

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON FUTURE WORKLOAD PLANNING

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) reviewed the documents and public comments under this agenda item and offers the following comments and suggestions.

Potential July meeting

The GAP understands the Council is considering a potential brief meeting in July. From the GAP's perspective, a one- or two-day virtual Council meeting in July is less than ideal for several reasons. This is prime fishing time for sport and commercial fisheries, and requesting attendance during this time may be asking business owners to sacrifice valuable time on the water to attend a meeting. One GAP member pointed out that the Council decided, years ago, to avoid scheduling any meetings in late June, July or August specifically for that reason. This year, Council and advisory body members may be trying to spend additional time with their families when the weather is good, especially as more areas open in the wake of COVID-19 closures. Additionally, it would be difficult for Council staff and management teams to complete any more or any comprehensive analysis for agenda items in the short time between the June and potential July meetings.

However, the GAP could support a one-, possibly two-day Council meeting for which it would be helpful to brief Council members on complex issues before the September meeting or to solicit input on items that don't require extensive analysis or preparation, such as the Executive Order 13921.

Requiring more analyses for July groundfish issues would subtract from the efforts needed to complete the 2021-2022 biennial harvest specifications and management measures package that needs to be in regulation by Jan. 1, 2021.

September meeting

Agenda Item F.2, Workload and New Management Measure Update Priorities

The GAP supports replacing this item with the four high priority items contained in the [GAP Informational Report 4](#) included in the advance briefing book for this meeting. The GAP strongly feels we need to stop planning for planning these items and actually move forward. Those items include (in no particular order or priority):

- **Non-Trawl Area Management and Salmon Troll Incidental Landings Limits**
 - The [Supplemental Salmon Advisory Subpanel report 1](#) under this agenda item also addresses this issue.
 - Regarding earlier discussions this week relative to Rockfish Conservation Area line modifications for the 2021-2022 biennial harvest specifications and management measures, the GAP considers [F.1.a, Groundfish Management Team \(GMT\) Supplemental Report 4](#) is a good place to begin considering the longer-term process of opening further RCA areas to the non-trawl sectors. Addressing the non-trawl RCA line issue in September would allow the GMT to address questions such as how many permits are available coastwide that could potentially fish the proposed areas for re-opening and, of those, how many would be likely to actually utilize those areas.

- **Mothership Sector Utilization**
- **Implement San Francisco Community Fishing Association/Platt EFP Regulations**
- **Amendment 21 Trawl/Non-Trawl Allocations**
 - Four species – widow rockfish, petrale sole, lingcod S. of 40° 10' N. lat.; and slope rockfish S. of 40° 10' N. lat., including blackgill rockfish – were included in the 2021-2022 harvest specifications and management measures package and changed to 2-yr allocations
 - Other species may be considered as part of this longer-term package

Agenda Item F.4, Gear-switching/Sablefish Management and Trawl Allocation Attainment Committee

The GAP supports including the gear-switching issue on the September agenda (currently shaded on [Attachment 2, Proposed September Council Meeting Agenda](#)), regardless of whether the meeting is held as an in-person meeting in Spokane or as a virtual meeting.

However, it is unclear to the GAP where we are in the amendment process and what will be publicly noticed for the September meeting. Members of the GAP differ on what should be included on the agenda the next time this issue is considered.

Some GAP members would prefer the Council move ahead with the selection of a range of alternatives (ROA) at that time, as it is currently written on the proposed September agenda; a status quo/no action alternative would be considered inherent to the ROA discussion and subsequent decision. Other members of the GAP suggest the Council move forward by first deciding whether this issue merits further attention and then consider a ROA, should one be necessary.

Regardless, the GAP is firm in its recommendation for inclusion of this issue on the September agenda.

[Executive Order 13921](#)

The GAP supports inclusion of a discussion about Executive Order 13921 during the September meeting, noting several industry members from various sectors have had discussions about it prior to this meeting and that some also referenced it in written public comment. Alternatively, it may be more appropriate to schedule it for both a July meeting (should the Council move forward with that option) and the September meeting. The GAP supports the [Supplemental Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel Report 1](#) relative to this item and considers this an important item to include.

PFMC
06/18/20