

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON THE GROUND FISH WORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION LIST

At our January work session (January 14-19, 2019), members of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) who were able to attend¹ discussed the items on the groundfish workload prioritization list. Based on that discussion, this report provides some background information; the GMT's first cut at what factors would be relevant to the analysis, potential benefits, and an estimate of the anticipated workload for the GMT for analyzing those management measures. This is similar to what we have done for new management measures during the biennial process. The anticipated workload is expressed qualitatively from low to high, rather than a direct estimate of the time needed to complete the analysis. We also provide information on the potential need for an Endangered Species Act (ESA) re-consultation and for what species is also provided based on precursory feedback from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

The information provided does not constitute a GMT recommendation as the entire team was not able to participate; rather it is provided to better inform the Council when deciding which item(s) to prioritize. Appendix 1 provides a tabular summary of initial input from the NMFS on regulatory complexity, ESA re-consultation, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), etc. as well as the GMT information outlined below.

At the March Council meeting, the GMT can provide additional details and recommendations on prioritization.

1. Clarify Catch Accounting Rules for Amendment 21

Background

Implementation of Amendment 21 resulted in unintended inconsistencies in the Federal regulations and the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) on how sablefish north of 36° N. Latitude is accounted for in the incidental open access (OA) fisheries. Some corrections have been made since 2011, but further work is needed. There may be additional corrections regarding non-sablefish species; however, more research as well as conversations with NMFS staff are needed.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

While there is likely little analysis needed from the GMT, there will need to be careful attention on how the inconsistencies are resolved.

Potential Benefits

Low (industry)/ High (regulatory)

This item would provide a high regulatory benefit because the FMP and regulations would become consistent within themselves and with one another. There would be low benefit to harvesters.

¹ Due to the federal government shutdown, National Marine Fisheries Service staff were unable to attend.

Workload

Low

2. Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl Requirement Between 40° 10' N Latitude and 42° N. Latitude

Background

The Council initially recommended the removal of the selective flatfish trawl (SFFT) requirement north of 40° 10' N. Latitude as a part of the trawl gear package in 2016. However, NMFS determined that the changes in Northern California (i.e., between 40° 10' and 42° N. Latitude) would be out of compliance with the 2017 Salmon Incidental Take Statement (ITS)². Prior to allowing any additional non-whiting mid-water and/or bottom trawling anywhere off California (i.e. South of 42° N. Latitude), the ITS requires three years of an exempted fishing permit (EFP) to better evaluate bycatch rates and stock composition. The 2017 and 2018 trawl gear EFPs did not include the exemption from SFFT between 40° 10' and 42° N. Latitude; the 2019 EFP does have the exemption and will be the first of the three required years. The earliest the SFFT requirement could therefore be removed off Northern California would be 2022.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

Preliminary input from NMFS has been that the main focus of this analysis would be the impacts to habitat and ESA listed salmon. No changes to habitat impacts are expected because no increases in trawling are expected with removal of the rule and because the small footrope requirement would remain when fishing shoreward of the rockfish conservation area (RCA) which dissuades trawling near rocky reef. Impacts to salmon would be informed by the ongoing EFP, but only six vessels indicated they plan to fish the EFP south of 42° N. Latitude in 2019.

Potential Benefits

Low

The main benefit would be consistency with other gear areas that do not require SSFTs and would allow vessels to use any type of small footrope trawl gear (including SFFT). The trawl gear regulations package revised the definition of SFFT to allow for use of four-seam nets, as bycatch excluders work better in four-seam hooded nets than two-seam SFFTs. Given this recent allowance for four-seam SFFTs, there may be less benefit now compared to the original proposal as part of the trawl gear package.

Additionally, the benefits may be low because few bottom trawl vessels fish in the area (i.e., 17 bottom trawl vessels in 2017 with 10,000 lbs. or more landed) and industry has stated that trawlers may continue to use SFFTs even if the requirement is removed. Based on Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) research and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) input, there are several advantages to using SFFTs including: (1) increased or constant catch rates of flatfish and marketable sablefish; (2) decreased bycatch rates of juvenile sablefish, Chinook salmon, Pacific halibut, and Pacific whiting (undesirable in bottom trawl); and (3) decreased net drag leading to fuel savings of up to 25 percent.

