

**North Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Advisory Panel Minutes  
Centennial Hall, Sitka Alaska  
October 4-8, 2004**

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

John Bruce	Bob Jacobson
Al Burch	Teressa Kandianis
Cora Crome	Mitch Kilborn
Craig Cross	Kent Leslie
Tom Enlow	Kris Norosz
Dan Falvey	Eric Olson
Duncan Fields	Jim Preston
Dave Fraser	Michelle Ridgway
Jan Jacobs	Jeff Stephan

*John Moller and Lance Farr were absent.*

**C-1 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Rationalization**

The AP recommends that the Community Purchase Program option currently in Alternative 2 be added to Alternative 3. Further, the AP recommends clarifying the intent of the community purchase option is to develop an alternative that is parallel to the halibut and sablefish purchase program adopted by the Council as Amendment 66.

The AP recommends that the Council appoint a Community Protection Committee to address issues related to the Community Fisheries Quota, CIFT and the Community Purchase program options. *Motion passed 18/0.*

If CFQs are created, the AP reaffirms its intent they only be leased to eligible community residents to fish. *Motion passes 17/0.* Additionally, we request the Council further define the purpose statement for the CFQ program prior to appointing a committee. *Motion passed 15/3.*

*A motion to eliminate the CIFT program from the list of community programs for further analysis failed 10/8.*

The AP recommends the Council adopt the following specific changes/additions/deletions by section: Community program changes apply to alternative 2 and alternative 3. *(Noted page numbers are taken from Attachment C of the annotated GOA Groundfish Rationalization motion)*

**2.2.2 Qualifying periods and landing criteria** (same for all gears in all areas) **(Page 1)**

(The analysis will assess AFA vessels as a group)

Option 1. 95-01 drop 1

Option 2. 95-02 drop 1

Option 3. 95-02 drop 2

Option 4. 98-02 drop 1

Suboption 1: For Pacific cod under all options consider only A season harvests for 2001 and 2002.

Suboption 2: For Pacific cod consider a sector allocation based on specified percentages prior to individual allocations.

**2.2.3.2.5** (Page 3) If a processor limited entry alternative is chosen, CV harvest shares will be issued in two classes. Class A shares will be deliverable to a licensed processor. Class B shares will be deliverable to any processor as authorized under this program.

Option 1. A shares be at the QS level and separable from B shares.

Suboption: Processor affiliated vessels would receive their entire allocation as A shares.

**Add Suboption: Prohibit B share holdings by processors**

*(motion passed 17/0/1)*

Option 2. Only the annual allocations will be subject to the Class A/Class B distinction. All long term shares or history will be of a single class.

**Add Suboption: Processor affiliated vessels to receive entire allocation as A shares.** *Motion passed 17/0*

**The AP recommends both choices be carried forward for analysis.** *Motion passed 17/0.*

#### 2.2.3.3.5 Leasing of QS (Page 6)

Option 1. No leasing of CV QS (QS holder must be on board or own at least 20% of the vessel upon which a designated skipper fishes the IFQ).

**Suboption 1: Applies in coops**

**Suboption 2: Would not apply in coops** *Motion passed 16/0*

Option 2. Allow leasing of CV QS, but only to individuals **and entities** eligible to receive QS/IFQ by transfer.

Option 3. Allow leasing of CP QS, but only to individuals and entities eligible to receive QS/IFQ by transfer.

Option 4. For individuals and ~~corporations~~ **entities** with CV QS, no leasing restrictions for the first three years. After this grace period, leasing will be allowed in the following ~~18 months~~ **calendar year** *(motion passed 18/0)* if the QS holder **is on board or** *(motion passed 13/6)* owns 20% or greater of a vessel on which 30% of the primary species shares held by the QS holder in at least 2 of the most recent 4 years were harvested. This provision would apply to independent lessees and within cooperatives.

**Suboption 1: Does not apply within cooperatives** *Motion passed 10/5/1.*

*Minority Report: A minority of the AP opposed including suboptions under option 1 and 4 that would "opt out" participants in coops. It is our view that leasing restrictions be applied equally to all QS holders without regard to coop status. Signed, Duncan Fields, Eric Olson, Dan Falvey, and Michelle Ridgway.*

**Add a suboption to Options 1 and 4 that would add a grandfather provision for initial recipients.** *Motion passed 16/0.*

#### 2.2.3.3.6 Separate and distinct harvest share use caps (Page 7)

Option 2. Caps equal to a percentage that would allow contraction of QS holders in the fishery by 20%, 30% or 50% of the number of initially qualified QS recipients by species and sector.

Suboption 1. Conversion of CP shares:

i. CP shares converted to CV shares

Option 1. will count toward CV caps

**Option 2. will not count toward CV caps at the time of conversion.**

Caps will be applied to prohibit acquisition of shares in excess of the cap.

*Motion passed 13/1/4*

#### 2.2.3.3.7 Owner On Board Provisions (Page 8)

Provisions may vary depending on the sector or fishery under consideration (this provision may be applied differently pending data analysis)

i. All initial issues (individuals and corporations) would be grandfathered as not being required to be aboard the vessel to fish shares initially issued as "owner on board" shares. This exemption applies only to those initially issued harvest share units.

~~Option 1. No owner on board restrictions.~~

Option 2. A range of **0% 5-50%** for fixed gear CVs and **0% 5-40%** for trawl gear CVs, of the quota shares initially issued to fishers/harvesters would be designated as "owner on board." *Motion passed 10/6/2*

**Suboption: Owner on board provision would not apply within a coop** *Motion passed 17/0*

### 2.2.3.3.8 Overage Provisions (Page 8)

~~A 7 day grace period~~ After an overage occurs for the owner ~~to~~ **must** lease sufficient IFQ to cover the overage **prior to the end of the season**. Failure to secure sufficient IFQ would result in forfeiture of the overages and fines.

i. Trawl CV and CP:

~~Suboption 1. Overages up to 15% or 20% of the last trip will be allowed greater than a 15% or 20% overage result in forfeiture and civil penalties. An overage of 15% or 20% or less, results in the reduction of the subsequent year's annual allocation or IFQ. Underages up to 10% of harvest shares (or IFQ).~~

~~Suboption 2. Overage provisions would not be applicable in fisheries where there is an incentive fishery that has not been fully utilized for the year. (i.e., no overages would be charged if a harvest share (or IFQ) holder goes over his/her annual allocation (or IFQ) when incentive fisheries are still available).~~

ii. Longline and pot CV and CP:

