

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON WORKLOAD & NEW MANAGEMENT MEASURES UPDATE

Each year in March or April, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council), the public, and advisory bodies have the opportunity to consider tentatively scheduling groundfish topics on the Council's year at a glance (YAAG) calendar, based on the workload of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), Council, and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). This report reminds the Council, advisory bodies, and the public of the status of this process as of the September 2022 Council meeting, when it was last discussed.

Appendix 1 provides the GMT's workload matrix, which shows the progress of ongoing and scheduled projects over the next two years. This does not represent agenda items that will span farther than the next two years. The shaded blocks represent the GMT's anticipated timeline for direct involvement with the issue (e.g., through the Council's final action), noting that some GMT members may have additional workload to assist NMFS and Council staff in developing the final regulatory documents.

Appendix 2 shows the most recent groundfish workload prioritization list (items the Council has prioritized; Table A) and those items that are still relevant but not yet prioritized (Table B), based on Council action through September 2022. The timing of prioritization of items on Table B will need to consider the associated workload in relation to the other groundfish (and non-groundfish) items the Council (and NMFS) is already working on.

The GMT notes that the four items currently in Table A have high workloads. The items associated with the stock definitions (both phase 1 and phase 2) are ever changing and likely to be more so in the future as we work through the management implications for the new delineations. While we work through the items in Table A, particularly stock definitions (Phase 1 and subsequent phases), the GMT requests the Council refrain from prioritizing items listed in Table B. It is the GMT's understanding that, after June 2023, the GMT will need to analyze and develop management measures that account for the new stock definitions of priority species in Phase 1.

Additionally, based on Council discussion in September and November 2022, the GMT is providing some details on what each of the items in Appendix 2, Table B entail and recommendations, including removing some items that no longer appear to be necessary. This will provide the Council with information beyond the brief title to better understand the intent of each item.

Items are numbered based on Table B in Appendix 2. The numbering is not any indication of GMT prioritization or ranking of importance, but instead reflects the order that items have been added to the list as they have been requested or introduced. Additionally, the GMT estimation of workload (high, medium, low) is intended to be qualitative only, noting that items with the same workload designation may not have equal workload levels. We further note that items are not exchangeable, and that the unique workload and logistics of each item mean that there is not a

simple formula for determining the number and type of items the Council should prioritize (e.g., low + low ≠ medium).

1. Clarify Catch Accounting Rules for Amendment 21

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. lat. is accounted for in the incidental open access fisheries.

Therefore, the GMT requests that NMFS and Council staff confer and examine the FMP and Federal regulations to determine the status and process to finalize, if necessary. After consultation, the GMT requests guidance on whether this item still needs to be included in Table B and the appropriate avenue for making this regulatory change.

Sector(s): Open Access

Anticipated Workload: Low

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

This measure is currently being evaluated through the Trawl Gear Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP), as the 2017 Salmon Incidental Take Statement (ITS) required three years of data before implementing any changes. This exemption has been provided under the Trawl Gear EFP since 2019; 2023 is year five of this exemption. However, few vessels have taken advantage of this exemption. Therefore, the GMT wonders if there is merit in continuing to provide this EFP exemption. It is the GMT's understanding that NMFS will bring information on this EFP to the Council in March 2023, including some information on salmon genetic samples.

Therefore, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B at the time of this report writing but may have additional input after discussion of the forthcoming NMFS Report.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: Unknown

3. Create 60-Mile Bank Rockfish Conservation Area Lines

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 Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) lines. Previously, the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) requested the Council establish coordinates for a 60 fathom - 150 fathom RCA that define the 60-Mile Bank due to concerns over cowcod bycatch primarily 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.

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 item be deleted from Table B at that time; however, Council requested that it remain on Table B.

As of January 1, 2023 several new regulations have been established that directly or indirectly will minimize cowcod south of 40° 10' N. lat. bycatch in the non-trawl sector, in addition to the long-standing non-retention of cowcod south of 40° 10' N. lat. in the non-trawl sector regulation. Annual catch targets (ACT) for cowcod south of 40° 10' N. lat. are now specified for the commercial and recreational sectors to reduce the risk of one sector utilizing more of the non-trawl allocation than the other sector. Recreational regulations for the Southern Management Area in California now authorize an all-depth fishery and an offshore fishery that would occur seaward of a specified RCA line. The new recreational regulations were designed to spread out recreational fishing effort to minimize the potential for localized depletion in any particular area, like the 60-Mile Bank. Allowing recreational groundfish opportunity in a larger area minimizes the need for a new management measure within B3. Lastly, the non-trawl commercial sector is now required to use and submit logbooks while fishing in Federal waters (3 nautical miles - 200 nautical miles), which will capture retained and discarded species, location, and gear type.

