

Motion 7: Utilizing page 2 of Supplemental HMSMT Report E.3.b, adopt the following:

- Continued outreach with fishermen on best practices for increased survivorship of released sharks;
- Continued research on potential gear modifications to improve survivorship of released sharks (gear switch from j-hook to circle hook);
- An updated thresher shark stock assessment utilizing data from both the United States and Mexico fisheries;
- Identification of the spatial/temporal extent of thresher shark pupping grounds and nursery areas;
- Improved collection of recreational data, including catch-and-effort estimates from vessels departing from private access marinas;
- Better estimates of the number and condition of sharks released;
- Improved monitoring and data collection for the commercial shark hook-and-line fishery and for non-HMS fisheries such as bottom set net and small mesh drift gillnet.

And add:

- Obtain available Marine Recreational Information Program funding for enhanced west coast HMS data collection.
- Support California Recreational Fisheries Survey efforts to improve data collection from the private boat fishery, specifically for trips originating from private access locations.

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich

Seconded by: Dan Wolford

Amndt: Include a one shark per angler bag limit per day of any species.

Moved by: Kathy Fosmark

Seconded by: Jerry Mallet

Amendment to Motion 7 failed. 11 no, 2 yes. Mr. Mallet and Ms. Fosmark voted no.

Main Motion 7 passed unanimously.

Motion 8: For inseason adjustments, adopt the GMT recommendations on Agenda Item F.1.b, Supplemental GMT Report, with the following modification:

- modify the petrale sole limit increase recommendation from north of 40°10' N latitude to coastwide as per the limits shown on Table 1 of that report.

The recommended inseason adjustments as per Motion 8 were as follows:

2008 Recommendations

1. Large footrope trawl gear north of 40°10' N latitude: increase the limit from 45,000 lb/2 months to 60,000 lb/2 months beginning December 1, 2008;
2. All trawl gears south of 40°10' N latitude: increase the limit from 65,000 lb/2 months to 75,000 lb/2 months beginning December 1, 2008; and
3. Maintain status quo limits for the sablefish fisheries in the Conception Area.

2009 Recommendations

1. Increase the 2009 period 1 limited entry trawl cumulative landing limits of sablefish from 14,000 lbs/2 months to 18,000 lbs/2 months north of 40°10' N latitude using large

- footrope trawls and from 14,000 lbs/2 months to 20,000 lbs/2 months between 40°10' N latitude and 38° N latitude south for all trawl gears;
2. Increase the 2009 period 1 coastwide shortspine thornyhead limits from 12,000 lbs/2 months to 17,000 lbs/2 months for all strategies except the northern selective flatfish trawl strategy;
 3. Increase the 2009 period 1 limited entry trawl cumulative landing limit of Dover sole in the south and in the north using large footrope trawls from 80,000 lbs/2 months to 110,000 lbs/2 months;
 4. Reduce the 2009 period 1 limited entry trawl cumulative landing limit north of 40°10' N latitude of petrale sole using large and small footrope trawls from 40,000 lbs/2 months to 25,000 lbs/2 months;
 5. Extend the seaward boundary of the non-trawl RCA between Cape Blanco and Cascade Head to 125 fm in period 1 next year;
 6. Extend the shoreward boundary of the non-trawl RCA between 40°10' N latitude and Cape Blanco to 20 fm in period 1 next year.

Motion 8 passed unanimously.

Motion 9: For Pacific sardine stock assessment and management measures, set the harvest guideline at 71,320 mt. based on the original STAT proposal which was not excluded based on science, but because it did not meet the process criteria.

Moved by: Steve Williams

Seconded by: Rod Moore

Motion 9 failed. 9 no, 4 yes. Mr. Steve Williams, Mr. Rod Moore, Mr. Frank Warrens and Ms. Fosmark voted yes.

Motion 10: Adopt a 2009 Pacific sardine allowable biological catch or maximum harvest guideline of 66,932 mt, including a 6,500 mt incidental set aside and a 1,200 mt research set aside; instruct the 2009 STAR panels to do a thorough review of the models and to work toward the goal of incorporating the PNW pilot aerial survey in future stock assessments. The motion includes the friendly amendment to include the allocation scheme for the harvest guideline and the incidental set asides as contained on page two of Agenda Item G.2.c, CPSMT Report, with an incidental landing allowance of no more than 20 percent Pacific sardine by weight, as well as the bulleted list of inseason actions on page 3 of Agenda Item G.2.c, CPSAS Report (as corrected under the report of the CPSAS earlier in this Agenda Item).