~~Overages up to 10% of the last trip will be allowed with rollover provisions for underages up to 10% of harvest shares (or IFQ).~~

~~Suboption. Overages would not be applicable in fisheries where there is an incentive fishery that has not been fully utilized for the year. (i.e., no overages would be allowed if a harvest share (or IFQ) holder goes over his/her annual allocation (or IFQ) when incentive fisheries are still available).~~

*Motion passed 12/4*

### 2.2.3.3.10 Limited processing for CVs (page 10)

~~Option 1. No limited processing~~ *Motion passed 15/0.*

Option 2. Limited processing of rockfish species by owners of CV harvest shares of rockfish species not subject to processor landing requirements are allowed up to 1 mt of round weight equivalent of rockfish per day on a vessel less than or equal to 60ft LOA. **The AP recommends the Council make the option consistent with LLPs** *Motion passed 16/0*

### 2.2.3.3.11 Processing Restrictions (Page 10)

Option 1. CPs may buy CV share fish not subject to processor landing requirements. Suboption. 3 year sunset

Option 2. CPs would be prohibited from buying CV fish harvested with A shares.

Option 3. CPs may buy incentive fish and incidental catches of CV fish not subject to processor landing requirements.

**Option 4. May buy delivery restricted CV fish if they hold a processing license.**

*A motion to strike options 1 and 3 failed 5/12*

### 2.2.9.2.1 Administrative entity (page 15) and 3.7.2.2 (page 54)

~~A Gulf wide administrative entity will receive and hold CFQ on behalf of eligible communities. The administrative entity representing one or more eligible communities must be a non-profit entity qualified by NMFS.~~

The administrative entity representing one or more eligible communities must be a non-profit entity qualified by NMFS.

The administrative entity shall be:

- Option 1. A single Gulf-wide administrative entity
2. An administrative entity for each GOA groundfish management area
  3. An administrative entity representing a group of communities with common culture and history.

*Motion passed 18/0*

#### **2.2.9.2.2 Eligible Communities (Page 15) and 2.2.9.3.2 (page 16) and 3.7.2.2 (page 54)**

- Option 1. Population (based on 2000 Census):
- a. 1,500 **but not less than 25**
  - b. 2,500 **but not less than 25**
  - c. 5,000 **but not less than 25**
  - d. 7,500 **but not less than 25**

*Motion passed 13/2/2*

#### **2.2.9.2.6 Allocation Basis (Page 16) and 3.7.2.7 (page 55)**

~~The initial allocation (harvest shares) of CFQ would be made to the administrative entity representing eligible communities.~~

- ~~Option 1. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity would be distributed amongst qualified communities on an equal basis.~~
- ~~Option 2. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity would be distributed amongst qualified communities on a pro rata basis based on population.~~
- ~~Option 3. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity from each GOA groundfish management area, by species, would be distributed amongst qualified communities located in the management area on an equal basis.~~

The AP recommends the Council delete this section. *Motion passed 18/0.*

#### **2.2.10.2 Tanner Crab (page 18)**

- Alternative 1: Status Quo (no bycatch controls)
- Alternative 2: Trigger bycatch limits for Tanner crab. Specific areas with high bycatch (or high bycatch rates) are closed to flatfish trawling for the remainder of the year if or when a trigger limit is reached by the flatfish fishery (and potentially additional areas for P. cod longline and pot gear).
- Alternative 3: Year round bottom trawl closure in areas with high bycatch or high bycatch rates of Tanner crab, *or areas of biological importance (and potentially additional areas for P. cod longline and pot gear)* *Motion failed 8/8/1.*
- Alternative 4: Voluntary bycatch co-op/pool for hotspot management

#### **2.2.11.2 Review and Sunset (page 19)**

- ~~Option 1. The program would sunset unless the Council decides to continue or amend the program. The decision of whether to continue or amend would be based on a written review and evaluation of the program's performance compared to its objectives.~~
- ~~Suboption 1. 5 years after fishing under the program~~
- ~~Suboption 2. 7 years after fishing under the program~~
- ~~Suboption 3. 10 year schedule after fishing under the program~~
- ~~Suboption 4. No sunset provision. *Motion passed 18/0.*~~
- Option 2. **Preliminary Formal** program review at the first Council Meeting in the **3<sup>rd</sup> year and formal review after Council meeting in the 5<sup>th</sup> year** *5<sup>th</sup> (motion passed 18/0) year after*

implementation to objectively measure the success of the program, including benefits and impacts to harvesters (including vessel owners, skippers and crew), processors and communities, by addressing concerns, goals and objectives identified in the problem statement and the Magnuson Stevens Act standards. This review shall include analysis of post-rationalization impacts to coastal communities, harvesters and processors in terms of economic impacts and options for mitigating those impacts. Subsequent reviews are required every 5 years.

For alternative 2A apply provisions generally at the ~~company~~ **facility** level. *Motion passed 13/4*  
For 2B, apply provisions generally at the facility (plant) level.

**2.3.1.1.1 Harvester delivery requirements (page 21)**

- Option 1. 50-100% of CV harvest share allocation will be reserved for delivery to:
  - i. the linked licensed closed trawl or fixed class processor (Applies to 2B).
  - ii. Any licensed trawl or fixed or large or small processor (Applies to 2A)

The remaining (50% - 0%) CV harvest share allocation can be delivered to:

- ~~any processor excluding CPs~~ *Motion passed 13/4*
- any processor including CPs

The AP recommends keeping the 50-100% option until data on catch history and delivery patterns are available. We believe it is important to maintain flexibility in setting this critical component for different gears and regions. *Motion passed 16/0.*

*A motion to have a 90/10 split failed 5/12/1.*

**2.3.1.1.2 Linkage (Linkages apply by area) (Applies to 2B): (Page 23)**

A harvester’s processor linked shares are associated with the licensed fixed or trawl (large or small) processor to which the harvester delivered the most pounds of groundfish during the last \_\_\_ years of the harvester qualifying years.

- i. 1
- ii. 2
- iii. 3

Option 1: If the processing facility with whom the harvester is associated is no longer operating in the community the harvester is eligible to deliver to

- i. any licensed processor
- ii. any licensed processor in the community

Option 2: Fishermen that, during the qualifying years, delivered the majority of their harvest (all species combined) to a community with a single qualified processor are exempt from processor linkages. *A motion to delete this option failed 3/11/2.*

*A motion to allow a processor in the same community who purchased the processing rights from the closed facility to receive the linkages failed 7/11.*

**2.3.1.1.4 Movement between linked processors (Applies to 2B) (Page 24)**

Any vessel that is linked to a processor, may with the consent of that processor, delivers A shares to another plant.