² <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2018-12-03/pdf/2018-26194.pdf>

Workload

Unknown

Preliminary discussions with NMFS suggest that ESA re-consultation for salmon will be needed. However, the members of the GMT present at our January work session believe that the 2017 Salmon Biological Opinion analyzed the gear rule including removal of the SFFT requirement in all areas. Therefore, the GMT looks to further guidance from NMFS on whether a re-consultation would be necessary if the EFP salmon impacts are similar to those previously analyzed.

3. Limited Entry Fixed Gear--Phase 2 (Permit Price Reporting)

Background

This item was initially recommended by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) during the Federal sablefish program review ([Agenda Item F.6.b, Supplemental SSC Report, June 2014](#)). In order to gain further insight into the limited entry fixed gear (LEFG) sablefish tier fishery, the SSC proposed the routine collection of permit sale prices, which would help to indicate the market value of the fishery. These data would also help evaluate the performance of the tier system during the Magnuson Steven Act required Limited Access Privilege Program (LAPP) review, contrast performance of this program with that of the trawl catch share program, and assess impacts of provisions of the trawl catch share program on those vessels that move between the fisheries.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The GMT does not believe any analysis would be required by the team.

Potential Benefits

Low

As the GMT currently does not have any information regarding permit price, these data could provide better economic analysis of permit value within the LEFG sablefish tier fishery.

Workload

None for GMT.

All survey administration and analysis would be under the purview of NMFS.

4. Create 60-Mile Bank Rockfish Conservation Area Lines

Background

The 60-Mile Bank is located about 45 nautical miles south of San Clemente Island along the U.S./Mexico border, and is not marked with RCA lines. Previously, the GAP requested the Council establish coordinates that define the 60-Mile Bank due to concerns over cowcod bycatch in the commercial groundfish fishery ([Agenda Item J.1.c, Supplemental GAP Report, September 2014](#)). This issue was prioritized by the Council for near term implementation and paired with the area modifications proposed under the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) process (see [Agenda Item I.6.a, Supplemental Joint Council/NMFS Staff Report, September 2014](#), item # 66). However, during scoping of the EFH/RCA Amendment in April 2015, the Council did not forward it for inclusion. It has remained on the workload prioritization list since that time.

During the review of the list in November 2018, the GAP requested that this item ([Agenda Item G.4.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1](#)) remain on the list, but as a low priority ([Agenda Item G.4.a, Supplemental GAP-GMT Report 1](#)). However, the GAP's most recent request for the need of a RCA around the 60-Mile Bank has changed from reducing cowcod bycatch in the commercial groundfish fishery to reducing regulatory discards of groundfish in non-groundfish charter operations.

At the November 2018 meeting, the Enforcement Consultants (EC) provided comment to the GMT that the geographic area is too small to be enforceable and as a result, the GMT recommended that this items be deleted from the list.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

An Environmental Assessment would be required to consider impacts to overfished species and habitat. Preliminary RCA coordinates were completed in November 2018. A review of charter logbooks data could provide additional information regarding the extent of groundfish species discard occurring in non-groundfish trips.

Potential Benefits

Low

Potential reduction in regulatory discards of groundfish species.

Workload

Medium

5. New Dressed to Round Conversion Factors for Sablefish

Background

Research by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) suggests that the current conversion factor of 1.6 for dressed and head-off sablefish may be too high, particularly in some times of the year. The 1.6 conversion factor has been applied to the oldest landings in PacFIN (1981) and was presumably used in earlier eras with the main intent of properly taxing sablefish landings.

While the WDFW conversion factors of 1.54 for rolled-cut and 1.57 for slight angle cut may be more justified (Figure 1), the 1.6 factor is in Federal rule for the LEFG, OA, and individual fishing quota (IFQ) fisheries (§660.60 (5)(C)(ii)) and would need to be changed. However, the Federal regulations specify that conversion factors are established by the states, are the basis of the Federal rates, and are subject to change:

“The weight limit conversion factor established by the state where the fish is or will be landed will be used to convert the processed weight to round weight for purposes of applying the trip limit or other allocation. Weight conversions provided herein are those conversions currently in use by the States of Washington, Oregon, and California and may be subject to change by those states. Fishery participants should contact fishery enforcement officials in the state where the fish will be landed to determine that state's official conversion factor”.

For California, changing the conversion factor would require changes to statute through the California legislature. For Oregon, it would be easier to make changes since they are not in statute and would not require legislative actions; changes could be adopted by the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission via a one meeting process since conversion factors are in Administrative Rule ([OAR 635-006-0215 \(3\)\(g\)C](#)). Changes to Washington state regulations would not be needed.

