

## GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS (EFPS) FOR 2009

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel(GAP) reviewed the six EFP applications under consideration and is recommending that five of the six applications continue through the EFP process. Although the GAP is forwarding these EFPs through the process the GAP is not necessarily recommending final approval of any of the EFPs.

The GAP has the following comments for the specific EFPs:

### **EFP #1 Fosmark**

The GAP supports moving this EFP forward with an amendment that requires human observers, not cameras.

### **EFP #2 The Nature Conservancy**

The GAP supports moving this EFP forward in the process but has serious concerns about the potential for the EFP to affect existing sablefish fishermen in the area. The GAP notes that under this weeks inseason agenda item action will likely be taken to reduce the open access sablefish fishery trip limits in order to accommodate this EFP in 2008. The GAP recommends reporting to the National Marine Fisheries Service on a weekly basis versus every two weeks. GAP members also expressed concern about the potential for a “derby fishery mentality” if EFP participants felt they were competing with traditional participants in a race for the available sablefish in the area. A race for the fish could result in a variety of negative unintended consequences. Lastly the GAP would like to receive and review a report on the activities from the 2008 EFP prior to making a final decision on the 2009 EFP moving forward.

### **EFP #3 CA Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (chilipepper)**

The GAP supports moving this EFP forward however has concerns about fishing taking place within the RCA and no depth restriction requirements. The GAP would also like to see a more thorough description of the gear to be utilized.

### **EFP #4 OR RFA (yellowtail)**

The GAP supports moving this EFP forward however has concerns about fishing taking place within the RCA and a more clear description of the depth restrictions.

### **EFP #5 Mikell (yellowtail)**

The GAP does not support this EFP moving forward because the information provided in the application does not meet the requirements of a proper EFP. The GAP believes that EFPs for yellowtail do have merit and the GAP would encourage the applicant to review the COPs for EFPs and consider resubmitting an amended application next year.

### **EFP #6 CA RFA (flatfish)**

The GAP supports this EFP moving forward but has some concerns about the methodology for choosing areas to fish where rockfish bycatch will not be an issue.

In general the GAP reminds the Council that for the last few years we have ultimately recommended that no EFPs be given final approval due to the potential impacts on species of concern. The GAP continues to recognize that overfished species impacts from the EFPs could impact current fisheries and believes that appropriate caps on all overfished species should be required for any EFPs that move forward.

PFMC  
06/08/08