North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Eric A. Olson, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Executive Director

605 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501-2252

Telephone (907) 271-2809

Fax (907) 271-2817

Visit our website: http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc

FINAL
ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES
March 28–31, 2011
Anchorage, Alaska

The following (20) members were present for all or part of the meetings:

Kurt Cochran	Jeff Farvour	Theresa Peterson
Craig Cross	Becca Robbins Gisclair	Ed Poulsen
John Crowley	Jan Jacobs	Neil Rodriguez
Julianne Curry	Bob Jacobson	Beth Stewart
Jerry Downing	Alexus Kwachka	Lori Swanson
Tom Enlow	Chuck McCallum	Anne Vanderhoeven
Tim Evers	Matt Moir	

Minutes of the February 2011 meeting were approved.

C-2 Final action on Halibut/Sablefish Hired Skipper restrictions

A motion was made to recommend the Council adopt Alternative 2 with Options 1 and 2. Immediately following this motion, a substitute motion was made to recommend Alternative 1. *The substitute motion failed 9/11.*

A motion to change the control date to the date of final Council action *passed 20/0*.

A motion to add a new option, Option 3: Initial recipients providing proof of ownership higher than Coast Guard documentation or abstract of title would be exempt from Alternative 2, *failed 4-16.*

Finally, the original motion to recommend Alternative 2 with Option 1 and Option 2 as amended, *failed 10/10*.

C-3(a) Review Salmon FMP changes

The AP recommends the Council select Alternative 3 as a Preliminary Preferred Alternative**,** and move this forward for initial review with the options and updates identified in Table 2 of the discussion paper.

The AP further recommends an expanded discussion of the risks associated with removing the West historical net areas from the FMP in the preliminary review draft.

Motion passed 19/0.

C-3(b) Initial review of GOA Chinook Salmon Bycatch control measures

The AP recommends the Council make the following changes to Component 2 of Alternative 2 (deletions are in ~~strikeout~~, additions are **bold/underlined**):

Alternative 2: Chinook salmon PSC limit and increased monitoring

Component 2: ~~Expanded observer coverage~~: **Improved Chinook salmon PSC estimates**:

Extend existing 30% observer coverage requirements for vessels 60' to 125' to trawl vessels less than 60' directed fishing for pollock in the Central and Western GOA.

Require full retention of all salmon in pollock trawl fisheries.

Modify the specific actions recommended by NMFS (to avoid delay for this action and implementation of observer restructuring package) to a statement: NMFS shall work with the processors to evaluate and address the quality of sorting at the plants to assist improvements in observer salmon estimates. The AP encourages NMFS to apply lessons learned from the BSAI to the Gulf where applicable.

Processing plants along with assistance from the Agency, in turn, should endeavor to ensure their fish tickets accurately reflect the species and number of salmon which will be delivered and sorted as salmon bycatch at their facilities.

NMFS is also encouraged to collaborate with industry to facilitate information sharing which will help to speed delivery of in-season data (total catch and salmon counts, by species) for the NORPAC data system and Catch Accounting System.

Motion passed 20/0

The AP recommends that the Council delete Alternative 3. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends that the Council delay final action on this issue until December 2011. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends that the Council direct staff that the next iteration of the analysis must include fish ticket counts for 2003 to 2010. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends that the Council request that the analysis include a discussion of municipal tax structures under the section on taxes. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends that the Council request that the analysis include a table indicating Chinook salmon bycatch estimates for non-pollock trawl fisheries for the same suite of years as the pollock trawl fisheries. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends that the Council request that the analysis include sport fish, commercial, subsistence and personal use fishery data for the same suite of years to the extent it is available. Data should be split by large management area (Area M, Area L, etc). *Motion passed 20/0*

A motion to recommend a preliminary preferred alternative of a 15,000 fish PSC limit with the 25% overage provision and the modified Component 2 failed 7/13.

Minority Report: A minority of the AP supported a motion to recommend the Council adopt a PPA including a PSC limit of 15,000 with the 25% overage provision as specified in the Council's February 2011 and Component 2 as modified by the AP. The minority felt that this level of PSC limit was appropriate to meet the Council's objectives for this action, as well as the requirements of National Standard 9, to reduce bycatch. Higher cap limits represent numbers that exceed the average GOA Chinook salmon bycatch for the pollock fishery and therefore represent little change from the status quo. Chinook salmon returns throughout the Gulf—including the Karluk River and Upper Cook Inlet—have been low and commercial, subsistence, personal use and sport fisheries have been restricted in these areas. Despite these restrictions escapement goals have still not been met. Regardless of knowing specific impacts of bycatch on these stocks, every fishery must share in the burden of conservation to ensure the long term health of this resource. The lack of information about stock of origin of the salmon caught as bycatch and specific impacts mandates that we take a precautionary approach and set a PSC limit for Chinook salmon in the GOA pollock fishery at a level that represents actual bycatch reductions on an expedited basis.