Share reductions of 10% - 20% ~~each time a harvester moves to a different linked processor~~ (*Motion passed 16/2*) for:

- i. 1 year
- ii. 2 years
- iii. 4 years
- iv. **Penalty to be paid proportionally over 2 years**
- v. **Penalty to be paid proportionally over 4 years** (*Motion passed 18/0*)

The share reduction shall be redistributed to:

- i. The shareholders in association with that processor that the shareholder left (if it continues to exist).
- ~~ii. All cooperatives in the sector on a pro rata basis.~~  
(Motion passed 18/0)

Suboptions:

- i. Penalty applies to A shares only.
- ~~ii. Penalty applies to both A and B shares. (Motion passed 15/2)~~
  - A. Full penalty applies to first move, subsequent moves are penalized at half of that rate.
  - B. Penalties apply only to the first transfer

**2.3.1.2.1 To qualify for a processor license** (Page 26), a processor must have purchased and processed a minimum amount of groundfish by region as described below in at least 4 of the following years:

- Option 1. 1995-99.
- Option 2. 1995-01
- Option 3. 1995-02

~~Option (Applies to 2B only since 2A is entity based).~~ If a processor meets the threshold for total purchased and processed groundfish for all their facilities combined, but does not meet the threshold for any one facility then the processor would be issued a license for the facility in which it processed most fish. Motion passed 14/1

- Option 2. ~~a. Large processor license~~
- ~~Suboption 1. 2000 MT~~
  - ~~Suboption 2. 1000 MT~~
  - ~~Suboption 3. 500 MT~~
- ~~b. Small processor license~~
- ~~Suboption 1. 500 MT~~
  - ~~Suboption 2. 200 MT~~
  - ~~Suboption 3. 50 MT~~ Motion passed 17/0

**2.3.1.2.2 Processor history** (page 27) would be credited to (and licenses would be issued to):

- Option 1. Operator – must hold a federal or state processor permit.
- ~~Option 2. Facility owner~~ Motion passed 18/0.
- Option 3. In circumstances where the facility operator was not affiliated with the facility owner during the processor license qualifying years, if the facility and/or entity met a license qualifying threshold, processing history would be credited to both the facility operator and facility owner for purposes of issuing the related processor limited entry licenses. Harvester associations and /or linkages would be accrued to the facility operator's license. Affiliation would be determined using the AFA common interest/control standard.

Custom processing history would be credited to:

- Option A. the processor that physically processes the fish
  - Option B. the processor that purchases the fish and pays for processing
- A motion to delete option A failed 8/8, a motion to delete option B failed 8/8.

**2.3.1.2.3 Transferability of eligible processor licenses (Page 28)**

Processor licenses can be sold, leased, or transferred.

- Option 1. Within the same community  
If the license is transferred within the community of origin, then vessel linkages are broken and vessels are allowed to deliver to any licensed processor
- Option 2. Within the same region

If the license is transferred outside the community of origin, then vessel linkages are broken and vessels are allowed to deliver to any licensed processor.

The AP recommends the Council keep both options. *Motion passed 17/0*

### 2.3.1.2.6 License ownership restrictions on processors (page 30)

~~Option 1. No restrictions~~

~~Option 2. Trawl/fixed license holders cannot hold any additional fixed gear only licenses.~~

~~Option 3. Large processor license holders cannot hold small processor licenses.~~

*Motion passed 12/5.*

Option 2. An entity may own no more than \_\_\_ licenses in \_\_\_(area, region, management unit)

*Motion passed 18/0*

### 2.3.2 Provisions affecting Allocation of Harvest Shares to Processors (Alternative 2C) (Page 30) (Correct numbering as shown)

- Processors are eligible to receive an allocation of QS if they meet ~~allocation~~ **eligibility criteria** identified in 2.3.1.2.1 (*motion passed 17/0*)

**Processors who do not meet eligibility criteria to document a vessel must transfer the QS to an entity meeting this criteria within 24 months.** *Motion passed 17/0.*

- Up to 30% of CV shares shall be designated as “CVP” shares and eligible to be held by processors **eligible to document a US vessel** and/or CV recipients. A portion of the CVP share allocation will be divided among eligible processors proportional to their history in the qualifying years as outlined in 2.3.1.2.1. Any balance of CVP not distributed initially to processors **shall be distributed** proportionally to CV recipients. *Motion passed 16/0*
- CVP is transferable between eligible CV holders and /or processors. ~~The market place will determine whether a separate class of QS remains with processing entities.~~
- CVP shares may be fished on any catcher vessel and subject to existing share designations and existing vessel use caps.
- CVP shares may be transferred or leased to any entity eligible to receive CV QS by transfer in 2.2.3.3.
- Caps of ~~CVP~~ **CVP** will apply at the company level by management area and will be a 10-30% of the total pool of CVP shares available in the management area. Recipients of CVP that exceed the cap will be grandfathered.
- No processors (and processor affiliates ~~& vessels~~ using the 10% rule) may own or control CV quota shares. CV initially issued to processor ~~affiliates~~ **affiliates** ~~vessels~~ will be grandfathered.

*Motion passed 17/0*

### 2.4.2.2 Cooperatives are required to have at least: (Page 33)

Option 1. 4 distinct and separate harvesters (using the 10% threshold rule)

Suboption: ~~trawl CP sector, all less 1 of distinct and separate harvesters, using the 10% threshold rule).~~ *Motion passed 16/0*

Option 2. 40 -100 percent of the harvest shares (or catch history) of its sector (may choose different percentages for different sectors)

~~Option 3. 40 -100% of separate and distinct shareholders (using the 10% threshold rule) belonging to its sector. Council may choose different percentages for different sector.~~ *Motion passed 16/0*

Option 4. 40 -75 percent of the harvest shares (or catch history) eligible for the cooperative.