Therefore, based on all of the above, **the GMT recommends removing this item from Table B.**

Sector(s): Non-trawl, Recreational

Anticipated Workload: Medium

4. New Dressed to Round Conversion Factors for Sablefish

Research by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) suggests that the current conversion factor in Federal regulations of 1.60 for dressed and head-off sablefish may be too high, particularly during certain times of the year.

The 1.60 factor is in Federal rules for the Limited Entry Fixed Gear (LEFG), Open Access (OA), and Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) fisheries ([50 CFR 660.60\(h\)\(5\)\(ii\)\(A\)\(1\)](#)). This item would align Federal regulations with the WDFW conversion factors of 1.54 for rolled-cut and 1.57 for slight angle cut, because they may be more appropriate and more representative of recent research (Figure 1). 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”.

It is the GMT’s understanding that this was originally requested by WDFW for the state of Washington. The GMT notes that if one state changes a conversion factor, debiting for IFQ species would differ between states, potentially creating equity issues. This would require the Council to remove the conversion factor from Federal regulation and allow individual states to adopt their own, at which point, WDFW could establish their preferred conversion factor through PacFIN.



Figure 1.. Differently dressed sablefish cuts.

Table A. 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	1.60	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%

The GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): IFQ, Non-trawl

Anticipated Workload: Low

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

This measure is currently being evaluated through the Trawl Gear EFP, as the 2017 Salmon ITS required three years of data before implementing any changes. This exemption has been provided under the Trawl Gear EFP since 2018; 2023 is year six of this exemption. It is the GMT’s understanding that NMFS will bring information on this EFP to the Council in March 2023, including some information on salmon genetic samples.

Therefore, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B at the time of this report writing but may have additional input after discussion and reading the forthcoming NMFS report.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: High

6. Carryover when Management Units Change

As described in September 2013 ([Agenda Item G.9.a, Attachment 1](#)), there is currently no Federal regulation defining how shorebased IFQ provisions, including carryover, should be addressed following a reallocation of quota shares resulting from a change in management areas. For example, this became an issue when management of lingcod changed to north and south of 40° 10' N. lat., rather than 42° N. lat. As noted below under B7, a minority of stocks or stock complexes are currently eligible for carryover.

The GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: Medium

7. Increasing Individual Fishing Quota Carryover from 10 Percent

Each year in March or April, the Council recommends issuing carryover up to 10 percent in the Shorebased IFQ Program for those stocks or stock complexes where the annual catch limit (ACL) is less than the acceptable biological catch (ABC). During the initial five-year catch share program review, the Community Advisory Board (CAB) identified increasing the available amount to greater than 10 percent as a potential priority. For example, the British Columbia groundfish catch share program issues carryover up to 30 percent for some stocks ([Bonzon, et. al., 2010](#)).

As shown in Table 2 below, only eight stocks or stock complexes are currently eligible for carryover, and all eight stocks have less than 50 percent attainment. However, the GMT understands that increasing the carryover rate for constraining stocks could benefit individual vessels. Changing the carryover percentage would be a procedural change, so workload is expected to be low.

Therefore, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: Low

Table B. Shorebased IFQ stocks and 2023 ABC/ACL comparison.

