (where ABC = ACL) at constant buffer levels below the OFL level and provide for options to manage non-target scallop stocks as either a complex, in the ecosystem component or removed from the FMP. The SSC approved releasing the public review draft after minor modifications to the analysis. The Council requested that additional information be provided to indicate where status quo (no action) would meet statutory requirements. The public review draft will be available on the Council's website in late August. Final action is scheduled for October 2010. Staff contact is Diana Stram.

## Upcoming Meetings

### SSC and Groundfish Plan

**Teams tier 6 workshop:** July 8, 12:30pm via WEBEX.

**Crab Plan Team** September 13-17, 2010 AFSC Seattle

**Groundfish Plan Teams** – week of September 20, Seattle

**Observer Advisory Committee:** September TBA

**Scallop Plan Team (T)**  
September 28, Anchorage  
(location TBD)

**Wakefield Symposium**  
November 8-11, Anchorage

**Groundfish Plan Teams** – week of November 15, Seattle

## AM 80 Vessel Replacement

At the June meeting, the Council took final action to allow Amendment 80 vessel owners to replace their vessels. Specifically, the Council selected Alternative 3, which allows owners to replace their vessels with another vessel for any purpose. A replacement vessel cannot exceed a length overall (LOA) of 295 feet. The selected action would allow the owner of an Amendment 80 vessel to assign a quota share permit from an original qualifying Amendment 80 vessel to the replacement vessel or to the LLP license derived from the originally qualifying vessel. A replacement vessel cannot enter an Amendment 80 fishery without quota share being assigned to that vessel or the associated permit. Persons holding a quota share permit associated with a vessel that is permanently ineligible to re-enter US fisheries is eligible to replace that vessel.

The Council also stipulated that a replaced vessel would be allowed to participate in the GOA flatfish fishery if the replaced vessel was also qualified to participate in that fishery. In addition, if the replacement vessel for the Amendment 80 vessel *Golden Fleece* is greater than the maximum length overall (MLOA) of the license that was originally assigned to that vessel, then that replacement vessel will be subject to all sideboards that apply to other Amendment 80 vessels, with the catch and PSC use of the *Golden Fleece* added to the existing GOA sideboards. If the *Golden Fleece* replacement vessel is less than or equal to the MLOA, then the original sideboards for the vessel apply.

The preferred alternative would also allow any vessel replaced under the program to be used to replace other Amendment 80 vessels, but these replacement vessels must be classed and loadlined or they must meet the requirements of the Alternative Compliance and Safety Agreement (ACSA). Replaced vessels not assigned to the Amendment 80 fishery would have a sideboard limit of zero in the BSAI and GOA groundfish fisheries to prevent expanded effort in other North Pacific groundfish fisheries.

Finally, during staff tasking, the Council requested staff bring back a discussion paper addressing the following issues: 1) impacts of Amendment 80 vessels on GOA flatfish fisheries as well as identified tangential issues associated with the recommended MLOA of replaced Amendment 80 vessels, 2) impacts from replaced Amendment 80 vessels on catcher processor sideboards for West Yakutat and Western GOA from Central GOA rockfish action, and 3) areas of overlap of these and other peripheral issues. A copy of the final motion is provided on the Council website. Staff contact is Jon McCracken.

## Chum Salmon Bycatch

The Council reviewed a discussion paper and reports on chum salmon bycatch trends, area closure options, the current suite of management alternatives, and updated genetic stock of origin information on chum salmon bycatch in the pollock fishery. The Council took action to refine the suite of alternatives for analysis of chum (non-Chinook) salmon bycatch management measures in the EBS pollock fishery. Alternatives under consideration include hard caps on the pollock fishery for chum salmon bycatch in the range of 50,000 - 353,000 fish and area closures triggered by caps between 25,000 - 200,000 fish. Options included under each alternative would allocate caps at the sector level. Trigger caps under consideration could be applied cumulatively over the season as well as further subdivided monthly. Candidate closure areas under consideration are selected to account for average percentages of historical bycatch over the season. Groupings of closures under consideration represent a range of 40% - 60% of historical bycatch. The Council also reviewed the report of the statewide teleconference conducted by Council staff to inform rural communities of the chum salmon bycatch initiative. The full Council motion on the alternatives, a description of candidate closures in the alternatives, and the report from the statewide teleconference are posted on the Council's website. Preliminary review of the analysis is scheduled for February 2011. Staff contact is Diana Stram.



Mark Fina gets ready to be dunked as part of the Sitka Sound Science Center fund raiser.