Note: Requirements may differ across sectors (or for CV and CP cooperatives)

**The AP believes it is important to maintain the range of options until data on catch history and sector allocation is available.** *Motion passed 16/0.*

**2.4.2.3 Duration of cooperative agreements: (Page 34)**

- Option 1. 1 year
- Option 2. 3 years
- Option 3. 5 years

**Suboption 1: This duration is minimum**

**Suboption 2: This duration is maximum**

*Motion passed 17/0*

**The AP recommends Council accept staff's recommended housekeeping changes on pages 35-40.**

*Motion passed 18/0*

**2.4.3.1 Annual Allocations (Page 35)**

- Option 1. Annual allocations of cooperative members would be issued to the cooperative.
- ~~Option 2. Annual allocation of the sector would be issued to the sector cooperative (if "true" sector cooperative alternative is selected)~~—*Motion passed 17/0*

**2.4.4.1 Set co-op use caps (Page 35) at 25 to 100% of total TAC by species (~~must choose 100 percent for a "true" sector cooperative~~)****2.4.5.2 License Transfers Among Processors (applies to processor limited entry *Alt 2B*) (Page 34)**

- Option 1. any ~~cooperative share~~ association with that license will transfer to the processor receiving the license. All harvest share/history holders will be subject to any share reduction on ~~severing the linkage departing the cooperative~~, as would have been made in the absence of the transfer.
- Option 2. any ~~cooperative share~~ associated with the license will be free to associate with any licensed processor. Harvest share/history holders ~~in the cooperative~~ will be free to move among ~~cooperatives processors~~ without share/history reduction.

**3.2 Sector definitions and allocations: (Page 39)**

To be determined as a CP a vessel must have a CP LLP license and process no less than

- a) 90%
- b) 50%
- c) 25%

of its qualifying catch processed on-board on average over the qualifying period.

- ~~Option 1: determined on a species by species basis~~—*Motion passed 17/0*
- Option 2: determined by the aggregate of all species

Low producing **catcher** vessel sector are

- Option 1. fixed gear **catcher** vessels under 60 feet that are below the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of primary species qualified harvest history by gear and area.
- Option 2. fixed gear **catcher** vessels less than average qualified harvest history by gear and area
- Option 3. fixed gear **catcher** vessels that are below the 75th percentile in qualified harvest history by gear and area

High producing **catcher** vessels are the remainder and are divided into a catcher vessel longline and catcher vessel pot sector. Sector definitions apply throughout Alternative 3.

**Option for Fixed Gear **Catcher Vessel** Low Producers: (page 40)**

- Option 1. Apply same rules for initial co-op formation and general co-op operation as apply to other sectors.



- Option 2. Exclude from co-op program, provide sector allocation and continue as an LLP/Open Access fishery.
- Option 3. Apply all co-op rules except processor affiliation requirement for initial co-op formation (i.e. harvester co-op without processor association).

### 3.2.4 Sector Allocation: Secondary and PSC species: (Page 41)

Secondary species: Thornyhead, rougheye, shortraker, other slope rockfish, Atka mackerel, and trawl sablefish. Includes SEO shortraker, rougheye, and thornyhead rockfish.

- Option 1: Sector allocation based on
  - 1) fleet average
  - 2) bycatch rate of 75<sup>th</sup> percentile
 for
  - a) the sector
  - b) the gear

during sector allocation qualifying period by area and primary species target fishery.

**The AP requests the Council recommend staff separate PSC and secondary species issues and bring back for further discussion. We further recommend section 3.3.3.2 on page 43:**

*Upon entering a cooperative, each recipient of primary species GH would receive an allocation of PSC GH, based on the primary species GH allocation. Each cooperative would receive an allocation of halibut mortality (harvest shares) based on the PSC holdings of its members. Secondary species would receive no halibut allocation.*

**be incorporated into the re-worked section. Motion passed 17/0**

### 3.3.2.2 Qualifying periods and landing criteria (same for all gears in all areas) for determining GH (The analysis will assess AFA vessels as a group). (Page 42)

- Option 1. 95-01 drop 1
- Option 2. 95-02 drop 1
- Option 3. 95-02 drop 2
- Option 4. 98-02 drop 1

Options to drop years would be to accommodate SSL restrictions or the inclusion of the state portion of the parallel fishery.

Individual GH will be based on retained catch for each species (includes weekly production report for Catcher/Processor sector). The denominator shall be total landed catch by species.

~~Option A: Include retained catch that is used for meal production—Motion passed 17/0~~

~~Option B: Exclude retained catch that is used for meal production~~

### 3.3.5 Catcher Vessel Co-ops. (Page 43)

Catcher vessel co-ops may be established within sectors between eligible harvesters in association with an eligible processor. A harvester is initially eligible to join a cooperative in association with the processor to which the harvester delivered the most pounds of primary species **by area by region** (*motion passed 14/0*) to during the

- a) qualifying years.
  - b) most recent 1, 2, or 3 years from the qualifying years.
- Suboption 1. On a species by species basis
  - Suboption 2. In the aggregate

### 3.3.7 Cooperatives are required to have at least: (Page 44)

- Option 1. 4 distinct and separate harvesters (using the 10% threshold rule)

- Option 2. 50-100 percent of the GH of its sector. Council may choose different percentages for different sectors.
- ~~Option 3. 50-100% of holders of GH belonging to its sector. Council may choose different percentages for different sector. Motion passed 14/0~~
- Option 4. 50-75 percent of the eligible GH for each co-op associated with its processor
- Option 5. Any number of eligible harvesters within the sector (allows single person co-op)

Note: Requirements may differ across sectors (or for CV and CP Cooperatives)

### 3.3.8 Duration of initial cooperative agreements: (Page 44)

- Option 1. 1 year
- Option 2. 2 years
- Option 3. 3 years
- ~~Option 4. Any length agreed between the co-op participants. Motion passed 14/0~~

### 3.3.11 Initial Cooperative Requirements (Page 46)

The following provision is required for the initial coop:

Catcher vessel coops may be formed by eligible harvesters (the coop) subject to the terms and conditions of a coop membership agreement. In order to receive an allocation of GH under this program, coops must enter into a duly executed contractual agreement (Contract) with the processor identified in Section 3.3.5.

Contracts established under this section shall specify the terms and conditions for transferring GQ or GH from the cooperative, including mechanisms whereby a member exiting the coop (or transferring GH from the coop) compensates the remaining coop members and/or the associated processor for exiting the coop (or transferring GH from the coop). Compensation can take on any form agreed to by the members and the associated processor, including permanent transfer of some or all GH generated by the existing participant to the remaining coop members and/or the associated processor.