IFQ Stocks	2023 ABC ACL Comparison
Arrowtooth flounder	ABC = ACL
Bocaccio south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Canary rockfish	ABC = ACL
Chilipepper rockfish south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Cowcod south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Darkblotched rockfish	ABC = ACL
Dover sole	ABC > ACL
English sole	ABC = ACL
Lingcod north of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Lingcod south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC > ACL
Longspine thornyhead north of 34° 27' N. lat.	NA
Minor shelf rockfish north of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Minor shelf rockfish south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Minor slope rockfish north of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Minor slope rockfish south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Other flatfish	ABC = ACL
Pacific cod	ABC > ACL
Pacific halibut (IBQ) north of 40° 10' N. lat.	NA
Pacific ocean perch north of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Petrale sole	ABC = ACL
Sablefish north of 36° N. lat.	No carryover issued
Sablefish south of 36° N. lat.	No carryover issued
Shortspine thornyhead north of 40° 10' N. lat.	NA
Shortspine thornyhead south of 40° 10' N. lat.	NA
Splitnose rockfish south of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL
Starry flounder	ABC = ACL
Widow rockfish	ABC = ACL
YELLOWEYE ROCKFISH	ABC > ACL
Yellowtail rockfish north of 40° 10' N. lat.	ABC = ACL

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

This item was identified by the CAB during the initial trawl IFQ 5-year review as a possible priority follow-on-action but was not selected by the Council for inclusion in the follow-on package resulting from that initial program review. This item would reconsider the current 3.2 percent aggregate non-whiting control limit and the weighting methodology used in calculating the limit. The GMT understands that the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) has been conducting research on the aggregate non-whiting control limit. The GMT has not seen the results of that research.

Therefore, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B and be considered for action when research by the NWFSC economists is completed.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: Medium

9. Permitting Commercial Sale of Recreational Fish Waste

The Council is being asked to consider allowing the sale of discarded recreationally-caught fish waste on a limited scale. Fish processors and charter operators at ports that prohibit the dumping of carcasses or fish waste in port must find alternative modes of disposal. The interest is to offset the costs of disposal incurred by processors or charter vessel operators.

In San Diego processors handle (cut and vacuum seal) recreational fish offloaded from Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel (CPFV) and private recreational boats. The heads, frames and offal from these fish are gathered by commercial trash collecting services and taken to the municipal dump. The processors have to pay for this service. The processors would like to be able to sell this recreational waste to trap/pot fisherman or sell it to be rendered down into fish oil. Similarly, in Washington, recreational vessels are required by state regulation to land whole fish or the carcasses (head and frame) of fish if fileted at-sea to allow species identification and enumeration. A common practice of charters is to filet catch during the return to port. After customers disembark, the charter vessels then must haul the fish waste out of the harbor for disposal. This adds extra expense and inconvenience to the charter operators. To help ease disposal of the carcasses, charter operators would like to be able to provide the carcasses to fish processors who in turn would have the ability to render and sell the waste.

Currently, under [§660.352](#) of Federal regulations, it is unlawful to “[s]ell, offer to sell, or purchase any groundfish taken in the course of recreational groundfish fishing.” This includes those parts of the fish that have been discarded or abandoned. In addition to changing Federal regulations to allow the sale of fish waste from recreationally-caught fish, Washington, Oregon, and California would need to implement conforming state regulations should they wish to allow this activity.

The GMT has concerns about blurring the line between commercial and recreational fisheries. While this request specifically deals with fish “waste”, waste would have to be very carefully defined to prevent commercial sale of whole recreational fish, filets, cheeks, etc.

Therefore, the GMT recommends removing this item from Table B.

Sector(s): Recreational

Anticipated Workload: Low

10. Petrale sole; Gutted/Head-on Conversion Factor

This originated as a request from industry to get a better price conversion factor. The GMT reached out to members of industry who initiated this request and found that they are no longer interested, and therefore, **the GMT recommends removing this item from Table B.**

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: Low

11. Salmon VMS Ping Rate

In June 2019, the Enforcement Consultants (EC) provided an update to the Council on Vessel Monitoring Movement (VMM) with respect to vessel monitoring system (VMS) ping rate for salmon troll vessels ([Agenda Item I.2.a, Supplemental EC Report 1, June 2019](#)). In their June 2019 report, they noted the “Council [previously] chose not to consider exempting salmon trollers in subsequent Vessel Movement Monitoring (VMM) Public Scoping Documents, primarily due to concerns related to monitoring salmon troll activity in and near the North Coast Commercial Yelloweye Rockfish Conservation Area (YRCA) and activity inside and out of the non-trawl Rockfish Conservation Areas.” In that same report, the EC recommended the Council consider exempting the salmon trollers from the then proposed, now current 15-minute VMS ping rate ([85 FR 35594](#)), but create specific areas where an increased ping rate would be required (e.g., a geofence around YRCAs).