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Dale Myer

Motion 10 passed unanimously.

Motion 11: Adopt the recommendations in Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental SSC Report (including the tentative STAR Panel schedule for 2009), and direct the SSC and its CPS Subcommittee to consider the recommendations of the CPSMT and the relevant comments under Agenda Item G.2, and to revise and publish a public review draft well in advance of the March 2009 Council meeting.

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Marija Vojkovich

Motion 11 passed unanimously.

Motion 12: Approve the April 2008 minutes as shown in Agenda Item H.1.b, April 2008 Council minutes.

Moved by: Rod Moore
Motion 12 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Frank Warrens

Motion 13: Approve the report of the Budget Committee as shown in Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental BC Report.

Moved by: Jerry Mallet
Motion 13 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Mark Cedergreen

Motion 14: Appoint Ms. Melodie Palmer-Zwahlen to fill the California Department of Fish and Game position on the Salmon Technical Team (replacing Mr. Allen Grover).

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich
Motion 14 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Kathy Fosmark

Motion 15: Appoint Dr. Thomas Helser to fill the NMFS NWR position on the STT (replacing Mr. Dell Simmons).

Moved by: Frank Lockhart
Motion 15 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Rod Moore

Motion 16: Appoint Dr. Louis Botsford to fill the vacant at-large position on the SSC.

Moved by: Dave Ortmann
Motion 16 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Dan Wolford

Motion 17: Appoint Ms. Laura Pagano to fill the vacant non-voting conservation position on the Groundfish Allocation Committee.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart
Motion 17 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Kathy Fosmark

Motion 18: Adopt the amendment language for COP 2, Advisory Subpanels, as found in Agenda Item H.3.a, Supplemental Attachment 1, to specify that the Council Chair may make an interim appointment to advisory subpanels to avoid lack of representation of any advisory sector while the formal replacement procedure is proceeding.

Moved by: Mark Cedergreen
Motion 18 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Rod Moore

Motion 19: Adopt as the Council's preferred alternative with respect to the general provisions for whiting coops:

Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
General Provisions - Whiting Co-ops			
		The mothership and catcher-processor sectors will be managed under a co-op system rather than an IFQ system	<i>Same as June</i>
Bycatch Rollover	B-1.3.2	Option 1 - Unused bycatch may be rolled over from one sector to another if the sector's full allocation of whiting has been harvested or participants do not intend to harvest the remaining sector allocation	Same as June
Bycatch Management	B-1.3	Subdivide bycatch among whiting sectors and within sectors, subdivide between co-op and non-co-op fishery and among co-ops within sectors	Same as June
At-Sea Observers/ Monitoring	B-1.4	Include as specified	Same as June
Mandatory Data Collection	B-1.5	Include as specified	Same as June

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Mark Cedergreen

Motion 19 passed. Mr. Dale Myer recused.

Motion 20: Adopt as the Council's preferred alternative for the mothership sector:

Motion 20 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Mothership (MS) Sector			
Groundfish LE Permit Length Endorsement	B-1	Retain the length endorsement for permits, with two modifications: 1) If a permit is transferred to a smaller vessel, then the permit would retain the larger length endorsement (e.g., if a permit endorsed for a 75 ft vessel is transferred on to a 50 ft vessel, the permit would retain the endorsement for a 75 ft vessel); and 2) to add length to a permit, additional permits required (as needed), but only one endorsement would be required for all combined permits (i.e., do not need to acquire multiple endorsed permits).	In June, had recommended removal of the length endorsement
Processor Participation	B-2.1a & c & B-2.2c	As specified for CVs and processors. Vessels excluded: Motherships operating as a catcher-processor may not operate as a mothership during a year in which it also participates as a catcher-processor	Same as June
Catcher Vessel Allocations	B-2.2a	Qualifying for a CV whiting endorsement in the MS fishery: minimum 500 mt in 1994-2003	Same as June
		Catch history assignment: 1994-2003, drop 2 years	Same as June
		<u>Bycatch history assignment: Pro-rata in proportion to whiting catch assignment</u>	Not addressed in June
Whiting Endorsement Transferability	B-2.2b	Transfer Option 1 - The CV whiting endorsement may <u>not</u> be severed from the permit	In June, Option 2 - change underlined
		<u>CV permits may be transferred two times during the fishing year, provided that the second transfer is back to the original CV (i.e., only one transfer per year to a different CV).</u>	In June, allowed two transfers per year