### Processors who do not meet eligibility criteria to document a vessel must transfer the GH to an entity meeting the criteria with the next 24 months

Following the initial coop period, new GH can be generated by eligible harvesters that have never been coop members only by joining a coop, **except as modified in section 3.6, option 2 (2), below** in association with the eligible processor pursuant to the terms of an agreement that meets the requirements for an initial coop.

**For individuals and corporations entities with CV GH, no leasing restrictions for the first three years. After this grace period, leasing will be allowed in the following 18 months calendar year (motion passed 18/0) if the GH holder is on board or (motion passed 13/6) owns 20% or greater of a vessel on which 30% of the primary species shares held by the GH holder in at least 2 of the most recent 4 years were harvested. This provision would apply to independent lessees and within cooperatives. Motion passed 17/0.**

### 3.4.1 General Cooperative Requirements (Page 47)

- Coop membership agreements will specify that processor affiliated vessels cannot participate in **price setting negotiations except as permitted by general antitrust law and negotiations concerning price setting, code of conduct, mechanisms for expelling members, or exit agreements**
  - ~~Option A: price setting negotiations except as permitted by general antitrust law.~~
  - ~~Option B: negotiations concerning price setting, code of conduct, mechanisms for expelling members, or exit agreements.~~

*Motion passed 16/0.*

**3.4.2.1 Qualified Persons. (Page 48)**

Persons qualified to receive GH by transfer include processors that associate with initial cooperatives pursuant to 3.3.40 11. and (not mutually exclusive):

- Option 1. US citizens who have had at least 150 days of sea time.
- Option 2. ~~Entities~~ **Persons** that meet U.S. requirements to document a vessel.
- Option 3. Initial recipients of CV **of fixed gear low producers**
- Option 4. Communities would be eligible to receive GH by transfer (this provision would be applicable if certain provisions of 2.2.9 are adopted).
- Option 5. U.S. citizens ~~eligible to document a vessel.~~ **For fixed gear only.**

**Processors who do not meet eligibility criteria to document a vessel must transfer the GH to an entity meeting the criteria with the next 24 months. Motion passed 16/0.**

**3.4.3 Ownership caps. (Page 49)**

**In places where the options are by sector and species, (3.4.3 and 3.4.4) the AP recommends the Council use species groups as follows: cod, pollock, rockfish in the aggregate, flatfish in the aggregate, and other species in the aggregate. Motion passed 17/0.**

Ownership of GH by a co-op member shall be capped at:

- Option 1. 1% of the GH by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg.rockfish, agg flatfish, agg. other species)**
- Option 2. 5% of the GH by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg.rockfish, agg flatfish, agg. other species)**
- Option 3. 20% of the GH by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg.rockfish, agg flatfish, agg. other species)**
- Option 3 30% of the GH by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg.rockfish, agg flatfish, agg. other species)**
- Option 4 no cap.

Allocations to original issues would be grandfathered at the original level of GH.

**3.4.4 Co-op use caps. (page 49)**

Control of GH or use of GQ by a co-op shall be capped at:

- Option 1. 15% by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg. flatfish, agg. other species )**
- Option 2. 25% by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg. flatfish, agg. other species)**
- Option 3. 45% by area, sector and species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg. flatfish agg. other species)**
- Option 4. no cap

**3.4.5 Vertical integration (Page 49)**

**Any processor holdings using Initial recipients of GH with more than the 10% limited threshold rule ownership by any processor are capped at: Motion passed 17/0.**

- Option 1. initial allocation of harvest CV and CP shares.
- Option 2. 115%-150% of initial allocation of CV GH.
- Option 3. 115%-150% of initial allocation of CP GH.
- Option 4. no cap

**3.4.6 Use caps of the original issues would be grandfathered in. (page 49)**

**The AP recommends the Council address cod, pollock, rockfish in the aggregate, and flatfish in the aggregate Motion passed 14/0**

Processors shall be capped at the entity level.

No processor shall process more than:

- Option 1. 25% of total harvest by area and primary species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg flatfish)**
- Option 2. 50% of total harvest by area and primary species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg flatfish)**
- Option 3. 75% of total harvest by area and primary species **group (cod, pollock, agg rockfish, agg flatfish)**
- Option 4. no cap

Processors eligible under 3.3.10 9 will be grandfathered.

### 3.4.7.1 Restrictions on transferability of CP harvest shares: (Page 50)

- ~~Option 1. CP GH may only be transferred to other CP GH holders.~~
- ~~Option 2. CP GH may be converted to CV GH. CP GH maintains its designation when transferred to persons who continue to catch and process the resulting CP GQ at sea pursuant to a CP co-op, if CP GQ is harvested by a CV and delivered to a processor, the underlying CP GH converts to CV GH.~~
- ~~Option 3. CP GH maintains its designation after transfer for 5 years following date of implementation, after which time any transfer of CP GH (or transfer of GQ outside of a cooperative) converts the underlying GH to CV GH.~~
- Option 4. CP GH may be converted to CV GH.** Once it is converted, it cannot be changed back to CP GH. CP GH maintains its designation when transferred to a person that continues to catch and process the resulting GQ at sea (within a cooperative or in open access). *Motion passed 15/3*

### ~~3.4.7.2 Re-designate CP GH as CV GH upon transfer to a person who is not an initial issuee of CP shares: (Page 51)~~

- ~~Option 1. all CP shares~~
- ~~Option 2. trawl CP shares~~
- ~~Option 3. longline CP shares~~

*Motion passed 13/3*

### 3.4.7.3 Leases of CP annual harvest allocations (GQ): (Page 51)

**Leasing would be allowed within a cooperative** (*motion passed 16/0*)

- Option 1. Allow leasing pursuant to an inter-Co-op agreement within CP sectors (no CP leases allowed across gear types).
- ~~Option 2. No leasing of CP GQ allowed~~
  - ~~Suboption: Allow for the first 3 years after program implementation.~~
- ~~Option 3. Allow leasing within a cooperative~~
- Option 2. Allow leasing pursuant to inter coop agreement from trawl to fixed gear and between fixed gear coops.** *Motion passed 17/0*

### 3.4.7.4 Conversion of CP GH and GQ: (Page 51) (Same as Page 7, 2.2.3.3.6)

- ~~Option 1. CP GH and GQ converted to CV GH and GQ will count toward CV caps~~
  - ~~Suboption 1. will count toward CV caps~~
  - ~~Suboption 2. will not count toward CV caps at the time of conversion.~~
- ~~Option 2. Caps will be applied to prohibit acquisition of shares in excess of the cap. Conversion of CP GH or GQ to CV GH or GQ alone will not require a CP GH holder or cooperative to divest CP GH and GQ for exceeding CP caps~~ *Motion passed 17/0*

## 3.5 Skipper/Crew Provisions (page 52)

A skipper is defined as the individual owning the Commercial Fishery Entry Permit and signing the fish ticket.

