

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON  
5-YEAR CATCH SHARE REVIEW AND INTERSECTOR ALLOCATION REVIEW PLANS  
AND FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) received overviews and briefings from the 5-year review project coordinating team: Mr. Jim Seger, (Council Staff), Ms. Abigail Harley (NMFS West Coast Region), and Dr. Lisa Pfeiffer (Northwest Fisheries Science Center).

The GAP supports the Community Advisory Board (CAB's) request for an additional face-to-face meeting after the draft analysis is complete, but before the June Council meeting. This would allow the CAB to offer comments and refine its recommendations on topics for follow-on actions using information from the draft review before the Council takes action.

The GAP further requests that every effort be made to complete the draft analysis as early as possible to provide the greatest opportunity for the CAB, GAP and other stakeholders to provide informed feedback.

As an overarching comment, the GAP wants to ensure that the review provide a basis for real program improvements and not just be a review to meet statutory mandates.

As a further overarching comment, the GAP notes that many potential program improvements are already in the pipeline. Completing those actions would go a long way toward meeting program objectives, especially related to economic performance. It is imperative that those actions continue to progress during the review.

Finally, the GAP recommends that Council staff provide the CAB and other stakeholders with a regular budget update. The GAP is concerned that the breadth of the analysis could cause some items to be delayed or drop off of the analysis. A budget update would allow stakeholders to recommend contracting components of the analysis if necessary.

### **1) Intersector allocation**

The GAP notes that due to the composition of the CAB, it is not the appropriate body to delve into trawl/non-trawl allocation decisions. The GAP also notes that as a general matter, it does not make sense to review trawl/non-trawl splits concurrent with the 5-year review. Many of those allocations were controversial and hard fought, and reviewing them would be likely to distract from important discussions around other program review elements. If the Council does decide to review trawl/non-trawl allocations, the GAP firmly believes those should be handled by the Groundfish Allocation Committee (GAC).

Regarding within trawl allocations, the GAP believes the make-up of the CAB would enable that body to provide meaningful and informed input. The GAP understands that some CAB members believe within trawl allocations need to be revisited. However, the GAP highlights its unanimous support to not revisit the three sector non-tribal whiting allocations or any of the established sablefish allocations.

## **2) Appendix E**

The GAP offers no comment on finalizing the update of Appendix E.

## **3) Catch Shares Review Blueprint**

The GAP supports the CAB additions to the blueprint. In addition, the GAP recommends the following additions and clarifications.

Generally speaking, the blueprint is comprehensive and will provide information to inform program improvements and fixes. The GAP is concerned that it may in fact provide too much information without clear prioritization of what is most important to achieving unmet program objectives. With that in mind, the GAP recommends prioritizing four areas for analysis from the Draft Guidance For Conducting Reviews of Catch Share Programs (Informational Report 1, November 2015, pg. 9 Section VI). Specifically, the GAP recommends an analysis of: A – program objectives yet to be achieved, B – accumulation limits/caps, F – allocation (for example consideration of within trawl allocations of constraining rockfish species), and G – cost recovery.

The GAP notes that the analysis emerging from the blueprint will offer a before/after snapshot, but will not be able to assign causality. The CAB, GAP, and other stakeholders are best poised to provide context and recommend priority items for follow-on action emerging from the analysis.

### **Specific blueprint additions:**

Revise the efficiency section of the blueprint (Annotated Outline, Agenda Item F.6.a, Blueprint, November 2016, pg. 12) to include consideration of how vessel caps, individual species caps, and aggregate caps relate to efficiency.

Include an analysis of the amount of and value of sablefish stranded South of 36° during the program.

PFMC

11/20/16