PART 2 – MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2011-2012 FISHERIES

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) considered the management recommendations put forth by the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) as well as those also included in other Agenda Item G.9 attachments (G.9.a Attachment 1; G.9.b CDFG Report; G.9.b VMSC Report; and G.9.c Public Comment) and agree that most of the issues should be analyzed.

The following list proposes some new issues to be analyzed and prioritizes others that are likely to have a more immediate and greater impact in 2011-2012, given the implementation of the Trawl Individual Quota (TIQ) program and the uncertainty regarding some of the potential and/or unknown impacts to the industry. The GAP is sensitive to the workloads of the GMT, Council staff, and the staffs of state agencies so have listed the following issues from Agenda Item G.9.a, Attachment 1, to be the highest priority. They are in no particular order:

- **Nearshore lingcod trip limits in the wintertime:** Fixed-gear fishermen are encountering larger amounts of lingcod in the winter and would like to see access to that analyzed.

- **Expand to 100 fathoms the current line around Catalina Island for fixed-gear and sport fishermen:** Currently, a 60-fathom line exists and fishermen are allowed to fish inside of this line. A prime deep rock habitat would be closed under the current California Marine Life Protection Act proposals. Extending the line would allow fishermen to retain some fishing opportunity.

- **Retention of shelf rockfish in the Cowcod Conservation Area (ref. Agenda Items G.9.b CDFG Report and G.9.c Public Comment):** Again, this would allow some fishing opportunity for recreational fishermen in light of proposed Marine Life Protection Act changes.

- **Redefine ownership and control for the limited entry sablefish tiered program:** The GAP requests an analysis of the program so it reflects the same requirements now envisioned for the groundfish TIQ program. The principal change would be to specify that the actual percent of ownership would apply. For example, if four people own equal shares of a permit, then they would each have 25 percent ownership/control applied. A secondary issue would be to drop the cross-reference of ownership and control of an owned vessel. The focus would be on who owns and controls the permit without concern for who owns the vessel.

- **Analyze retention of a sublimit or boat limit of canary rockfish in Oregon and Washington recreational fisheries:** This would allow a percentage of those fish to be used for data collection. There should be no change in the scorecard. The limits should be set low enough – one fish per angler, two or three fish per boat – so as to eliminate any chance for targeted fishing on prohibited stocks. California's similar proposal should be analyzed as well.
• **Halibut Individual Bycatch Quotas (IBQ):** The trawl interests on the GAP consider this to be every bit as constraining to the fleet as the canary issue.

• **Hot spot/cold spot analyses for canary and yelloweye rockfish for potential groundfish fishing areas (GFAs) or closures (e.g., RCAs) for both commercial and recreational fisheries:** This issue is referenced in both G.9.a Attachment 1 and G.9.b. CDFG Report. The GAP notes this is an important issue to consider for all fisheries because there is a tremendous amount of closed ground that may not need to be closed and defining these discrete areas would be helpful.
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