This issue was brought up at the 2018 PacFIN Data Committee meeting and state staff are reviewing the research.



Figure 1. Different dressed sablefish cuts, WDFW research indicates the current dressed to round conversion factor of 1.6 may be too high.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The main task would be to verify that the lower conversion factors indicated by WDFW research are more justified than the current conversion factor of 1.6. The GMT would also need to look at impacts to mortality via retrospective comparison and to ex-vessel revenue.

This research is likely to indicate that conversion factors are best informed by a multitude of variables such as cut type, gear, season, and fish length, etc. However, the GMT has previously stressed that conversion factors should be as universal as possible to minimize complexity for fishermen and catch accounting systems ([Agenda Item I.5.c, Supplemental GMT Report; September 2010](#)).

Potential Benefits

Low

The main benefit would be more accurate catch accounting of dressed landings. There would also be short-term benefits for fishermen as they could be debited less for their dressed weight landings (Table 1). For every 10,000 dressed lbs. that are landed, they would be debited 16,000 lbs. with the current conversion; 15,400 lbs. with the new rolled-cut conversion (+600 lbs. savings); and

15,700 with the new angle-cut conversion (+300 lbs. savings). This could result in an extra 27.6-55.0 mt of coastwide round sablefish landings, an increase of 0.5-1.0 percent.

Table 1. Current and potential dressed to round conversion factors, and an example of potential benefits to fishermen if they were to land 10,000 lbs. of dressed sablefish.

Cut-type	Dressed to round conversion	Dressed lbs. landed	Round lbs. that would be debited	Recovery rate
SQ: All dressed cuts	1.6	10,000	16,000	62.5%
New: Rolled-cut	1.54	10,000	15,400	64.9%
New: Angle-cut	1.57	10,000	15,700	63.7%

Workload

Low

Assuming that this change is only adopted for Oregon and Washington, replacing conversion factors from the current 1.6 to another constant number (e.g., 1.54) would require minimal workload for data processing systems, and may only require a categorical exclusion for NEPA according to NMFS staff.

The overall workload could increase if more research is deemed necessary to better inform the conversion factors (e.g., outside of the WDFW study area) and to make necessary changes to state and Federal regulations. Further, the workload could greatly increase for catch accounting systems if the conversion factors were changed from the flat 1.6 to a more complicated approach that would depend on factors such as season, fish length, gear, etc.

6. Non-Trawl Rockfish Conservation Area Modifications

Background

In November, the Council recommended changing this item from analyzing moving the seaward boundary of the non-trawl RCA for pot gear only to examining non-trawl RCA modifications as a whole. The non-trawl RCA was implemented to protect overfished rockfish species, particularly yelloweye and canary rockfishes. With canary rockfish rebuilt and yelloweye rockfish is expected to be rebuilt in the next decade, the non-trawl RCA is preventing fishermen from accessing key fishing grounds for now underutilized and healthy rockfish stocks such as lingcod and mid-water rockfishes (e.g., yellowtail, widow, and canary rockfishes).

Relevant Factors For Analysis

Similar to the trawl RCA analysis, the GMT would have to assess any habitat (likely minimal), economic, and biological impacts. Additionally, according to NMFS staff, changes to the non-trawl RCA would reinitiate consultation on the humpback whale Biological Opinion (BiOp) to evaluate entanglements risks with pot gear.

The main consideration would be additional impacts to yelloweye rockfish, which the GMT notes will be uncertain since there is minimal information on non-trawl commercial impacts within the non-trawl RCA except for EFPs. However, proxy information such as recreational data and fisheries independent surveys exist within the non-trawl RCA and could help assess potential fixed gear impacts. For example, analysis could use the relationship between depth and bycatch rates in the recreational fishery as a proxy for missing non-trawl RCA depths for fixed gear. Additionally, the GMT could also evaluate historical fish ticket data during the 1990's before non-trawl RCA was established and flag historical non-trawl trips potentially occurring within the non-trawl RCA based on the species landed. This is similar to the Stephens-MacCall method used for filtering in stock assessments that also predicts where a vessel fished based on their landings.