- Option 1. No skipper and/or crew provisions
- Option 2. Establish license program for certified skippers. For initial allocation Certified Skippers are either:
  - i. Vessel owners receiving initial GH or harvest privileges; or
  - ii. Hired skippers who have demonstrated fishing experience in Federal or State groundfish fisheries in the BSAI or GOA for 3 out of the past 5 years as documented by a CFEC permit and signed fish tickets and/or appropriate NMFS documentation (starting date for five years is 2003).
- Suboption 1. include crew in the license program.
- Suboption 2. require that new Certified Skippers licenses accrue to individuals with demonstrated fishing experience (Groundfish – BSAI/GOA, state or federal waters) similar to halibut/sablefish program.

**Similar to the Community Provisions, the AP recommends the Council flesh out the skipper and crew provisions in alternative 3 concurrent with further GOA Groundfish Rationalization development rather than as a trailing amendment. We recommend incorporating stakeholder input in developing the options. The AP further recommends considering:**

- **Concept of transferable skipper licenses**
- **Nature of licenses – are they by area, gear, species, etc**
- **Minimum sea time qualification**

*Motion passed 16/1*

**3.6 LLP/Open Access fishery provisions: (page 52)**

Allocation for each sector of primary species, secondary species, and PSC to the LLP/Open Access fishery will be those amounts remaining after allocation of the co-ops Harvesters that choose not to participate in a co-op may continue to fish in the LLP/Open Access fishery

~~Option 1: Allow directed fishing for primary species only. The Manage LLP/Open Access fishery sector allocations for primary species only. Continue current MRA for secondary species and unallocated species and PSC management. Motion passed 17/0~~

Option 1: ~~Suboption:~~ PSC allocations to the LLP/Open Access fishery will be reduced by

- a. 0 percent** *Motion passed 17/0*
- b. 10 percent
- c. 20 percent
- d. 30 percent

Note: this reduction may differ by sector

Option 2: the following provision would apply to the LLP/Open Access fisheries:

1. PSC allocations to each sector will be reduced by:
  - 0 percent** *Motion passed 17/0*
  - 5 percent beginning on the date of program implementation;
  - an additional 5 percent beginning on the second year of program implementation;
  - an additional 10 percent beginning on year 5 of program implementation; and

**The AP recommends moving the following section into 3.3.11 on page 46**

~~2. Beginning on year 3-5 of the program implementation any eligible CV harvester which has not entered into a co-op pursuant to section 3.3.10 may join an initial co-op in association with the processor that the harvester delivered the most pounds of primary species to in the previous~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ a) 2 years~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ b) 3 years~~

~~The contract for this initial co-op must otherwise satisfy the requirement of this program, including the terms and conditions of 3.3.10 (except for the provision specifying which processor the harvester must associate with).~~

- Option 3: The LLP of any vessel that has entered a co-op and generated GH pursuant to this program may not be subsequently used, or transferred to another vessel, to fish in the LLP/Open Access fishery for any primary or secondary species identified under this program, **unless the LLP that entered the coop and generated GH exits the coop with the same amount of GH that the LLP brought into the coop initially.** *Motion passed 17/0.*

### 3.7.2.2 Administrative entity (page 54)

~~A Gulf wide administrative entity will receive and hold CFQ on behalf of eligible communities. The administrative entity representing one or more eligible communities must be a non-profit entity qualified by NMFS.~~

The administrative entity representing one or more eligible communities must be a non-profit entity qualified by NMFS.

The administrative entity shall be:

- Option 1. A single Gulf-wide administrative entity
2. An administrative entity for each GOA groundfish management area
  3. An administrative entity representing a group of communities with common culture and history.

*Motion passed 18/0*

### Eligible Communities 3.7.2.2 Eligible Communities (page 54)

- Option 1. Population (based on 2000 Census):
- a. 1,500 **but not less than 25**
  - b. 2,500 **but not less than 25**
  - c. 5,000 **but not less than 25**
  - d. 7,500 **but not less than 25**

*Motion passed 13/2/2*

### 3.7.2.7 Allocation Basis (page 55)

~~The initial allocation (harvest shares) of CFQ would be made to the administrative entity representing eligible communities.~~

~~Option 1. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity would be distributed amongst qualified communities on an equal basis.~~

~~Option 2. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity would be distributed amongst qualified communities on a pro rata basis based on population.~~

~~Option 3. 0%—100% of the annual harvest rights from the CFQ owned by the administrative entity from each GOA groundfish management area, by species, would be distributed amongst qualified communities located in the management area on an equal basis.~~

The AP recommends the Council delete this section. *Motion passed 18/0.*

### 3.7.2.10 CFQ Management (Page 56)

The CFQ Program will be managed in a manner similar to the halibut/sablefish community purchase program. The Council shall establish a CFQ implementation committee to implement this program ~~as a trailing amendment~~. The committee will advise on the provisions of the program. (Motion passed 16/0)

## C-2 Central GOA Rockfish Demonstration Pilot Program

The AP recommends not including the non-trawl sector from the primary program.

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

*Motion passed 14/0*

### Sideboard Provisions

#### General Provisions:

There are no exemptions from sideboards, except for CP vessels which opt out of the pilot program.

a. For fisheries that close on TAC in the GOA, the qualified vessels in each sector (trawl CV and trawl CP) would be limited, in aggregate, in the month of July to the historic average total catch of those vessels in the month of July during the qualification years 1996 to 2002. Fisheries that this sideboard provision would apply to include West Yakutat rockfish and WGOA rockfish.

b. For flatfish fisheries in the GOA that close because of halibut bycatch, the qualified vessels in each sector (trawl CV and trawl CP) would be limited, in the aggregate, in the month of July to the historic average halibut mortality taken by those vessels in the target flatfish fisheries in the month of July by deep and shallow complex.

c. In the event that one or more target rockfish fisheries are not open, sideboard restrictions will not apply for those target allocations.