Signed by: Becca Robbins Gisclair, Chuck McCallum, Julianne Curry, Alexus Kwachka, Jeff Farvour, Tim Evers, Theresa Peterson

A motion to add a fourth option under Component One for a 40,000 fish PSC limit failed 10/10.

C-4(a) BSAI Crab IFQ/IPQ Deadline – Final Action

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 2 in its entirety for final action. *Motion passed 20/0*

C-4(b) Crab Economic Data Reports (EDR)

The AP recommends the Council move forward with the staff analysis of the harvester EDR alternatives and elements shown in the attached table. *Motion passed 20/0*

The AP recommends the Council move forward with the staff analysis of the processor EDR alternatives and elements shown in the attached table. *Motion passed 20/0*

C-4(c) Pribilof Island Blue King Crab Rebuilding Plan – Final Action

The AP believes that the analysis to revise the rebuilding plan for Pribilof Islands blue king crab is not ready for final action at this time for the following reasons:

- The model cannot accurately predict rebuilding. This is reflected in the SSC minutes from their December meeting. As a result, although the model is the best information we have, it does not accurately predict the impacts of the actions before us. The document needs a better discussion of the limitations of the model.
- Text in the analysis referring to figures are not always correct and text is not always clear (page 19 for example) making it difficult to understand the analysis of the impacts on stock rebuilding.
- The AP is concerned that the bycatch figures resultant from the pot cod fleet may not be accurate due to extrapolation issues from a fleet with less than 100% observer coverage. Further information in the analysis would be helpful on this topic.

- The analysis does not analyze the impacts of the action (closing areas to groundfish vessels) on the environment (habitat, marine mammals, cumulative effects, impacts of shifting effort).
- The analysis does not analyze the impacts of the action (closing areas to groundfish vessels) on the groundfish fisheries.
- Options to close areas for pelagic fishing are not included even though pelagic gear may at times be fishing on the bottom.
- The analysis looks at the Pribilof blue king crab stock as a discrete stock when in fact it is likely part of the St. Matthews and St. Lawrence population (and likely included the Aleutian Islands in the past). Genetic information is not yet available to confirm this but is critical information for making a decision and may be available in the near future.
- The AP understands that PIBKC bycatch accounting methods will change within the next year, but the analysis does not consider the impact of this change.

Motion passed 20/0

The AP recommends the Council request that the analysis include a table showing the average percent of the ABC taken by each sector over the years 2003 to 2010. *Motion passed 20/0*

C-4(d) Finalize Tanner Crab Rebuilding Plan

The AP recommends the Council defer choosing a final alternative for the Tanner crab rebuilding plan until after the May 2011 Crab Plan Team meeting. Further, the AP recommends the Council request the Crab Plan Team to review reference levels for the Tanner crab fishery including B_{msy} and make suggestions for alternatives, knowing that the earlier data (1969-1973) in the time series may be inappropriate.

Motion passed 17/0

C-5(a) Essential Fish Habitat – Final Action

The AP recommends the Council take final action to select Alternative 2 for each Action 1-7 as shown on page 5 of the analysis. *Motion passed 17/0/1*

C-5(b) Bristol Bay Red King Crab (BBRKC) Spawning Area/Fishing Effects – Discussion Paper

The AP recommends the Council request an expansion of the BBRKC EFH discussion paper with the following priorities:

- A discussion of the effects of the existing red king crab closure areas.
- A discussion of the importance of environmental variables on red king crab distribution, in particular in the Amak area, as well as the importance of removals from this area.
- An expanded discussion of fishing intensity with regard to recent sweep modifications and reduced bottom contact, and a more robust comparison of years in regards to fishing intensity.

Motion passed 18/0

C-6 GOA Pacific cod Jig Fishery Management

The AP recommends selecting Alternative 2 as the preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) and delaying final action until December 2011. This will provide opportunity for the Alaska Board of Fisheries to comment and take action in October. The AP further recommends the final action include a list comparing State and Federal management regulations. The AP requests options to include prohibiting the use of any other gear type onboard while fishing in the federal jig fishery.