Potential Benefits

High

Lingcod and mid-water rockfishes are amongst the most prolific and underutilized groundfish stocks. The uncaught non-trawl quotas of these species north of 40°10 N. Latitude that are constrained by yelloweye rockfish and the non-trawl RCA are estimated to be worth \$35.6 million in income and 2,203 jobs. To put it in perspective, these uncaught quotas are estimated to be worth approximately five times the value of the entire coastwide nearshore fishery, approximately three times the value of the coastwide commercial Pacific halibut fishery, and to be on par with the coastwide FG sablefish fishery (non-IFQ; [see Tables 4 + 5 of Agenda Item F.2.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1, April 2018](#)). These fisheries would be expected to see the greatest increase in participation and benefit if given additional opportunity to access lingcod and mid-water rockfish.

While the values of uncaught non-trawl quotas constrained by the non-trawl RCA are high, it could take many years to achieve much additional benefit. The main issue is low non-trawl harvest guidelines (HGs) of constraining yelloweye rockfish are expected to prevent benefits from increasing above an additional 40 percent during the remainder of the rebuilding period such as \$2.3 million in ex-vessel revenue in 2019 to \$3.2 million by 2027 (see Table B-9 of [Appendix B of Changes to the Yelloweye Rockfish Rebuilding Plan for the 2019-2020 Biennial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures; Agenda Item E.4, Attachment 5, June 2018](#)). A second issue could be the development of new markets to handle the higher volumes of lingcod and mid-water rockfishes, with the latter being a same concern prior to issuance of the trawl EFPs. Although, we note that markets did quickly develop.

In general, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the potential benefits of reopening the non-trawl RCA as well as potential impacts to yelloweye rockfish. For similar reasons, the Council has taken a slow and phased in approach to increasing LEFG and OA lingcod trip limits the past three years. Slowly opening the non-trawl RCA during the next decade of the yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan could help fisheries better adapt to large-scale increases in the yelloweye rockfish allocations once the stock rebuilds with a maximum sustainable yield (MSY) of approximately 100 mt.

Workload

High

7. Remove Certain Midwater Area-Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Non-Whiting

Background

Under current regulations, midwater rockfish targeting is only permitted during the primary whiting season north of 40° 10' N. Latitude (inside and outside the RCAs) and is allowed year-round seaward of the RCA south of 40° 10' N. Latitude. The 2017 Salmon ITS requires that NMFS implement an EFP for a minimum of three years to collect information on Chinook and coho salmon bycatch levels in the fishery from January to mid-May for north of 40° 10' N. Latitude and year-round for south of 40° 10' N. Latitude. An EFP was issued in 2018 and continued into 2019, therefore the earliest implementation date for the fishery is 2021.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The GMT would need to analyze the biological and economic impacts of allowing non-whiting midwater trawling prior to May 15th north of 40° 10' N. Latitude and year-round within the trawl RCA south of 40° 10' N. Latitude. Additionally, this would trigger re-initiation of the consultation on ESA salmonids. In the proposed action, the year-round midwater non-whiting fishery was only analyzed as an EFP under a controlled cap, not as a targeting fishery. This analysis would require analyzing stock-specific impacts.

Potential Benefits

High

In the 2018 trawl gear EFP alone, the midwater component of the EFP (i.e., excluding the bottom trawl landings from the gear rule provisions) landed 25.8 million pounds of groundfish with an ex-vessel value of \$6.9 million. With high value midwater stocks now rebuilt, these changes could provide significant opportunity for industry. Processors routinely mention that having stable, year-round fisheries is essential to building and maintaining markets.

Workload

High

8. Carryover when Management Units Change

Background

As described in September 2013 ([Agenda Item G.9.a, Attachment 1](#)), the Federal regulations do not cover how shorebased IFQ carryover of quota pounds (QPs) should be handled when there is a reallocation of quota shares (QS) as a result of changes in management areas (area subdivision, combination, or line movement) or when a subdivision of a species group causes shifts in the distribution of QS. The recent geographic subdivision of lingcod highlights this issue and its relation to 660.140(c)(3)(vii).

Relevant Factors For Analysis

There is likely little to no analysis for the GMT, as this item would provide regulatory clarity if a management boundary or stock complex is changed.

Potential Benefits

Low

Currently, there are no regulations that specify how carryover QP will be issued in a year subsequent to a change in the management unit. When this issue arose for lingcod, NMFS notified the Council of this shortcoming and requested guidance on how to address this issue. The benefit for industry is expected to be low since changes to management units are rare. However, workloads would benefit from a consistent approach and/or formula for when these rare instances do occur (e.g., blackgill rockfish south).