The salmon troll fleet has now been subject to the 15-minute ping rate since July 2020. **The GMT requests additional information from the Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) and/or EC to verify whether this item should remain or be removed from New Management Measures Prioritization list (Table B).**

Sector(s): Salmon troll

Anticipated Workload: Low

12. Prohibition of Directed Shortbelly Rockfish Fishery

The Council has designated shortbelly rockfish an Ecosystem Component (EC) species within the FMP, recognizing its importance as forage in the California Current Ecosystem (CCE) and current absence of targeted fishing. EC species are not targeted or generally retained for sale or personal use and are neither currently subject to overfishing, overfished, or approaching overfished status, nor likely to become so in the absence of conservation and management measures. Shortbelly rockfish have not been targeted to date, and harvesters and processors have testified to the Council that there is no reasonably foreseeable future market for this species. While the stock has not been assessed since 2007, multiple indicators point to unusually high recruitment and abundance in recent years.

In designating shortbelly rockfish an EC species, the Council’s June 2019 motion specified that:

“The ecosystem component designation would still allow the Council and NMFS to monitor and manage the species and, in a timely manner, determine whether federal management is needed per the NSI guidelines. If catches exceed 2,000 metric tons in a calendar year the Council will investigate changes in catches, stock abundance, fishing behavior, marketability, or other factors and reconsider EC species designation. The Council may also recommend other management measures for shortbelly rockfish that meet the Council’s ecosystem objectives in the FEP (Fishery Ecosystem Plan).”

Amendment 30 amended the FMP to specify that the Council review shortbelly rockfish’s status as an EC species when the 2,000 mt threshold is exceeded or projected to be exceeded.

The Council has been explicit in its recognition of the forage value of shortbelly rockfish, there has been no indication of interest in targeting this species, and existing monitoring provides full accounting and accountability. Nonetheless, concerns have been raised about the possibility of future interest in targeting, particularly concerns about potential interest due to the growth in global demand for fish oil or fishmeal for agricultural or other purposes. The Council has acknowledged these concerns and expressed a priority for the forage contribution of shortbelly rockfish in the CCE and a desire that no targeted shortbelly rockfish fishery develop, at least without thorough analysis first.

Biological and fishery information considered by the Council in 2019-2020 indicated that stock abundance is high and the impact of mortality in existing fisheries is low. Infrastructure that would be needed to support a fishery on shortbelly rockfish is either non-existent or dedicated to significantly higher value products such as Pacific whiting. There currently is no conservation concern for the shortbelly rockfish stock based on current fisheries and fishing practices.

It is the GMT’s understanding that an amendment to the groundfish FMP would be required to enact a prohibition on directed fishing on shortbelly rockfish. That requires at least a three meeting process and a National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) analysis (type to be determined). November 2021 [ODFW Report 1](#) could act as a basis for further analysis.

The GMT recommends this item remain on Table B.

Sector(s): IFQ

Anticipated Workload: High

13. *Lingcod Trip Limit Adjustments in the Salmon Troll Fishery North of 40° 10' N. lat.*

The Council took inseason action in April 2021 to increase the lingcod opportunity for salmon trollers. At that time, the Council adjusted the lingcod allowance ratio from 1 per 5 Chinook salmon to 1 per 2 Chinook salmon, per trip. The GMT and Council had lengthy discussions about the ability to, and appropriateness of, making that adjustment under inseason action but ultimately chose to pursue inseason action due to prior analyses in the [2019-20 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Environmental Assessment](#) and the need for immediate action due to COVID-19 related impacts and depressed salmon quotas.

The GMT requests additional information from the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and members of the salmon troll fishery on whether there are additional requests beyond the Council's inseason action in 2021, and therefore, whether this item needs to remain in Table B. The GMT suggests that this type of request may be best included as part of the biennial process so that impacts can be analyzed with impacts from all other IOA impacts to determine the appropriate off the top deductions. This could have impacts to other commercial and recreational groundfish sectors by reducing allocations and/or requiring different management measures depending on the amount of set-aside needed.

