D-3(b) Area Closure Options for Chum Bycatch Alternatives
February 15, 2010

> *The Council requests staff develop an expanded discussion paper based on Advisory Panel recommendations. Additions to the Advisory Panel recommendations are shown underlined and deletions in strikethrough.*

The ~~AP recommends the~~ Council move<u>s</u> ~~forward with~~ the following revised ~~(bold)~~ components for analysis:

Component 5: Area Option

a) Large area closure
b) Discrete, small area closures identified by staff in February Discussion paper (20 ADF&G statistical areas, identified in Table 4)
c) <u>Groupings of the small area closures (described in Option b above) into 3 zones that could be triggered independently with subarea, rather than statistical area, level closures</u>

Component 6: Timing Option – Dates of Area Closures

a) Trigger closure of Component 5 areas when the overall cap level specified under Component 1(a) was attained
b) Under Component 5(b) discrete small closures would close when <u>an</u> overall cap was attained and would close for the time period corresponding to periods of high historical bycatch, considering both number of salmon and bycatch rate (i.e. Table 11 in February Discussion Paper)
   <u>Under Component 5(c) subareas within a zone would close for the time period corresponding to periods of high historical bycatch within the subarea when a zone level cap was attained</u>

c) Under Component 5, areas close when bycatch cap is attained within that area (i.e. Table 12 in February Discussion Paper)
   a. for the remainder of year
   b. for specific date range

Component 7 Rolling Hot Spot (RHS) Exemption - Similar to status quo, participants in a vessel-level (platform level for mothership fleet) RHS would be exempt from regulatory triggered closure(s).

   Sub-option (a) RHS regulations would contain an ICA provision that the regulatory trigger closure (as adopted in Component 5) apply to participants that do not maintain a certain level of rate-based chum salmon bycatch performance.

In addition, include the following items in the next discussion paper:

▪ Analyze discrete area approach normalized across years (i.e. proportion of salmon caught in an area in a year rather than numbers of salmon)

- Discuss how Component 7 and suboption would be applied

- <u>In depth description of the rolling hot spot regulations (Amendment 84), focusing on parameters that could be adjusted if the Council found a need to refine the program to meet objectives under Component 7</u>

- Discussion from NMFS of catch accounting for specific caps for discrete areas, <u>and area aggregations described in Component 5 and for areas within those footprints that may have other shapes that could be defined by geographic coordinates</u> [Component 6(c)]

- <u>Discussion from NMFS on the ability to trigger a regulatory closure based on relative bycatch within a season (with respect to catch accounting system and enforcement limitations) considering changes in bycatch monitoring under Amendment 91</u>

- <u>Contrast a regulatory closure system (Components 5 and 6) to the ICA closure system (Component 7) including data limitations, enforcement, potential level of accountability (i.e., fleet-wide, sector, cooperative, or vessel level)</u>

- Examine differences between high bycatch years (i.e. 2005) and other years to see what contributes to high rates (i.e. timing/location, including fleet behavior and environmental conditions)

- <u>Examine past area closures and potential impacts of those closures on historical distribution of bycatch and on bycatch rates (qualitative); include 2008 and 2009 data and contrast bycatch distribution under VRHS versus the Chum Salmon Savings Area</u>