Workload

Low

9. Retain Halibut in the Sablefish Fishery (South of Pt. Chehalis)

Background

At its September 2006 meeting, the Council received a proposal to allow retention of Pacific halibut caught in fixed gear sablefish fisheries (LE and OA) in the Port Orford area ([Agenda Item G.1.d, Supplemental POORT Report, September 2006](#)). The Council took no action on the proposal, but did state its intent to consider halibut bycatch retention on a broader scale. ODFW brought the issue forward again in 2010 ([Agenda Item D.3.b, ODFW Report, September 2010](#)). At that time, the Council again took no action on the proposal, and it eventually was included in the “Omnibus” list. The GMT notes that there are currently discussions going on between the Council and the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) through a separate process on proposed changes to the directed commercial halibut fishery. This item may end up being incorporated into that process, or may no longer be necessary. Therefore, any further action on this should wait until that process has completed.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

Information would need to be compiled on how many vessels participate in the sablefish fishery only, the directed halibut fishery only, or both fisheries. Depending on the amount of quota moved from the directed fishery to the sablefish fishery, the GMT would need to analyze the economic impact on those vessels that participate in the directed halibut fishery only. Additionally, the GMT would analyze the amount of halibut discarded during the sablefish fisheries that could potentially be turned into landed catch.

Potential Benefits

Medium

This measure would turn a portion of the discarded bycatch of Pacific halibut in the sablefish fishery into landed catch. This should reduce discard mortality of halibut, and potentially allow for more efficient harvest of the halibut quota. The GMT notes that discard mortality in the non-nearshore (sablefish) fishery has typically been above 20 mt per year, and has been estimated to be as high as 107 mt. To put this in perspective, the non-treaty directed halibut fishery landings were 91.5 mt in 2018, a year with a relatively high allocation.

Allowing retention could also supply small amounts of fresh halibut to local markets over a longer time period, which could increase prices for fishermen and processors. Some of the benefits might be offset by allocative effects.

Workload

Medium

10. Discard Mortality Rates for the Recreational Fisheries

Background

In 2008, the GMT developed, the SSC endorsed, and the Council approved, discard mortality rates (DMRs) for surface released fish in the recreational fishery, with the intent of reviewing those rates at regular intervals. In 2013, the Council adopted depth-based mortality rates for cowcod, canary rockfish, and yelloweye rockfish associated with the use of descending devices. Those three species were chosen because they were all overfished at the time, and no retention was allowed. Since that time, there has been interest from anglers in looking at DMRs when descending devices are used for additional species, especially since Washington and Oregon made descending devices mandatory. Anglers have stated that they would like to receive some “credit” for having to use descending devices, and that having rates for additional species provide more accurate mortality estimates.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The GMT would need to review updated research to determine if the surface rates already in use are still appropriate, or need to be updated, and if new rates for the use of descending devices for additional species could be developed. The GMT expects to use new data and the same SSC-endorsed methodologies to update the recreational DMRs, so the SSC would not need to review this analysis. No regulatory updates would be needed, as this is a catch accounting issue.

Potential Benefits

Low

The GMT is unsure the application of DMRs to additional species will result in measurable benefits. Unlike cowcod and canary and yelloweye rockfish, many species that are currently constraining to recreational fisheries are nearshore species that may not have significantly lower mortality when descending devices are used. In addition, as discussed below, these species may not be discarded at a very high rate.

Preliminary modeling suggests that revisiting DMRs for surface releases will result in limited benefits, these findings could be further discussed in a supplemental report. The majority of mortality for most species comes from landings, and the aggregate DMRs (i.e., portion of total discard that die) are already low for key species such as black rockfish (i.e., 16 percent for CA and 15 percent for OR and WA in 2017). Even reducing the black rockfish DMR to the lowest possible value (i.e., 7 percent for hooking mortality), which would be an approximately 50 percent DMR reduction, would only be expected to result in a few tons of savings for each state (Table 2).

Table 2. Maximum potential black rockfish mortality savings (in mt) if the recreational DMRs were lowered to the lowest possible (i.e., 7 percent, which would be ~50 percent reduction from current DMRs).

