

## GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CATCH SHARING PLAN AND ANNUAL REGULATIONS

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) heard from representatives of Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Each detailed their state position on this issue. After lengthy debate, consensus could not be reached with respect to the Columbia River subarea. Consensus was achieved with respect to approval of the individual state proposals for all areas outside of the aforementioned subarea.

A majority of the GAP favored a status quo for the Columbia River subarea. This would be to retain the 2005 plan for 2006: equal poundage contributions of quota from Oregon and Washington, 7 day/week fishery, and no retention of groundfish except sablefish when halibut is on board the vessel. The majority felt that maintaining equal state shares was preferred. They felt that a contribution from Oregon for Oregon port landing only was potentially unfair to Washington port fishermen. It was felt that any contribution should be shared by all. They cited the example of Washington unilaterally contributing salmon for take in both states in this same subarea as an example of their position. It was felt that retention of groundfish except rockfish was preferred, but due to concerns about the shale pile area on the Oregon side, (where canary and yelloweye are encountered) and a greater desire to maintain status quo, no groundfish retention, except sablefish was preferred. Keeping this subarea as a single managed entity was of paramount importance.

A minority of the GAP supported the Oregon proposal for the Columbia River subarea. They favored the two-season approach with a contribution from the Oregon central coast for the second season. This contribution from the Central Coast would be for landing in Oregon ports only. It was felt that the more conservative Central Coast season structure was the primary reason there was any quota to transfer at all. The minority did not believe that the conservation of quota for a full season of fishing should result in loss of the savings to another state where a derby style fishery is conducted.

The GAP members felt that remedies potentially exist to resolve future disputes involving this Columbia River subarea. It was suggested that for future plan proposals the following examples could be acceptable to both states representatives if an increased quota were offered from Oregon.

1. A more conservative season structure similar to or the same as Oregon Central Coast.
2. No groundfish retention, except sablefish, the same as or similar to the Oregon proposal.

The GAP felt that a general compromise was needed leaning toward the concerns of the area users who are contributing the additional quota. The GAP also felt that Oregon and Washington should resolve their differences before this issue is brought to the Council.