Motion passed 19/0

D-1 Scallop SAFE

The AP recommends that the Council approve the Scallop SAFE report. *Motion passed 17/0*

D-2(a) Halibut Ramp EFP Report

The AP received a report on the halibut RAMP experiment.

D-2(b) GOA Halibut PSC Limit

The AP recommends that the Council develop a comprehensive FMP amendment and regulatory amendment and analysis of ways to reduce halibut bycatch by all sectors and gear types engaged in GOA groundfish fisheries. *Motion passed 12/6*

Minority Report: The following motion was made before a substitute motion replaced it by a vote of 12-6:

The AP recommends that the Council adopt a purpose and scope for GOA halibut PSC that incorporates the following principals and functions:

There are a number of long-standing issues regarding the PSC limits of halibut in the Gulf of Alaska. Halibut-dependent fisheries have significantly changed since PSC limits were set.

The AP recommends that the GOA halibut PSC discussion paper be forwarded for initial review with the following options addressed in the analysis through the 2011 specifications process:

Reduce GOA PSC limits by:

- *10%*
- *20%*
- *30%*

The analysis is intended to be a short-term action to be used as a springboard for more comprehensive review of halibut bycatch management.

A minority of the AP supported the original motion. The minority felt that urgent action must be taken to reduce halibut PSC limits in the Gulf of Alaska through the 2011 specs process as a short-term solution for bycatch reduction while also pursuing a comprehensive long-term solution through an FMP/ Regulatory Amendment process.

After careful review of the IPHCs presentation and bycatch reduction discussion paper, the minority of the AP felt that it is clear that slow halibut growth rates threaten the rebuilding potential of halibut stocks. Uncertainty surrounding slow growth rates warrants a precautionary approach to halibut removals. The directed commercial and charter halibut fisheries have taken significant reductions in allowable harvest over the past decade. The dynamics of the directed and non-directed halibut fisheries have changed significantly since halibut PSC limits were set in 1986. Vast improvements in technology have resulted in more efficient fishing by PSC limited fisheries. Other factors have contributed to PSC limits not being reached in recent years.

The IPHC has expressed significant concern over bycatch impacts to the halibut resource. Each pound of under 32-inch bycatch mortality reduces future yield to the directed commercial fishery by one pound and 1.6 pounds of future yield to the female spawning biomass. The directed halibut fisheries are impacted by lost yield due to downstream effects from area of capture. Therefore, the Council should take immediate action to reduce the halibut PSC limit in the GOA to protect the halibut resource and achieve meaningful bycatch reductions to benefit all users.

Signed by: Julianne Curry, Becca Robbins Gisclair, Chuck McCallum, Theresa Peterson, Tim Evers, Jeff Farvour

D-2(c) Salmon Excluder EFP

The AP recommends that the Council approve this EFP. *Motion passed 19/0*

D-2(d) AFA Impacts on BS cod trawlers – discussion paper

The AP reviewed the discussion paper and recommends that the Council take no further action on this issue. *Motion passed 19/0*

D-3(b) Observer Advisory Committee Report

The AP received a report on the Observer Advisory Committee meeting.

Data type	Data element	Alt 1. (status quo)	Alt 2.	Alt 3.
Fishing data	Fish ticket number	all crab fisheries	-	-
	Days fishing	by crab fishery	-	-
	Days traveling (from port to grounds) and offloading	by crab fishery	-	-
Deliveries and revenues	Landings by share type - pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Deadloss by share type - pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	-
	Landings by share type - revenues	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Vessel owner's IFQ used on the vessel by share type	by crab fishery	-	-
	Vessel owner's IFQ used on other vessels by share type			
	Leased quota by share type - pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery- arms length only
	Leased quota by share type - cost			
	Leased quota by share type - crew contributing shares	by crab fishery	aggregated all crab fisheries- count of crew leasing	-
Crew	Number of crew by fishery	by crab fishery	-	-
	Payments to crew	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Payments to captain	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Labor payment details - charges and deductions	in all crab fisheries	-	-
	Revenue shares - owner/crew/captain	by crab fishery	-	-
	Crew license number/CFEC permit number	aggregated across all crab fisheries	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-
	Insurance premium - crab only	aggregated across all crab fisheries and aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Paid deductibles - crab only	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-	-
	Pot purchases - number	aggregated for all crab fisheries	aggregated all fisheries new pots only	-
	Pot purchases - cost			
	Pot purchases - location	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Line and other gear purchases - costs	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Line and other gear purchases - location	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Bait used - species/pounds by fishery	by crab fishery	-	-
	Bait used - species/cost by fishery			