Motion 20 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
MS Processor Permit Qualification	B-2.2a	Qualifying Entities: The owner or bareboat charterer of qualifying motherships will be issued MS permits	Same as June
		Qualification Requirements: Minimum requirement of 1000 mt of whiting in any two years, 1997-03	Same as June
MS Processor Permit Transferability	B-2.2c	Transferability: MS permits will be transferable and MS permits may be transferred to a vessel of any size	Same as June
		Option 1 - MS permits may not be transferred to a vessel engaged in harvest of whiting in the year of the transfer	Same as June
		Modified Option - MS permits may be transferred two times during the fishing year, <u>provided that the second transfer is back to the original mothership (I.e., only one transfer per year to a different mothership).</u>	In June, had allowed two transfers per year
		Usage Limit: No individual or entity owning an MS permit may process more than <u>45%</u> of the total MS sector whiting allocation	In June, had limited usage to 40%
Co-op Formation	B-2.3.1	Co-ops are not required, but may be voluntarily formed. A minimum of 20% CV permit holders is required to form a co-op. This minimum threshold balances the potential advantages for multiple co-ops while limiting implementation and management costs and administrative requirements for managing this sector.	In June, had required minimum of one co-op
		Subdivide whiting between co-op and non-co-op fishery and among co-ops within sectors.	Same as June
		In the event there is more than one co-op, whiting and bycatch QP will be transferable between co-ops through an inter-co-op agreement.	Same as June
		The non-co-op fishery will close based on projected attainment of their allocation of either whiting or one or more bycatch species	Same as June
Co-op Agreement Provisions	B-2.3.3e	Include as specified. The intent is to have MS participants work with NMFS to develop and describe a process and co-op agreement requirements to include in the implementing regulations for this action.	Same as June
Initial Ties to the Motherships	B-2.4.1	<u>No processor tie. By September 1 of the year prior to implementation and every year thereafter, CV permit is required to contact NMFS and indicate whether CV permit will be participating in the co-op or non-co-op fishery in the following year. If participating in the co-op fishery, then CV permit must also provide the name of the MS permit that CV permit QP will be linked to in the following year (i.e., annual CV-MS linkage that may be changed each year without requirement to go into "open access" fishery). Once established, the CV-MS linkage shall remain in place until changed by CV permit.</u>	In June, required 90% processor tie and allowed "stacking" of 10%
		<u>By July 1 of the year prior to implementation and every year thereafter, if CV permit would be participating in the co-op fishery in the following year, then CV permit must notify the MS permit that the CV permit QP will be linked to in the following year.</u>	
		In the event there is agreement between the CV permit holder and the MS permit holder to which it is linked, the QP may be transferred to another MS permit.	Same as June

Motion 20 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
MS Processor Withdrawal	B-2.4.2	<u>If the MS permit withdraws subsequent to QP assignment, then the CV permits that it is linked with is free to participate in the co-op or non-co-op fishery. The MS permit shall notify NMFS and linked CV permits of its withdrawal, and CV permits shall notify NMFS of their intent to participate in the co-op or non-co-op fishery thereafter. If continuing in co-op fishery, then CV permit shall provide NMFS with the name of the MS permit for new linkage.</u>	

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Mark Cedergreen

Motion 20 passed. Mr. Dale Myer recused.

Motion 21: Adopt as the Council's preferred alternative for the catcher-processor sector:

Motion 21 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
<i>Catcher Processor Sector</i>			
General Provisions	B-4	Adopt a co-op for the catcher-processor sector; include provisions as specified	Same as June
		Specify harvest amounts in regulation for co-op	
		Do not require unanimous consent for a member to leave the co-op	Same as June
		If the voluntary co-op fails, then QS will be divided equally among ten CP permits in sector	Same as June
		Catcher processor cannot operate as a mothership during the same year it participates in the CP fishery	Same as June
		Mandatory data collection included	Same as June
		Annual co-op report required	Same as June
		Bycatch: The CP sector fishery will close based on projected attainment of its bycatch allocation	Same as June
CP Endorsement		Create a catcher-processor endorsement to be placed on qualified limited entry permits. Qualified permits are those that harvested and processed in the catcher-processor sector of the whiting fishery sometime from 1997-2003. Limited entry permits with catcher-processor endorsements will continue to be transferable; however, the endorsement is not severable from the permit.	Same as June
Permit Transfer		<u>CP permits may be transferred two times during the fishing year, provided that the second transfer was back to the original CP (i.e., only one transfer per year to a different CP).</u>	In June, had allowed one transfer per year (status quo).