Sector(s): Salmon troll

Anticipated Workload: Medium

14. Limited Entry Fixed Gear Review Follow-on Items

As part of the limited entry fixed gear review, several items were identified for follow-on actions ([Supplemental GAP Report 1, March 2022](#)). The GMT provides some additional information below on each of those sub-items. The GMT notes that the sub-items below do not have to be done as one unit but could be split into individual items or combined for prioritization. There may be some efficiencies with combining some of the sub-items together, but some items only apply to the primary tier fishery within the LEFG fleet, so the Council may wish to consider splitting or combining based on which fisheries the items aim to impact. For example, if the Council wishes to expand an item to other sectors beyond the primary tier program (e.g., B14c), it would be prudent to keep it separate from other items specific to the primary tier program (e.g., B14a).

a. Cost recovery

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) requires NMFS to collect fees to recover the costs related to the management, data collection, and enforcement directly related to and in support of a limited access privilege program (LAPP) ([16 U.S.C. § 1854\(d\)\(2\)](#)). The Permit Stacking Program was categorized in the 2006 Reauthorization of the MSA as a LAPP, and therefore, cost recovery is required. NMFS is also authorized to charge fees to recover administrative costs associated with permits, including the sablefish-endorsed limited entry permits (see [50 CFR 660.25\(f\)](#)).

This item is needed in order to determine what the incremental management, data collection, analysis, and enforcement costs are to the Program. **The GMT understands that this work is ongoing by NMFS and recommends this item stay on Table B.**

Sector(s): Primary Tier Fishery

Anticipated Workload: Low

b. Removal of base permit

The base permit designation dates back to the development of Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP. The provision was used to determine that at least one permit in a sablefish permit stack had a length endorsement that was long enough for the vessel. In [Agenda Item E.4.a, NMFS Report 2, March 2022](#), NMFS reported that the length requirement is already covered by a

separate regulation within § [660.25\(b\)\(3\)\(iii\)](#), subpart C and is not necessary for a base permit to be designated to enforce the length requirement. NMFS indicated that the designation of the base permit creates an unnecessary administrative burden on fishery participants and NMFS staff. **Given that the requirement to designate a base permit is duplicative and unnecessary, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.**

Sector(s): Primary Tier Fisher

Anticipated Workload: Low

c. Allow use of slinky pots by longline-endorsed permits

The original request to allow the use of slinky pots by longline endorsed permits came up during the LEFG Catch Share Program Review, which includes only LEFG participants that hold both a gear endorsement and a sablefish endorsement (i.e., primary tier fishery participants). However, the GMT is aware of some vessels registered to longline-endorsed LEFG permits that do not also hold a sablefish endorsement, and therefore fish against the DTL trip limits, who are interested in the ability to use slinky pots due to their linkage to reduced whale interactions. All LEFG permits, regardless of sablefish endorsement, are endorsed for longline gear and/or pot gear. This means that vessels registered to longline-endorsed LEFG permits cannot use pot gear unless they also obtain a pot-endorsed permit. The GMT consulted NMFS staff who confirmed that slinky pots are interpreted as “pot/trap” gear defined as “a portable, enclosed device with one or more gates or entrances and one or more lines attached to surface floats” ([50 CFR 600.10 “Trap”](#)).

Out of 227 LEFG permits in 2022, 164 were sablefish-endorsed and 59 did not hold a sablefish endorsement. Of the sablefish endorsed permits, 132 were associated with longline gear only, 28 with pot/trap gear only, and 4 with both longline and pot/trap gear. The remaining 59 permits that did not hold a sablefish-endorsed permit were endorsed for longline gear. To avoid excluding vessels tied to the 59 permits that do not hold a sablefish endorsement but can still fish sablefish with longline gear under the DTL limits, **the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B and be separated from the rest of the LEFG Catch Share Program Review requests as a stand-alone item that includes all permits in the LEFG fishery (i.e., sablefish tier and DTL).**

Sector(s): Limited Entry Fixed Gear (Primary Tier and Trip Limit)

Anticipated Workload: High

d. Add fourth permit per vessel

Currently, an LEFG participant can stack up to three sablefish tier permits on a vessel. This item would allow for a fourth permit to be stacked on a vessel and could provide more opportunity for fixed gear participants, which might be especially important given the gear switching agenda item. However, with the addition of a permit, there are concerns about potential fleet consolidation.