Data type	Data element	Alt 1. (status quo)	Alt 2.	Alt 3.
Crab costs	Bait used - purchase location by fishery	by crab fishery	-	-
	Fuel used - gallons by fishery	by crab fishery	aggregated all fisheries	-
	Fuel used - cost by fishery			
	Fuel used - purchase location by fishery	by crab fishery	-	-
	Food and provisions - costs	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-	-
	Other crew expenses	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Freight costs for landed crab	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Storage, wharfage, delivery costs for gear	aggregated for all crab fisheries	-	-
	Observer costs - by fishery	by crab fishery	-	-
	Landing taxes and fees	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-	-
	Cooperative fees	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-	-
	Other expenses	aggregated across all crab fisheries	-	-
Vessel costs	Vessel and equipment investment - cost	aggregated across all fisheries (excluding exclusively non-crab costs)	aggregated all fisheries, including R&M	-
	Vessel and equipment investment - location	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Repair and maintenance - costs	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Repair and maintenance - location	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Insurance premium	aggregated across all fisheries	Aggregated All Fisheries	-
	Fuel, lubrication, fluids - annual - cost	aggregated across all fisheries	Aggregated All Fisheries	-
	Fuel, lubrication, fluids - annual - location	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Other vessel specific costs	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
All activities	Days at sea - all activities	aggregated across all activities	-	-
	Gross revenues - all activities	aggregated across all activities	Aggregated All Fisheries	-
	Pounds - all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	-	-
	Labor cost - all activities	aggregated across all activities	Aggregated All Fisheries	-

Data type	Data element	Alt 1. (status quo)	Alt. 2	Alt. 3
Production	Production - dates covered by fishery	by crab fishery		
	Production - processing days by fishery	by crab fishery	Providing first and last day and number of active days	Providing first and last day and number of active days
	Raw crab processed by fishery	by crab fishery		
	Product and processed pounds by fishery	by crab fishery		
	Production - crab size and grade	by crab fishery		
	Production - box size	by crab fishery		
	Production - finished pounds	by crab fishery		
	Production - custom processing identifier	by crab fishery		
Revenues	Sales to affiliates/non-affiliates by species - product/process	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Sales to affiliates/non-affiliates by species - crab size and grade	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Sales to affiliates/non-affiliates by species - box size and finished pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Sales to affiliates/non-affiliates by species - revenues (fob)	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Custom processing by species/product/process	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Custom processing revenues	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
Labor	Average processing positions	by crab fishery		
	Man-hours	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	aggregated across all fisheries
	Total processing labor payments	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	aggregated across all fisheries
	Crab processing employees by residence	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	aggregated across all fisheries
Custom processing services purchased	Custom processing services purchased - raw pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Custom processing services purchased - product and process	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Custom processing services purchased - size and grade	by crab fishery		
	Custom processing services purchased - box size	by crab fishery		
	Custom processing services purchased - finished pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Custom processing services purchased - processing fee	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
Crab purchases	Raw crab purchases by fishery - ifq type	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Raw crab purchases by fishery - size and grade	by crab fishery		
	Raw crab purchases by fishery - pounds	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Raw crab purchases by fishery - gross payments	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery

Data type	Data element	Alt 1. (status quo)	Alt. 2	Alt. 3
Crab processing costs	Fisheries taxes and fees - crab only	by crab fisheries		
	Processing and packing materials, equipment, and supplies - crab only	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Food and provisions - crab only	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Other direct crab labor costs	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Insurance deductibles - crab only	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Repackaging costs	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Broker fees and promotions by fishery	by crab fishery		
	Lease (IPQ) costs	by crab fishery	by crab fishery	by crab fishery
	Observer costs	by crab fishery		
	Freight cost for plant supplies	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Freight costs for products	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Product storage	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Water, sewer, and waste disposal	aggregated across crab fisheries		
	Other crab-specific costs	aggregated across crab fisheries		
General plant costs	Annual fuel, electricity, lubrication, hydraulic fluids	aggregated across all fisheries		
	Plant and equipment investments	aggregated across all fisheries		
	Repair and maintenance	aggregated across all fisheries		
	Foremen, managers, other employees and salaries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries
	Other plant specific costs	aggregated across all fisheries		
General processing information	Processing days - annual total - all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries
	Gross FOB revenues - annual total - all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries
	Finished processed pounds - annual total - all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries
	Processing labor costs - annual total - all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries	aggregated across all fisheries