Motion 21 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Length Endorsement		<u>Retain the length endorsement for permits, with two modifications: 1) If a permit is transferred to a smaller vessel, then the permit would retain the larger length endorsement; and 2) to add length to a permit, additional permits required (as needed), but only one endorsement would be required for all combined permits (i.e., do not need to acquire multiple endorsed permits).</u>	In June, had retained length endorsement

Moved by: Phil Anderson
 Motion 21 passed unanimously.

Seconded by: Dale Myer

Motion 22: Manage the shoreside non-whiting fishery under status quo (No IFQ program).

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich
 Motion 22 failed. 11 no, 2 yes. Ms. Vojkovich and Ms. Fosmark voted yes.

Seconded by: Kathy Fosmark

Motion 23: Adopt as the Council's preferred alternative for the shoreside sector:

Motion 23 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
<i>IFQ Program</i>			
General Provisions	A-1	Applies to shoreside whiting and non-whiting fisheries	Same as June
Scope: Gears and Fisheries Covered	A-1.1	Modified Option 2 - If a vessel has an LE trawl permit and groundfish is caught by any gear, IFQ must be used, with the following exceptions: exempted trawl, California halibut trawl , coastal pelagic species gear, highly migratory species gear, salmon troll, crab pot, and LE fixed gear (when it is declared they are fishing against their endorsement).	Not addressed in June
Gear Switching and Conversion	A-1.1 & 1.7	Gear switching allowed. Do not include provisions for permanent gear conversion.	Change underlined
IFQ Management Units: Species	A-1.2	<u>For non-whiting sector, IFQ is required for all species, except: longspine S. of 34.27'; minor nearshore rockfish (N & S); black rockfish (WOC); CA scorpionfish; cabezon; kelp greenling; shortbelly rockfish; other rockfish; spiny dogfish. The catches of these species would be accounted for and tracked against the overall OY. If a trawl allocation for any of these species is adopted in the future, then QS/QP for those species could be added at that time. For whiting fisheries, IFQ required for whiting and species with bycatch caps. Bycatch caps would be established for the following species; sablefish, widow, canary, and darkblotched rockfish, and Pacific ocean perch. The catches of all groundfish species would be accounted for and tracked against the overall OY.</u>	Change underlined

Motion 23 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Area Management	A-1.2	<u>For species managed under coastwide OY with precautionary harvest policy (I.e., 40:10 or some other policy) applying to a specific area, subdivide the OY and apply the precautionary policy as recommended by the Council's SSC.</u>	Only applies to species currently managed in this manner, rather than all species
Number of Trawl Sectors	A-1.3	Three trawl sectors	Same as June
Limited Entry Permit Length Endorsement	A-1.6	<u>Retain the length endorsement for permits, with a modification: If a permit is transferred to a smaller vessel, then the permit would retain the larger length endorsement (e.g., if a permit endorsed for a 75 ft vessel is transferred on to a 50 ft vessel, the permit would retain the endorsement for a 75 ft vessel).</u>	In June, had recommended removal of the length endorsement
Initial Allocation – Whiting	A-2.1	<u>80% to harvesters;20% to processors (no adaptive management)</u>	In June: 80 harvesters/20 processors (with 10 adaptive)
Initial Allocation - Non-whiting	A-2.1	<u>90% harvesters; 10% to adaptive management</u>	In June: 80 harvesters/20 processors (with 10 adaptive)
Attributing and Accruing Processor History	A-2.1.1	Option 3 (whiting) - Attribute history to the receiver reported on the fish ticket, except history may be reassigned to an entity not on the landings receipt, if parties agree or through an agency appeals process	Two options adopted in June (1 and 3)

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Rod Moore

Amdmnt #1: Do not include “California halibut trawl” in the list under Section A-1.1.

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich

Seconded by: Kathy Fosmark

Amendment #1 to Motion 23 passed unanimously.

Amdmnt #2: Change the initial allocation for whiting and non-whiting to read “100% QS to harvesters and 10% QP to adaptive management” in the “Initial Allocation - Whiting” cell and in the “Initial Allocation – Non-whiting.”

Moved by: Dan Wolford

Seconded by: Marija Vojkovich

Amendment #2 to Motion 23 failed. 9 no, 3 yes, 1 abstention. Ms. Vojkovich, Ms. Fosmark, and Mr. Wolford voted yes. Mr. Lockhart abstained.