- IFQ halibut and sablefish are exempt from sideboard provisions

#### CP Specific Sideboard Provisions:

Vessels may decide to opt out of the CGOA pilot program on an annual basis. These vessels may not target POP, Northern rockfish or Pelagic Shelf rockfish in the CGOA in the years they choose to opt out. They may retain these species up to the MRA amount in other fisheries. They will be sideboarded at the sector level in the GOA as referenced in a and b above, but will not be subject to other sideboard restrictions within their sector.

*Option 1 -The history of vessels which opt out will remain with the sector.*

*Option 2 -The history of vessels which opt out will be distributed pro-rata between sectors.*

Opting out is an annual decision. Vessels which choose to opt out must so notify NMFS. The decision to opt out should not in any way alter the status of their catch history for future rationalization programs.

For the CP sector, the pilot program fishery will start at the same time as the open access fisheries (in July). CPs which qualify for the CGOA rockfish pilot program, and which do not choose to opt out, are required to harvest 90% of their CGOA rockfish allocation, or to participate in the target rockfish fishery in the CGOA for two weeks (whichever is shorter) before participating in any other BSAI or GOA groundfish fishery. A vessel which has met this requirement can then move into the BSAI or GOA open access fisheries without limitation or restriction, except at the sector level in the GOA as referenced in the CV/CP inter-sector sideboards.

History may be consolidated between vessels, however each individual vessel that transfers its history to another CP or CV must still refrain from operating in any other BSAI or GOA groundfish fishery until 90% of all of the rockfish allocation on the stacked vessel is harvested in the CGOA, or for two weeks (whichever is shorter).

Option: three week stand-down

**CV Specific Sideboard Provisions:**

- The qualifying vessels in the trawl CV sector cannot participate in the directed yellowfin sole, other flatfish (flathead, etc) or Pacific Ocean perch fisheries in the BSAI in the month of July.
- Qualifying vessels in the trawl CV sector would be limited, in aggregate, in the month of July, to the historic average total catch of those vessels in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery in July during the qualification years 1996 to 2002.
- AFA CVs qualified under this program are subject to the restraints of AFA sideboards and their coop agreement, and not subject to additional sideboards under this program.

*Motion passed 16/1*

**Set Asides**

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 5% of each of these target rockfish species.

- 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. Increase fixed gear portion of the fixed gear set aside each year by 0.5%/year each year the fixed gear sector catches their full allocation.

*Motion passed 11/4*

- 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 any sector will occur at the end of the third quarter, and if the non-qualified vessel quota is not taken by November 1, it will be rolled over to the class of eligible vessels. *Motion passed 15/0*

The AP notes that estimates of thornyhead and shortraker/rockfish incidental requirements in the sablefish halibut and p.cod longline fisheries have been repeatedly requested yet still not provided. We wish to highlight the importance of having this data available at initial review to allow refinement of the alternatives prior to final action. *Motion passed 15/0*

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 vessels that would be allowed to fish in the entry level fishery
    - Suboption: Equal share distributions to the vessel applicants **by sector**
    - Suboption: Limited access competitive fishery **by sector**
  - Entry permits are non-transferable and must be fished by the named vessel
- Motion passed 16/0*

5.4 CV sector

The AP requests the Council modify the last two bullets for alternative 2 as follows:

- Catcher vessel cooperatives are required to have at least 5-10 eligible LLPs
- ~~Coops may engage in inter cooperative transfers of annual allocations to other cooperatives with agreement of the associated qualified processor~~
- No processor associations required by coops.

*Motion passed 16/0*



**C-3 (a) Habitat Areas of Particular Concern**

The AP recommends adding an option to action 2, alternative 3 GOA Corals in SE as follows:  
Prohibit bottom trawling in subareas and designate remainder of HAPC as a research priority for longline gear impacts. *Motion passed 11/2*

Additionally, the AP recommends information on Canadian bottom contact fisheries in the proposed Dixon Entrance HAPC be included in the analysis. *Motion passed 17/0.*

**C-3 (d) Alternative 5B** The AP endorses the Aleutian Island trawl industry's attempt to provide data to modify alternative 5B boundaries based on the 200 MT approach. We request the council provide an opportunity and timeframe for this data to be analyzed prior to the December council meeting. *Motion passed 15/1.*

**C-7 Halibut Subsistence**

The AP recommends the following actions and alternatives:

Action 1. Revise the subsistence halibut regulations for gear and harvest to address local area issues.

Alternative 1. No action.

(a) - (c): 30 hooks  
three times the individual gear limit

(d): 30 hooks per vessel

Alternative 2. Change gear and annual limits in local areas.

(a) in Kodiak road zone and Chiniak Bay:

Issue 1. Gear limit, annual limit, and community harvest permit program:

Option 1. 5 hooks and 20 fish annual limit

Option 2. 10 hooks and 20 fish annual limit

Issue 2. Limit stacking on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1. one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2. two times the hook limit

(b) in Prince William Sound:

Issue 1. Gear limit and community harvest permit program:

Option 1. 5 hooks

Option 2. 10 hooks

Issue 2. Limit stacking on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1. one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2. two times the hook limit

(c) in Cook Inlet:

Issue 1. Gear limit and community harvest permit program:

Option 1. 5 hooks

Option 2. 10 hooks

Issue 2. Limit stacking on a single unit of gear per trip provided the subsistence user(s) are on board the vessel to:

Option 1. one hook limit (no stacking)

Option 2. two times the hook limit

## (d) in Sitka Sound LAMP:

Seasonal gear and vessel limits:

June 1 to August 31

15 hooks per vessel

no power hauling

5 halibut per day/vessel

September 1 to May 31

(30 hooks per vessel)

(power hauling allowed)

10 halibut per day/vessel

**Option: Apply Sitka Sound LAMP restrictions to all of Area 2C Motion passed 15/1**

Option for areas (a) - (d): Require mandatory retention of rockfish. A fisherman would be required to stop subsistence halibut fishing for that day if the legal limit of rockfish allowed under State regulations were caught. This applies to the current State limits for rockfish only. Subsistence users would not be restricted below current bag limits.

