

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON
BIENNIAL MANAGEMENT SPECIFICATIONS FOR 2015-16 GROUND FISH FISHERIES

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) met with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) to go over management measures for 2015-16 and offers the following recommendations.

Remaining groundfish harvest specifications

The GAP has nothing to add regarding biennial specifications under this agenda item.

For the next items, we referred to [Agenda Item H.10.b, GMT Report](#). The GAP addressed each item in order and offers the following comments. In general, we agree with the GMT's inclusion of a range of analyses.

Set-aside deductions from the annual catch limits (ACLs) and trawl allocations

At the time this report was drafted, the GMT had not reported any new information to the GAP.

Preliminary two-year allocations

The GAP has no requests at this time.

Range of management measures for more detailed analysis

Referencing [Agenda Item H.10.b, GMT Report](#), the GAP considered the range of management measures proposed by the GMT. In general, we agree with the inclusion of most of the proposed analyses. We list below those items that have additional GAP comments, we list those below.

The GAP realizes that some of the analyses will depend on what action the Council takes on as a result of its action on stock complexes. All management measures related to the slope rockfish complex will be completed in the stock complex analysis as requested by the Council.

A.1 Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) Coordinates – update RCA coordinates to better approximate depth

We understand the Council has changed its review of the management measures process and this is scheduled for review in June 2014. We plan to bring back a comprehensive proposal to modify trawl RCAs at that time.

A.3 Area closure – spiny dogfish Groundfish Conservation Area

The GAP understands the reason for the analysis, but spiny dogfish is a highly mobile species; there are no areas in which they reside for any period of time. It would be technically infeasible to include any closure areas for spiny dogfish. Furthermore, closure areas likely would have little effect.

C.3 Rougheye rockfish excluder for trawl vessels fishing seaward of the RCA

While the GAP recalls the Council requested inclusion of this analysis, the GAP neither supports including it in the analysis nor thinks regulations could be developed to implement the measure.

Research is under way to develop various excluder devices for groundfish trawl fisheries. However, this research is far from complete. Therefore, the GAP recommends against further analysis of this alternative because it is both legally and technically infeasible.

B.2 Trip limit – review commercially important, highly attained species and other requested species: Nos. 4 and 5; shelf rock and bocaccio south of 34° 27' N. latitude:

The limited entry and open access fixed-gear fleets request higher trip limits of bocaccio and shelf rockfish, since these fleets are nowhere near attaining their allocations. For example, a 1,000 lbs. bimonthly trip limit of bocaccio for limited entry and 400 lbs. bimonthly limit for open access may be a place to start. The GAP also suggests this be tied into the two-year allocation analysis.

G.1 (California) Time/area closures, bag limits, depth restrictions and season closures:

The GAP supports the request by the Southern California Charter Fleet to analyze a change in RCA lines to allow access to 50 fm to 60 fm depths for recreational anglers south of 34° 27' N latitude. We hope the Council considers increasing the bocaccio bag limit as incidental bycatch in this fishery as the stock rebounds. Considering a year-round fishery should also be analyzed as this species rebuilds.

H.1 (Washington, Oregon & California) Canary rockfish bag limit:

The GAP supports this analysis for retention of canary rockfish. There already is allowed retention of overfished species, i.e., bocaccio, and this retention could apply coastwide, for two states or for a single state.

We request the GMT analysis also include mortality rates based on the use of descending devices.

PFMC
11/06/13