Amdmnt #3: Under Section A-1.1, add “limited entry fixed gear” to the list of exceptions; under IFQ management “species with bycatch caps” strike the phrase “~~species with bycatch caps. Bycatch caps would be established for~~” and add “sablefish” to that list.

Moved by: Mark Cedergreen

Seconded by: Phil Anderson

Amendment #3 to Motion 23 passed unanimously.

Amdmnt #4: Under the section “Gear Switching and Conversion” have it read “Include provisions for permanent gear conversion.”

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich

Seconded by: Dan Wolford

Amendment #4 Withdrawn, not voted on.

Main Motion 23 passed as amended. Mr. Lockhart abstained.

Motion 24: Adopt as the Council's preferred alternative for the shoreside sector:

Motion 24 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Recent Participation Requirements (Permits)	A-2.1.2	Recent participation not required	Same as June
Recent Participation Requirements (Processors - SS)	A-2.1.2	Option 2 (whiting) - 1 mt or more of deliveries from whiting trips in each of any two years from <u>1998-04</u>	Change underlined
Allocation Formula for Catcher Vessel Permits	A-2.1.3	Option 2 – An equal division of the buyback permits' pool of QS for all groundfish, except overfished species, among all qualifying permits plus allocation of the remaining QS based on each permit's history	Same as June, but not for allocation of OF species
		Non-whiting non-overfished species: Use permit catch history (1994-03, drop 3 worst years)	Same as June
		Non-whiting overfished species: Modified option 2 - use <u>finer scale</u> bycatch rates	Change underlined
		Shoreside Whiting: Use 1994-03, drop 2 worst years	Same as June
		Shoreside Whiting overfished species: Option 2 - pro-rata based on whiting allocation	Same as June
Allocation Formula for Processors	A-2.1.3	Shoreside Whiting: No bycatch allocation; whiting allocation based on 1998-2004 (drop 2 worst years) and use relative history	Same as June
Permit Holding Requirement	A-2.2.1	If a vessel has an overage: Element 4 - Allow exceptions for vessel to participate in the fisheries for which IFQ would not be required to cover groundfish catch: exempted trawl; CPS purse seine; HMS fisheries; salmon troll; and crab pot. Element 6 - Alternative compliance options would <u>not</u> apply.	In June, had included Elements 4 and 6; change underlined
Carryover	A-2.2.2	Will not apply to QP that are not transferred to a vessel's account	Same as June
Eligibility to Own or Hold	A-2.2.3a	Include as specified (p. A-212)	Same as June
Temporary Transfer Rules	A-2.2.3c	Suboption 2 - QS will not be transferred in the first two years of the program (QP will be transferable)	Same as June

Motion 24 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Accumulation Limits	A-2.2.3e	It is the intent of the Council to have accumulation limits. However, the details of the accumulation limits would be further developed and analyzed through a trailing action. Items to be addressed through the trailing action would include: 1) identification of the species that would be subject to accumulation limits; 2) description of how to treat overfished species; 3) determination of whether to apply accumulation limits at the vessel (usage) or entity (ownership/control) level or both; 4) how accumulation limits would be tracked, and 5) how accumulation limits would apply to and affect community based or regional fishing associations. The intent would be to have the trailing action process completed in time for the accumulation limits to begin upon implementation of the trawl rationalization program.	Needs specificity
Grandfather Clause	A-2.2.3	No grandfather clause	Same as June

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Mark Cedergreen

Amdmnt #1: Allocation formula for processors is amended to include:

“Allocate whiting quota share based on the entity’s history for the allocation period of 1998 – 2004 (drop two worst years) and use relative history.”

This amends section A-2.1.3(d) of the IQ alternatives regarding whiting.

Moved by: Rod Moore

Seconded by: Phil Anderson

Amendment #1 to Motion 24 passed: 11 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention. Ms. Vojkovich voted no and Mr. Lockhart abstained.

Amdmnt #2: Add language to the “Accumulation limits” Section on how accumulation limits would apply to and affect community-based and regional fishery associations.

Moved by: Dan Wolford

Seconded by: Marija Vojkovich

Amendment #2 to Motion 24 passed unanimously.

Main Motion 24 passed as amended. Mr. Lockhart abstained.