State	Landings (mt)	Discard mortality (DM)	Total mortality (mt)	Max. possible DM savings	% max. savings
WA	220.0	3.9	223.9	2.1	0.9%
OR	396.9	6.8	3.1	3.6	0.9%
CA	87.1	6.4	93.5	3.6	3.8%

It is unknown what the actual DMRs could be at this time since a literature/research review still needs to be completed. However, developing those rates, and updating the surface rates, would reflect the most current research, and make the total mortality estimates more accurate.

Workload

Medium

The workload for the GMT would be medium. There will also be some additional workload for the state catch estimation programs to implement any changes.

11. Gear Switching and Trawl Sablefish Area Management

Background

During the catch shares review hearings and follow on actions, the Council chose to separate any actions regarding gear switching in the shorebased IFQ program and changing of the management lines for sablefish in the trawl sector into a separate track. The Sablefish Management and Trawl Allocation Attainment Committee (SaMTAAC) was created to discuss issues associated with this topic and provide advice to the Council for if and when they take action. The SaMTAAC is expected to bring back an informational update in the spring of 2019.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

GMT members are already assisting in analyzing background information requests for SaMTAAC members as well as potential alternative impacts. Biological impacts from potential changes in gear switching to economic impacts to individuals, processors, and communities through changes in limits, opportunities, and quota share changes will be assessed. Additionally, as some alternatives would change how the groundfish fishery operates, there may need to be a re-initiation on the salmon BiOp.

Potential Benefits

Depends on the alternative(s).

Workload

Very High (depending on alternative(s) chosen)

12. Increasing Individual Fishing Quota Carryover from 10 Percent

Background

Each year in March or April, the Council recommends issuing carryover up to 10 percent in the shorebased IFQ program for those species where the annual catch limit is less than the acceptable biological catch ($ACL < ABC$). During the five-year catch share review, the Community Advisory Board (CAB) identified one potential of its priorities as increasing the available amount to greater than 10 percent. For example, the program in British Columbia issues carryover up to 30 percent for some species ([Bronzon, et. al, 2010](#)).

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The evaluation of the percentage of QPs that could be carried over would be based on the risk to the ACL and the ABC, but would be similar to the framework already established. The GMT's analysis each year would continue to analyze the species where carryover is available and the potential amount of carryover that could be issued to vessel accounts without risk to the ACL.

Potential Benefits

Low

Given the species that would be eligible for carryover (i.e. where the $ABC > ACL$) and the low attainment of those species in recent years, there is likely little benefit to increasing the amount of carryover. Table 3 below shows all the IFQ species, with those eligible in black and those not eligible for carryover in grey. As shown, only 10 species in 2019 will be eligible for carryover.

Table 3. IFQ Species and 2019 ABC/ACL Comparison.

IFQ Species	2019 ABC ACL Comparison
Arrowtooth flounder	ABC = ACL
Bocaccio rockfish South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Canary rockfish	ABC = ACL
Chilipepper rockfish South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Cowcod South of 40°10' N.	ABC > ACL
Darkblotched rockfish	ABC = ACL
Dover sole	ABC > ACL
English sole	ABC = ACL
Lingcod North of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Lingcod South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Longspine thornyheads North of 34°27' N.	NA
Minor shelf rockfish North of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Minor shelf rockfish South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Minor slope rockfish North of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Minor slope rockfish South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Other flatfish	ABC = ACL
Pacific cod	ABC > ACL
Pacific halibut (IBQ) North of 40°10' N.	NA
Pacific ocean perch North of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Petrale sole	ABC = ACL
Sablefish North of 36° N.	NA
Sablefish South of 36° N.	NA
Shortspine thornyheads North of 34°27' N.	NA
Shortspine thornyheads South of 34°27' N.	NA
Splitnose rockfish South of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL
Starry flounder	ABC = ACL
Widow rockfish	ABC = ACL
Yelloweye rockfish	ABC > ACL
Yellowtail rockfish North of 40°10' N.	ABC = ACL

Of those 10 species eligible for carryover, the IFQ allocation attainments have been less than 50 percent for all species except sablefish N of 36° N. Latitude in the last three years.

Workload

Low to none.

As the framework for issuing carryover would be the same, there would be little to no additional workload for the GMT during inseason and low workload associated with this analysis.

13. Aggregate Non-Whiting Quota Share Control Limits and Individual Species Weighting

Background

This item was identified by the CAB as a possible priority follow-on-action, but was not selected by the Council for inclusion in the Follow-On-Action package. This item would reconsider the current 3.2 percent aggregate non-whiting control limit and the weighting methodology used in calculating the limit.