Originally, this request contained a requirement for this permit to be held by a “second generation” industry member, or someone who is on the vessel fishing. The GMT requests that the industry further clarify what this means, but it is the GMT’s understanding that the requirement that at least

one permit be held by a “second generation” industry member was not intended to mean family but rather someone who was not exempt from the owner-on-board requirement. This action would also benefit from one of the recommendations of the most recent [LEFG review](#) to “prepare a report clarifying the owner on board exemption requirements to determine if regulatory or data system changes are needed.” The GMT thinks that this may be best addressed by members of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office of Law Enforcement and the NMFS West Coast Region.

The GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): Primary Tier Fishery

Anticipated Workload: Medium-High

e. Allow cumulative non-sablefish landing limit for each permit

This item would allow each tier permit to have a trip limit associated with it for each non-sablefish LEFG species. Therefore, if a vessel has two tier permits registered to it, that vessel would be able to land twice the trip limit for each species on the LEFG list. Since the ability to stack trip limits based on the number of permits owned would multiply landings per permit, there could be catch accounting concerns and enforcement issues. The Council would need to consider how processing plants keep track of landing limits, as well as what those landing limits would be in the event that a permit is moved off a vessel mid-period.

The GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): Primary Tier Fishery

Anticipated Workload: High

f. Sablefish Permit Price Reporting

This item was initially recommended by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) during the 2014 LEFG Catch Share Program Review ([Agenda Item F.6.b, Supplemental SSC Report, June 2014](#)). In order to gain further insight into the 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-Stevens Act required 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. Sablefish permit price data would also be helpful when analyzing economic impacts from potential changes to the fishery requested under the LEFG Catch Share Program Review.

Given the other requests for changes to the LEFG fishery following the LEFG Catch Share Program Review and the ongoing gear switching agenda item, the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B.

Sector(s): Primary Tier Fishery

Anticipated Workload: Low

15. Remove the Non-Trawl RCA

Complete removal of the non-trawl RCA is an aspirational, long-term goal, not something that can likely be done in the near-term. The GMT notes that there will be EFH considerations and ESA considerations. Additionally, there currently is no data to inform potential impacts from opening all of those areas. The GMT will be receiving logbook data in the coming years as some areas are opening to limited gears. Therefore, **the GMT recommends this item stay on Table B**, as there is not enough data to move forward at this time.

Sector(s): Non-trawl

Anticipated Workload: Very High

Appendix 1. GMT workload matrix, with progress of ongoing and scheduled projects

Action	Category	Mandated vs. Council's Discretion	Likely GMT Lead Analyst(s)	2023												2024											
				Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		
Biennial Groundfish Harvest Specifications	Biennial Process	M	All																								
Biennial Groundfish Management Measures		M	All																								
Exempted Fishing Permit Applications		M	Massey																								
Stock Assessment Updates and Panels		M	All																								
Inseason Monitoring & Management	Inseason	M	Mel, Whitney, Katie																								
ESA Humpback Whale BiOp Measures b/	ESA	M	Lorna																								
Non-Salmon ESA workgroup		M	TBD																								
Trawl Catch Share Review & Inter-Sector Allocation Review	Program Review	M	Whitney, TBD																								
Sablefish Gear Switching	Council Identified Priorities	CD	Whitney, Katie																								
Non-Trawl Area Management		CD	Mel, Whitney, TBD																								
Stock Definitions		M	All																								
Ecosystem Items	Ecosystem	M	TBD																								
Annual Halibut CSP a/	Halibut	CD	Lorna, TBD		***																						
CSP Changes & Comm. Fishery Changes Scoping a/		CD	TBD																								
Marine Spatial Planning	Marine Planning	CD	TBD	As needed												As needed											

a/ GMT may not be directly involved, but members of the team will be as part of their other duties

b/ Stating in March 2023 there will be an agenda item about Pot Gear Marking

*** notes when regulations are expected to be final

Appendix 2. The most recent groundfish workload prioritization list

Table A. Groundfish management measure items prioritized by the Council. (updated January 12, 2023)

Item #	Sector	Short Title	Category	Mandated or Requested Improvement	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts	Progress to Date	Scheduled on YAAG a/
A1	Non-trawl	Non-Trawl Area Management	Area Management	Spatial access	H	Mel/ Whitney/ Brett/Jessi	analysis and background	FPA March 2023
A2	IFQ	Sablefish Gear Switching	Allocation/ Area Management	Fishery performance	H	Council staff/ Whitney/Katie	Multiple revisions to the ROA	PPA June 2023
A3	All	Stock Definitions-Phase 1	FMP Amendment	Mandated	H	Todd/NMFS staff	NMFS paper describing the issue; white paper with ROA	PPA/FPA March/June2023
A4	All	Stock Definitions-Phase 2 (including stock complexes)	FMP Amendment	Mandated	H	Council/NMFS staff	None	Not yet scheduled

Table B. All other potential groundfish management measure items (not in priority order nor scheduled on YAAG).