# Observer Program

At the June meeting, the Council reviewed the initial review draft of the observer restructuring analysis (BSAI FMP Amendment 86/GOA FMP Amendment 76) and a report from the Observer Advisory Committee (OAC). In general, the program is proposed to be restructured such that NMFS would contract directly with observer providers to deploy observers, and the industry sectors included under the program would pay either a daily fee or a fee based on a percentage of ex-vessel revenues (maximum of 2%), as authorized under the Magnuson Stevens Act. The suite of alternatives varies by the scope of the fishing sectors included and the type of fee; however, sectors that are not currently subject to any observer coverage requirements (i.e., the commercial halibut sector and <60' groundfish sector) are included under every action alternative. The restructured program is intended to provide NMFS with the flexibility to deploy observers according to a scientifically valid sampling plan and to reduce the bias inherent in the existing program, to the benefit of the resulting data.

Upon review, the Council released the analysis for public review, with two new options and several revisions. Both new options will be evaluated under each of the primary alternatives. The first option would assess an ex-vessel value fee on halibut landings and groundfish landings from vessels either <40', <50', or <60' length overall that is equal to half of the fee assessed on all other sectors subject to the fee under the preferred alternative. For example, if the Council approved a 2% ex-vessel value fee at final action, selection of the option would result in a 1% ex-vessel value fee for halibut and groundfish landings from small vessels. The second option requires that, if a restructuring alternative is approved, NMFS would release a draft observer program sampling design and deployment plan annually by September 1, available for review and comment by the Groundfish Plan Teams at their September meeting. The SSC and Council would review and approve the plan on an annual basis.

Upon hearing public testimony about the limited ability for some smaller vessels to

carry an observer, and recognizing that the proposed action provides a funding mechanism for electronic monitoring, the Council approved a motion to task the OAC and staff to develop electronic monitoring as an additional tool for fulfilling observer coverage requirements. The intent is for electronic monitoring to be available for specified sectors at the time a restructured observer program is implemented. Note that the current schedule proposes Council final action on a restructured program in October 2010, with the first year of a new program in 2013.

Given that the North Pacific is the only region in which industry pays all of the direct costs of deploying observers, the Council also approved writing a letter to NOAA HQ to request Federal funds for start-up funding to implement a restructured observer program in the North Pacific, as well as an annual appropriation.

The Council approved convening the OAC prior to the Council's scheduled final action in October. The primary purpose would be to review the public review draft analysis and provide comments on the analysis to the Council. The OAC may also have preliminary discussions regarding the development of electronic monitoring as an alternative tool for fulfilling observer coverage requirements. The initial review draft restructuring analysis, the May OAC report, and the June Council motion are posted on the Council website. The public review draft analysis is expected for release in mid-September. Staff contact is Nicole Kimball.

## Groundfish Retention Standard

At the June 2010 meeting, the Council reviewed a status report on the implementation of the Groundfish Retention Standard (GRS) Program. This status report was in response to a Council request at its April 2010 meeting for NMFS to provide a report reviewing the enforcement and prosecution concerns raised during the development of the GRS Program, Amendments 80 and 93 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands area (FMP), any new concerns about monitoring and enforcing the GRS program that have been identified by the agency or industry

participants, and potential concepts for refinement of the GRS Program to address these concerns.

In the June 2010 report, NMFS identified two issues with the current GRS program. First, implementation of the GRS calculation does not correlate with historic groundfish retention rates presented to the Council at the time of Amendment 79 final action, and requires groundfish retention well beyond those considered by the Council. The current GRS calculation schedule may impose economic hardships to the Amendment 80 fleet well beyond those considered in the Amendment 79 analysis. Second, NMFS enforcement has significant concerns with the cost of enforcing a GRS violation, which may hinder their ability to enforce the current GRS program.

After reviewing the June 2010 report and listening to public comment, the Council approved an emergency action to temporarily suspend the GRS regulations. Additionally, the Council initiated an FMP amendment to explore revising the current GRS program by considering the following alternative approaches:

- Revise the current GRS schedule to correlate groundfish retention considered in the Amendment 79 analysis to groundfish retention calculated with the current GRS enforcement methodology.
- Allow the Amendment 80 sector to engage in internal monitoring and administration of a groundfish retention program to meet Council retention goals described in Amendment 79. At the October 2010 Council meeting, the Amendment 80 sector should provide the Council with a unanimous detailed civil contract that would hold each individual entity or cooperative accountable to meet these retention goals.

The Council is scheduled to review the analysis at the October 2010 Council meeting. Staff contact is Jon McCracken.

