PART 2 – MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2011-2012 FISHERIES

This meeting marks the initiation of the Council harvest specifications and management measures decision-making process for 2011-2012 fisheries. Under Agenda Item G.2, a range of annual catch limits for each stock and stock complex were adopted under Agenda Item G.6, allowing for analysis of 2011-2012 harvest specifications. Under this agenda item, the Council should adopt or give guidance on concepts and a range of management measures designed to stay within the harvest specifications adopted under Agenda Item G.6. The Council should attempt to give specific guidance on concepts and management measures to facilitate informative impact analysis and preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) over the winter. The NEPA analyses will help the Council develop a preferred suite of 2011-2012 management measures by April 2010. After a public review period, the Council will take final action at the June, 2010 Council meeting.

The NWFSC has developed a new regional west coast input-output (I/O) model to analyze personal income impacts stemming from fishery-related activities. The NWFSC has asked the Scientific and Statistical Subcommittee (SSC) to review this new model and comment on its utility in analyzing the economic impacts of the 2011-2012 groundfish harvest specifications and management measures. This I/O model is intended to supplant IMPLAN/FEAM, which has been used by the Council and others in the past to model impacts of fishery-related economic activity. (IMPLAN, for IMpact Analysis for PLANning model, is a general computer application for regional modeling that outputs measures of induced employment and personal income within a region. FEAM, for Fishery Economic Assessment Model, is an extension of IMPLAN containing specification of income multipliers for west coast and Alaska fisheries developed by William Jensen and Hans D. Radtke.) The multipliers contained in FEAM would need to be updated to ensure the accuracy of its predictions. At this time it is unclear whether this can be done in time for use in the groundfish harvest specifications analysis. On the other hand, the NWFSC I/O model is relatively untested and only applies to the groundfish trawl sector. For these reasons it may be advisable to use both models for the harvest specifications analysis and compare the results. The SSC has been asked to comment on this approach.

Helpful guidance from the Council under this agenda item would be a range of recreational and commercial allocations for key species such as yelloweye and canary rockfish; a range of season and area restrictions for the primary fishing sectors; a range of trip limits, daily-bag-limits, and other harvest control measures for key target and constraining bycatch species; a range of geographic or sector-specific harvest guidelines; and a sense of how far fisheries should be restricted in 2011-2012 to rebuild depleted species as quickly as possible given the social and economic consequences of doing so. To facilitate guidance on concepts to be included in the analysis of 2011-2012 management measures, a preliminary list of potential management issues solicited from agencies, industry, and the general public is provided in Agenda Item G.9.a, Attachment 1. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) also provided a list of 2011-2012 management measures they are recommending for analysis in Agenda Item G.9.b, CDFG Report. Further, the Council’s Vessel Monitoring System Committee requested analyses on proposed modifications to the vessel monitoring system regulations (Agenda Item G.9.b, Vessel Monitoring System Committee Report).
The Council should carefully consider the intended scope of action and workload on the GMT, Council constituent agencies, and Council staff when deciding which issues are the highest priority for analysis. Some matters on the list of potential issues may be particularly labor-intensive and others may not be as closely linked to the decisions typically considered in the biennial harvest specifications and management measures process.

**Council Action:**

1. Provide guidance on economic impact model use, as appropriate.
2. Adopt, or give guidance on, a preliminary range of 2011-2012 management measures, including initial allocations.

**Reference Materials:**

4. Agenda Item G.9.c, Public Comment.

**Agenda Order:**

a. Agenda Item Overview  
   Kelly Ames, Kit Dahl  
b. Reports and Comments of Management Entities and Advisory Bodies  
c. Public Comment  
d. **Council Action:** Adopt Concepts and Guidance for a Preliminary Range of Management Measures, Including Initial Allocations
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