Motion 25: Adopt as the Council’s preferred alternative for the shoreside sector:

Motion 25 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Tracking and Monitoring	A-2.3.1	Program: Alt 1 - discards allowed; discards of IBQ required	Same as June
		At-sea Catch Monitoring - Non-whiting: Alt 2 - At-sea observers required	Same as June
		Shoreside Whiting: Observers would be required in addition to or as a replacement for video monitoring	Same as June

Motion 25 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
		At-sea Whiting: Observers would be required in addition to or as a replacement for video monitoring	Same as June
		MS and CP: Remove reference to "supplemental video monitoring on processors may also be used"	Same as June
		Shoreside Catch Monitoring - Include as specified	Same as June
		Catch Tracking Mechanisms - Include as specified	Same as June
		<u>Landing Hour Restrictions: Landing hours may be restricted</u>	In June, had Alt 2 - landing hours limited
		Vessel Certification - Include as specified	Same as June
		Program Performance Measures - Include as specified	Same as June
Data Collection	A-2.3.2	Include as specified	Same as June
Program Costs	A-2.3.3	Cost Recovery: Option 1 - Fees up to 3%	Same as June
Program Duration and Modification	A-2.3.4	Include as specified: 4-year review process	Same as June
Pacific Halibut IBQ	A-4	Establish limit for legal-sized Pacific halibut bycatch mortality through the use of an IBQ in the trawl fishery up to 10% of the Area 2A Constant Exploitation Yield (CEY) as set by the International Pacific Halibut Commission. This amount will be set initially at 10% and may be adjusted through the biennial specifications process.	Needed specificity
Other Provisions		Require that all QP be deposited into a vessel account each year	
		Require that all retained IFQ non-whiting groundfish in the non-whiting groundfish fishery be landed shoreside (i.e., no at-sea landings allowed for non-whiting groundfish). Ensuring that non-whiting groundfish continues to be delivered shoreside helps protect shoreside processors and communities that have historically relied on groundfish deliveries.	
		Initiate a trailing action process to require eligibility criteria to own or hold QS (e.g., ownership interest in a vessel or permit) to help ensure that QS holders have direct ties or investments in the fishery. Requirements should not be so onerous so as to preclude or discourage crew members, for example, from acquiring QS and entering the fishery.	

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Mark Cedergreen

Amdmnt #1: Adopt for the non-whiting T-RAT alternative for consideration as a trailing action, a permit-owner-on-board requirement and grandfathering provision similar to that specified in Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP language.

Moved by: Kathy Fosmark

Seconded by: Marija Vojkovich

Amendment #1 withdrawn, not voted on.

Amdmnt #2: Regarding landing hour restrictions – revert to the June action (which was Alternative 2, Landing Hours Limited).

Moved by: Marija Vojkovich

Seconded by: Frank Lockhart

Amdmnt #3: Amend Amendment #2 to read “Landing Hour Restrictions: Landing hours **may be restricted**”

Moved by: Phil Anderson

Seconded by: Dave Hanson

Amendment #3 to Amendment #2 passed unanimously.

Amdmnt #4: Adopt the following:

The Council shall begin a review of the TIQ program no later than five years after implementation of the program. The review will evaluate the progress the TIQ program has made in achieving the goal and objectives of Amendment 20. The result of this evaluation could include dissolution of the program, revocation of all or part of quota shares, or other fundamental changes to the program. Holders of quota shares should remain cognizant of this fact when making decisions regarding their quota shares, including buying, selling, and leasing of these shares.

The Council shall consider the use of an auction or other non-history based methods when distributing quota share that may become available after initial allocation, such as quota that results after a stock transitions from overfished to non-overfished, when quota share from an AMP is no longer needed, when “use it or lose it” quota shares are forfeited, and if any quota is available after the initial or subsequent reviews of the program are completed.

The specific form of the auction or other method of distribution shall be designed to achieve the goals of Amendment 20, specifically including minimizing the adverse effects from an IFQ program on fishing communities to the extent practical.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart

Seconded by: Marija Vojkovich

Amendment #4 to Motion 25 passed. Mr. Jerry Mallet, Mr. Dave Ortmann, Mr. Frank Warrens and Ms. Kathy Fosmark voted no.

Motion 25 passed as amended. Mr. Myer recused himself.

Motion 26: Adopt as the Council preferred alternative for the shoreside sector:

Motion 26 Topic	Section	Council Preferred Alternative	Change from June?
Adaptive Management	A-3	It is the intent of the Council to have an adaptive management program for the shoreside non-whiting sector. Up to 10% of the non-whiting QS will be reserved for this program. QS will be divided among the 3 states. QS/QP will be provided through separate, but parallel, processes in each of the three states (e.g., through the use of regional fishery associations or community stability plans or other means). Further details will be developed through a trailing action with the intent of having the adaptive management provisions apply during the first year of implementation of the trawl rationalization program.	Needs specificity