Action 2. Revise the list of eligible subsistence halibut communities.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Add to list of eligible communities:

Option 1. Naukati

Option 2. Port Tongass Village

Action 3. Create a subsistence halibut possession limit for areas **2C and/or 3A and/or 3B**.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Possession limit equal to two daily bag limits

**Alternative 3. A limit of one daily bag limit Motion passed 17/0**

**Alternative 4. Possession limit equal to two daily vessel limits**

**Alternative 5. Possession limit equal to one daily vessel limit Motion passed 13/1**

Action 4. Revise the definition of charter vessels.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Allow the use of charterboats for subsistence halibut fishing

Alternative 3. Adopt the State of Alaska definition of charter vessels to redefine a charterboat vessel as State- licensed and restrict their use in the subsistence fishery to the owner and identified immediate family members (father, mother, brother, sister, children, legally adopted children). **registered. Restrict the use of charter vessel to the owner of record and immediate family (owner must be a qualified subsistence user). Prohibit the use of a charter vessel for subsistence fishing while clients are on board. Prohibit the transfer of subsistence halibut to clients. Motion passed 14/0.**

*Suboption: Prohibit use of a charter vessel June 1-August 30 for subsistence fishing for halibut. Motion failed 7/7. **Minority Report:** The minority voted to limit use of a charter vessel by the owner and their immediate family to the season September 1 – May 31. We feel this may help resolve abuses of subsistence provisions by charter vessels while providing for traditional halibut subsistence harvest practices outside the primary charter season. Signed: Duncan Fields, Michelle Ridgway, Eric Olson.*

Action 5. Revise the \$400 customary trade limit for subsistence halibut by IPHC regulatory area.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Revise the customary trade limit to \$100.

Alternative 3. Eliminate the customary trade limit (\$0)

**Alternative 4. Allow the customary and traditional practice of sharing halibut expenses between:**

**Option 1: Between members of an Alaskan Tribe**

**Option 2: Between any recognized Alaska tribes**

- Option 3: Between Alaska rural residents**
- Option 4: With any qualified halibut subsistence user eligible under this program**
- Option 5: Under the terms of a community harvest permit** *Motion passed 16/0*
- Alternative 5. Develop recordkeeping requirements for trade involving cash** *Motion passed 16/0*

Action 6. Allow subsistence halibut fishing in non-subsistence areas under special permits.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Allow the use of community harvest permits, educational permits, and ceremonial permits in non-traditional use areas by tribes whose traditional fishing grounds are located within these areas, with a 20-fish per day bag limit.

**The AP wishes to note its concern over the accuracy of the subsistence survey for SHARC card members. Reporting on the survey is entirely voluntary. The AP believes survey results need to be verified through dockside sampling or other appropriate independent verification methods. The magnitude of the subsistence harvest increases in some areas dictate increased verification for conservation reasons.** *Motion passed 15/0.*

### **C-6 Halibut Sablefish IFQ Program**

#### ***IFQ/CDQ 4C/4D***

The AP recommends the Council move the regulatory package for IFQ/CDQ area 4C/4D forward for public review, with following changes:

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Allow holders of Area 4C IFQ and CDQ to harvest such IFQ/CDQ in Area 4D.

~~Option: Allow holders of Area 4D IFQ and CDQ to harvest such IFQ/CDQ in Area 4C.~~

**At the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year after implementation, the program will be evaluated.** *Motion passed 17/0*

#### ***Halibut and Sablefish IFQ program***

The AP recommends the release regulatory amendment package for IFQ amendments for public review, with the following changes:

Action 1. Allow the use of medical transfers.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Allow medical transfers.

#### **Add options for evidence of qualifying medical conditions**

**Option 1: State certified medical professional**

**Option 2: Licensed medical doctor or their representative**

**Add a section "Limits to medical transfer"**

**1. 3 out of 6 years**

**2. 2 out of 5 years**

Action 2. Tighten the criteria allowing the use of hired skippers.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. To use the hired skipper exception, a QS holder must demonstrate at least a 20% vessel owner interest in the vessel to be used and have continuously owned the vessel as documented by the contemporary abstract of title for the previous:

a. 6 months

b. 12 months

c. 24 months

d. year to date plus previous calendar year

#### **Add option to allow for replacement vessel in the event of a loss**

Action 3. Add vessel clearance requirements to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands sablefish fisheries.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Add vessel clearance requirements to the BS and AI sablefish regulations.

Option 1. Add check-in/check-out for the Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea sablefish fishery (e.g., in Dutch Harbor, Adak, St Paul, St George) **The AP recommends the list of communities mirror the list of communities from IPHC for the Halibut Sablefish Check-in Check-out.**

Option 2. Require VMS when fishing in the Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea sablefish fishery

Action 4. Amend the sablefish product recovery rate for bled sablefish.

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Change product recovery rate from 0.98 to 1.0.

**Expand the discussion on the amount of additional blood loss realized from bled fish (gear code 03) vs. round fish (gear code 01) landed using normal handling practices such as gaffing. The discussion should focus on the role of this difference in determining an appropriate PPR for bled sablefish.**

**Expand the discussion of the impact of changing the PRR on the stock assessment model.**

Action 5. Amend the halibut block program in Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Increase block limits to 3 or 4 blocks

Alternative 3. Unblock all QS blocks that yield more than 20,000 lb

Alternative 4. Allow blocked QS greater than 20,000 lb to be divided into smaller blocks

Alternative 5. Increase the Areas 2C and 3A halibut sweep-up level to the 5,000 lb equivalent in 1996 QS units.

**Request staff add a table that shows consolidation of quota share over time by size of holdings**

**Request staff add a table that provides CEY projections for next 3 years in Area 3B and 4ABC**

Action 6. Amend Area 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D halibut quota share categories

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Allow IFQ derived from D category QS to be fished on C category vessels

Alternative 3. Allow IFQ derived from D category QS to be fished on C or B category vessels

Alternative 4. Combine C and D category QS

Action 7. Amend fish down regulations for Area 2C halibut and Southeast Outside District sablefish

Alternative 1. No action.

Alternative 2. Eliminate the exception to the fish down regulations for Area 2C halibut and Southeast area sablefish

*Motion passed 16/0*

Additionally, the AP requests the Council staff task with developing a discussion paper that reviews 3 proposals

1. Alaskan Leader Fisheries: Allowing frozen other species on board while fishing IFQ

2. Hubbard: Fish A and/or B, C, D shares any time any order

3. Thompson: Allow use of pot gear in the sablefish fishery during June. *Motion passed 16/0*

Further, the AP requests the Council schedule Halibut Sablefish IFQ agenda item as the first item on the agenda for the December 04 meeting. *Motion passed 16/0.*