Item #	Sector	Short Title	Category	Mandated or Requested Improvement	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts	Progress to Date	GMT Recommendation
B1	Open Access	Clarify Catch Accounting Rules for Amendment 21	Catch Accounting	Fishery function	L	Council staff	Unsure if FMP and regulations have been adequately updated	Retain
B2	IFQ	Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl (SFFT) requirement between 40° 10' and 42° N. lat.	Gear	Fishery performance	Unknown	Council staff	Ongoing EFP (Year 5 of 3 needed per Salmon ITS)	Retain
B3	Non-Trawl, Rec	Create 60-Mile Bank RCA Lines	Area Management	Spatial access	M	CDFW staff	None	Remove
B4	IFQ, Non-Trawl	New Dressed to Round Conversion Factors for Sablefish	Catch Accounting	Fishery performance	L	TBD	Preliminary discussions held at PacFIN meeting	Retain
B5	IFQ	Remove Certain Time and Area-Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Non-whiting	Area Management	Spatial & Temporal Access	H	Council staff/TBD	Ongoing EFP (Year 6 of 3 needed per Salmon ITS)	Retain
B6	IFQ	Carryover when Management Units Change	Catch Accounting	Fishery function	M	Council staff	None	Retain
B7	IFQ	Increasing IFQ Carryover from 10 Percent	Harvest Specifications	Fishery performance	L	TBD	None	Retain

Item #	Sector	Short Title	Category	Mandated or Requested Improvement	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts	Progress to Date	GMT Recommendation
B8	IFQ	Aggregate Non-whiting QS Control Limits and Individual Species Weighting	Accumulation Limits	Fishery function	M	NWFSC / Council Staff	Pending research	Retain
B9	Rec	Permitting Commercial Sale of Recreational Fish Waste	Permitting	Fishery performance	L	NMFS WCR/EC staff	None	Remove
B10	IFQ	Petrals; Guttled/ Head-on conversion factor	Catch Accounting	Fishery performance	L	Katie	None	Remove
B11	Salmon troll	Salmon VMS Ping Rate	Enforcement	Enforcement	L	EC Staff	Preliminary scoping	Retain
B12	IFQ	Prohibition of directed shortbelly rockfish fishery	Catch prohibition	Fishery prohibition	H	TBD	pre-scoping via ODFW report Nov 2021	Retain
B13	Salmon troll	Lingcod trip limit adjustments north of 40° 10' N lat.	Species Access	Fishery performance	M	Corey Niles/Whitney	None	Retain
B14	Primary Tier Fishery	LEFG follow on	Program enhancement	Fishery performance				
B14a	Primary Tier Fishery	Cost recovery	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	L	TBD	NMFS paper describing cost recovery. March 2022	Retain
B14b	Primary Tier Fishery	Removal of base permit	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	L	TBD	NMFS paper on topic. March 2022	Retain

Item #	Sector	Short Title	Category	Mandated or Requested Improvement	Analytical Workload (H, M, L)	Primary Analysts	Progress to Date	GMT Recommendation
B14c	LEFG	Allow use of slinky pots by longline-endorsed permits	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	H	TBD	None	Retain
B14d	Primary Tier Fishery	Add 4th permit per vessel	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	M - H	TBD	None	Retain
B14e	Primary Tier Fishery	Allow cumulative non-sablefish landing limit for each permit	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	H	TBD	None	Retain
B14f	Primary Tier Fishery	Sablefish permit price reporting	Program enhancement	Fishery performance	L	TBD	Agenda Item F.6.b, Supplemental SSC Report, June 2014	Retain
B15	Non-trawl	Remove the non-trawl RCA completely	Area Management	Spatial access	Very H	TBD	None	Retain

PFMC
02/10/23