**DRAFT NPFMC THREE-MEETING OUTLOOK - updated 6/22/10**

October 4, 2010 Anchorage, AK Captain Cook	December 6, 2010 Anchorage, AK Hilton Hotel	January 31, 2011 Seattle, WA
Joint Protocol Committee (T) SSL BiOp/ Measures: <b>Review; Action as necessary</b> Research Priorities: <b>Finalize</b> GOA Rockfish Program Regulations: <b>Report; action as nec.</b> Halibut Catch Sharing Plan: <b>Review Regulations</b> GOA Halibut PSC Discussion Paper: <b>Review disc. Paper (T)</b> Am 80 GRS Program Changes: <b>Initial Review (T)</b> Observer Program Restructuring: <b>Final Action</b> BSAI Crab ROFR: <b>Initial Review</b> BSAI Crab Emergency Relief: <b>Initial Review</b> Economic Data Collection: <b>Review disc papers; action as nec.</b> BSAI Chinook salmon bycatch EDR: <b>Review regulations/ forms</b> Arrowtooth Flounder MRA: <b>Final Action</b> GOA Tanner Crab Bycatch: <b>Final Action</b> BSAI Crab SAFE/OFLs: <b>Review and Approve</b> BSAI Crab ACLs/snow crab rebuilding: <b>Final Action</b> Pribilof BKC Rebuilding Plan: <b>Initial Review</b> Scallop ACLs: <b>Final Action</b> Groundfish Specifications: <b>Receive Plan Team Reports</b> <b>Adopt Proposed Catch Limits</b> HAPC: <b>Review Proposals for Analysis</b> Groundfish Workplan: <b>Annual review</b>	GOA Rockfish Program Regulations: <b>Review (T)</b> BS&AI P.cod Split: <b>Discuss plan/action as necessary (T)</b> P.cod Jig Fishery Management: <b>Discussion Paper (T)</b> CQE area 3A D class purchase: <b>Initial Review</b> CQE in Area 4B: <b>Review Discussion paper</b> Area 4B D shares on C vessels: <b>Initial Review/Final Action</b> Am 80 GRS Program Changes: <b>Final Action (T)</b> BSAI Crab ROFR: <b>Final Action</b> BSAI Crab Rationalization 5-year review: <b>Receive report</b> BSAI Crab Emergency Relief: <b>Final Action</b> AI P.cod Processing Sideboards: <b>Initial Review (T)</b> GOA Chinook Salmon Bycatch: <b>Discussion paper (T)</b> BBRKC Spawning Area/fishing effects: <b>Discussion paper (T.)</b> Salmon FMP NS1 Amendments: <b>Discussion paper (T)</b> Pribilof BKC Rebuilding Plan: <b>Final Action</b> Sablefish Recruitment Factors: <b>Discussion Paper (T)</b> MPA Nomination Discussion Paper: <b>Review</b> Hagemeister Island: <b>Initial Review</b> Groundfish Specifications: <b>PT reports; Approve SAFE;</b> <b>Adopt Final Catch Limits</b> EFH Amendment: <b>Initial Review (T)</b>	IFQ Discussion Papers: <b>Review (T)</b> CQE area 3A D class purchase: <b>Final Action</b> Four new CQE eligible communities: <b>Initial/Final Action(T)</b> Am 80 Replacement Vessel Sideboards: <b>Discussion Paper (T)</b> AI P.cod Processing Sideboards: <b>Final Action</b> BSAI Chum Salmon Bycatch: <b>Preliminary Review</b> Hagemeister Island: <b>Final Action</b> HAPC: <b>Action as necessary</b> EFH Amendment: <b>Final Action (T)</b>

ACL - Annual Catch Limit

AI - Aleutian Islands

GOA - Gulf of Alaska

SSL - Steller Sea Lion

BKC - Bue King Crab

BOF - Board of Fisheries

FEP - Fishery Ecosystem Plan

CDQ - Community Development Quota

VMS - Vessel Monitoring System

EFP - Exempted Fishing Permit

BiOp - Biological Opinion

MRA - Maximum Retainable Allowance

PSC - Prohibited Species Catch

TAC - Total Allowable Catch

BSAI - Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands

IFQ - Individual Fishing Quota

ROFR - Right of First Refusal

GHL - Guideline Harvest Level

EIS - Environmental Impact Statement

LLP - License Limitation Program

SAFE - Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation

MPA - Marine Protected Area

EFH - Essential Fish Habitat

HAPC - Habitat Areas of Particular Concern

**Future Meeting Dates and Locations**

*Oct 4-, 2010 in Anchorage (Captain Cook)*

*Dec 6- 2010 in Anchorage Hilton*

*January 31-February 8, 2011-Seattle*

*March 28-April 5, 2011-Anchorage*

*June 2011 - Nome*

*September 26-, 2011 in Unalaska*

**(T) Tentatively scheduled**