As we noted in our November statement, we understand that the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) is currently researching the aggregate non-whiting control limit, and recommended that this item stay on the list until the NWFSC updates the Council on that analysis ([Agenda Item G.4.a, Supplemental GMT Report 2, November 2018](#)).

Relevant Factors For Analysis

The GMT would need to analyze current shorebased IFQ fishery quota ownership and the impacts of changing the species weighting to quota owners.

Potential Benefits

Unknown

Currently, attainments of many IFQ stocks are low (~25 percent). This measure focuses on limits that impact the distribution of benefits from the fishery (the control limits) rather than the amount of fish a vessel could harvest (the annual vessel limits). The recently completed catch share review indicated that the control limits do not appear to be constraining total fleet harvest and that only three entities (out of 247 that own QS) appeared to be controlling amounts of QS within 10 percent of the aggregate non-whiting QS limit (page 38 of the catch share review). The NWFSC analysis could indicate whether increasing these limits could increase attainment or have other benefits for the economic performance of the fishery.

Workload

Medium

14. Trawl/Non-Trawl Amendment 21 Allocations

Background

In June 2017, the Council finalized the intersector allocation review document as a part of the five-year catch shares review. At that time, the Council chose not to consider any changes to any trawl/non-trawl allocations. However, there was interest in looking at some of the formal allocations, including lingcod south of 40° 10' N. Latitude, at a later time.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

For this item, the GMT would update the historical mortality by trawl and non-trawl sectors for each species from the intersector allocation review document. The team would also consider impacts from allocation options (biological, economic, and social). Additional analysis may be

needed for the salmon BiOp depending on the alternatives that are forwarded and if it is outside the scope of the proposed action and impacts.

Potential Benefits

Depends on species

Given changes in the groundfish fishery since the time many of these allocations were formalized, redistributing allocations from sectors where quota is stranded to those with consistently high attainment may be beneficial. For example, as shown in Table 4 below, the non-trawl sector has ranged from attaining 69 to 125 percent of their lingcod south of 40° 10' N. Latitude allocation while the trawl sector attained less than 6 percent annually over the last five years.

Table 4. Attainment of trawl- non-trawl allocations for lingcod S of 40° 10' N. Latitude, 2013-2017.

Year	Fishery HG	Trawl			Non-Trawl		
		Mortality	Allocation	% Attain	Mortality	Allocation	% Attain
2013	1,102	13.7	496	3%	417.5	606	69%
2014	1,054	16.1	474	3%	550.3	580	95%
2015	995	29.1	448	6%	685	547	125%
2016	937	21.1	422	5%	642.55	515	125%
2017	1,242	22.6	559	4%	506.29	683	74%

a/ 2011-2015 data from [Intersector Allocation Review](#), 2016-2017 from WCGOP GEMM and Total Mortality Reports

Workload

Medium/High depending on species and range of allocation options.

15. Mothership Sector Utilization

Background

In September 2017, members of the Mothership (MS) sector provided public comment on several issues hindering the utilization of the MS whiting allocation. A majority of the MS sector participants met in November and brought forward a summary of the meeting, issues, and potential solutions at the November Council meeting ([Agenda Item G.4.b, Supplemental Public Comment 2, November 2017](#)). There were short term solutions, including temporarily increasing the processing limit and changing the commitment date for catcher vessels (CVs), and long term solutions with consensus (increasing the processing limit to something greater than 45 percent) and without consensus (such as having a reciprocal commitment of a MS to a CV or allowing CVs to deliver shoreside if an MS is unavailable).

Relevant Factors For Analysis

Depending on the scope of the alternatives within this item, the GMT would need to assess a variety of factors. For example, the GMT would analyze the appropriate level for a processing limit in the current fishery and explore the implications of allowing MS vessels to operate as catcher processors or allowing CVs to deliver MS quota shoreside.

Potential Benefits

Depends on alternative(s) selected

The MS sector has had an average of 78 percent attainment of whiting over the last 8 years, with a low of 39 percent in 2015 and high of 97 percent in 2012. The allocation in 2012 was almost 2.5 times less than in 2018, post-tribal reapportionment. Therefore, finding ways to increase attainment of the sector's allocation could provide significant benefits to processors, catcher vessels, and their communities

Workload

Medium to high, dependent on scope.

