

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON PROPOSED ALLOCATION  
CHANGES TO HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) received a presentation from Ms. Kelly Ames regarding proposed changes to the Area 2A halibut catch sharing plan and we offer the following comments.

After reviewing the materials, including the [Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife \(ODFW\) Report](#) under this agenda item, a majority of the GAP supports the conclusions in that report. That is, do not consider revision of the Pacific halibut catch sharing strategy of the non-treaty halibut allocation in Area 2A at this time. The majority also supports reviewing the most recent allocation changes in five years (2019), pending additional information that will inform the Council, states, and advisory bodies as to the effects of the most recent allocation changes.

The GAP wishes to add some clarifying comments to that recommendation. First, consideration for future changes should not be limited to the California sport fishery. Second, future proposals to modify the current catch sharing arrangement should consider the full range of arguments involved with allocating the available harvest including but not limited to catches or to resource distribution. Particularly for sport fisheries there is a need to address important fishery objectives such as season opportunity and the minimization of season disruption. Although the ODFW recommendation effectively defers consideration of changes until 2020, the GAP encourages the Council begin gathering information that could be considered for potential allocation changes in advance of this future decision to ensure full discussion of viable alternative approaches.

The GAP also suggests using guidance from the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) on allocation considerations to inform some of the analysis prior to 2019:

1. Present participation in and dependence on the fishery, including alternative fisheries.
2. Historical fishing practices in and historical dependence on the fishery.
3. The economics of the fishery.
4. Any consensus harvest sharing agreement or negotiated settlement between the affected participants in the fishery.
5. Potential biological yield of any species or species complex affected by the allocation.
6. Consistency with the Magnuson-Stevens Act national standards.
7. Consistency with the goals and objectives of the FMP.