16. Moving Platt/Emley Exempted Fishing Permit into Regulations

Background

As of the beginning of 2019, this EFP will be in its 8th year of data collection. The EFP has allowed the participants to fish commercial mid-water gear within the non-trawl RCA with the goal of selectively catching healthy mid-water rockfishes (e.g., yellowtail, chillipepper, widow, and bocaccio rockfishes) while minimizing impacts to demersal overfished rockfish (i.e., yelloweye rockfish and cowcod). At the November 2018 Council meeting, the applicants provided a report summarizing 2013-2018 fishing activity and effectiveness of the new gear.

Relevant Factors For Analysis

Low participation and delayed issuance of EFP permits have made evaluation of moving this EFP into regulation difficult. The GMT would need to evaluate bycatch of yelloweye rockfish, cowcod, and Chinook salmon relative to fishing effort. Additionally, there would need to be consideration of expanding and creating new regulations and monitoring requirements to allow these gears within the non-trawl RCA.

Potential Benefits

Medium

Non-trawl attainments of many mid-water rockfish are low, in part due to being constrained by the non-trawl RCA. The EFP gear has been successful at selectively targeting mid-water rockfishes so far, but there have been concerns regarding the economic viability if the EFP were moved to into rule as a new fishery. A more rigorous NEPA analysis would be needed.

Workload

Medium

Appendix A. Summary table of groundfish workload prioritization items and the potential work and benefits associated with each item.

New #	Sector	Short Title	Category	NEPA Analysis Required	ESA Reconsultation Needed?	Regulatory Complexity (H, M, L)	Implementation Complexity (H, M, L)	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Benefits (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts
1	Trawl, Non-Trawl	Clarify Catch Accounting Rules for Amendment 21	Catch Accounting	CE	No	?	?	L	L	Council/ NMFS staff
2	Trawl IFQ	Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl (SFFT) requirement between 40° 10' and 42° N. Latitude.	Gear	EA	Yes - salmon	M	M	Unknown	L	NMFS
3	LE FG	LEFG Permit Price Reporting	Permitting	CE	No	M	H	L (if any)	L	NWFSC
4	Trawl, Non-Trawl, Rec	Create 60-Mile Bank RCA Lines	Area Management	EA	No	H	H	M	M	Mel/ Caroline
5	Trawl, Non-Trawl	New Dressed to Round Conversion Factors for Sablefish	Catch Accounting	CE	No	L	L	L	L	Patrick/ Jessi
6	Trawl, Non-Trawl	Non-Trawl RCA Modifications	Area Management	EA	Yes-humpback	L	M	H	H	Patrick/ Jessi/ Mel
7	Trawl IFQ	Remove Certain Time and Area-Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Non-whiting	Area Management	EA	Yes - salmon	M	M	H	H	NMFS staff/ Patrick/ Jessi
8	Trawl IFQ	Carryover when Management Units Change	Catch Accounting	EA	No	H	H	L	L	NMFS/ Council staff

New #	Sector	Short Title	Category	NEPA Analysis Required	ESA Reconsultation Needed?	Regulatory Complexity (H, M, L)	Implementation Complexity (H, M, L)	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Benefits (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts
9	LEFG, OA	Retain Halibut in the Sablefish Fishery (South of Pt. Chehalis)	Season Structure	EA	Possibly no	M	M	M	Depends	Lynn/ Heather
10	Rec	Discard Mortality Rates for the Recreational Fisheries	Catch Accounting	None	No	None	None	M	L	Heather/ Lynn/ Caroline/ Patrick
12	IFQ	Increasing IFQ Carryover from 10 Percent	Harvest Specifications	CE	No	M	H	No change from current?	L	Jessi/ Abby/ Council Staff
13	IFQ	Aggregate Non-whiting QS Control Limits and Individual Species Weighting	Accumulation Limits	CE	No	M	M	M	Depends	NWFSC / Council Staff
14	Trawl, Non-Trawl	Trawl/Non-trawl Amendment 21 Allocations	Allocation	EA	Depends	M	M	M/H	Depends on species	depends on species chosen
15	MS	Mothership Sector Utilization	Accumulation Limits	CE	No	M	M	M/H	Depends on alt.(s) selected	Jessi/ Patrick/ NMFS/ Council staff
16	Fixed Gear	Moving Emley/Platt EFP into Regulations	Gear	EA	No	M	M	M	M	Mel/ Caroline

CE = Categorical Exclusion
EA = Environmental Analysis

PFMC
02/11/19