

## GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON GROUND FISH WORKLOAD AND NEW MANAGEMENT MEASURE PRIORITIES

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) met with members of the Groundfish Management and Team (GMT) and reviewed the documents under this agenda item. Referencing the [Groundfish Management Team \(GMT\) Report 1](#) under this agenda item, the GAP makes the following recommendations.

### Removal of some items

The GAP recognizes the GMT, in [GMT Report 1](#), recommended removal of three items from the groundfish workload:

- B3, Create 60-Mile Bank RCA Lines;
- B9, Permitting Commercial Sale of Recreational Fish Waste; and
- B10, Petrale; Guttled/ Headon conversion factor.

The GAP agrees with removing two of these:

- B3, the 60-mile Bank RCA Lines issue, has been resolved; and
- B10, the Petrale Conversion Factor, is no longer as important as it once was.

However, the GAP suggests retaining B9, Permitting Commercial Sale of Recreational Fish Waste. The GAP understands each state would have to develop rules conforming to Federal regulations but there is a lot of interest to continue to develop this. Referencing the [Enforcement Consultants' Supplemental Report 1](#) under this agenda item, "The EC understands that the request to allow a port to establish a contract with a company that would collect waste at fish cleaning stations and use that waste to produce commercially sold products including fish meal, fertilizer, fish oil etc., is still active. The intent of the request is to reduce the amount of waste discarded at the port. Adjusting the Federal regulations would allow the States to develop rules specific to this activity."

### Limited entry fixed-gear (LEFG) sablefish follow-on action Items

While the GAP continues to suggest no specific prioritization of the workload items, we acknowledge GAP members had higher interest in retaining two trawl items and the fixed-gear sablefish items on the workload list.

Regarding the LEFG sablefish items (follow-on package; B14a-f)), the GAP realizes some of these items have high workload values. The GAP considered trying to repackage some of the items but ultimately decided that National Marine Fisheries Service and the GMT might have additional suggestions for packaging them differently based on different sets of criteria. Most of the LEFG follow-on package proposals will afford the sablefish fisheries the most flexibility and conservation of the resources. Furthermore, the GAP may have more insightful recommendations following a scoping process. Those items include:

- B14a, Cost recovery;

- B14b, Removal of base permit;
- B14c, Allow use of slinky pots by longline-endorsed permits;
- B14d, Add fourth permit per vessel;
- B14e, Allow cumulative non-sablefish landing limit for each permit; and
- B14f, Sablefish permit price reporting.

Lastly, the GAP also suggests the sablefish pot gear-marking issue could be added to this package and the scoping session for further discussion.

## Comments on other items

Regarding the remainder of the items in Table B, the GAP discussed the two trawl workload items, B2, Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl (SFFT) requirement between 40° 10' and 42° N. lat., and B5, Remove Certain Time and Area Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Nonwhiting. The GAP requests both items remain on the list and elevated for implementation.

- B2, Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl (SFFT) requirement between 40° 10' and 42° N. lat. As noted, this has been an exempted fishing permit (EFP) since 2018. The EFP has shown its effectiveness in limiting salmon incidental catch, no matter from which environmentally significant unit (ESU) the salmon originated. Moving the EFP into regulations would simplify fishery regulations for participants, fishery managers, and enforcement.

Therefore, the GAP requests this item remain on the workload list and also requests a more concerted effort to use genetic testing to determine the salmon ESUs that are affected.

- B5, Remove Certain Time and Area Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Nonwhiting: The GAP supports leaving this item on the list for future action. Similar to item B2 relative to salmon concerns, the EFP has demonstrated the ability for midwater trawl gears to operate successfully and avoid salmon, which was one of the goals of the EFP. This gear change has afforded the trawl fleet more efficiency in its operations and the GAP requests this item be retained on the list and moved into regulation as soon as practicable. If consideration of the area restriction could slow down implementation, then the GAP would support first moving forward with the time restriction portion.

## Additions

### Consideration use of natural bait for recreational long-leader fishery:

The Oregon recreational longleader gear (30 foot dropper)"/"Holloway gear" was implemented as a means of fishing for mid-water species and avoiding yelloweye rockfish. The use of natural bait was prohibited in an effort to reduce the catch of canary rockfish, which were restricted at that time. Fast forward to now: The longleader rig has proven successful in avoiding yelloweye and the canary rockfish limit is 15 fish.

There is no longer a need to avoid canary rockfish and natural bait should be allowed. In water deeper than 40 fathoms, bait is allowed with the same three hooks when fishing for lingcod and

the daily limit of five groundfish. The same fish caught on the longleader gear can be caught on the bottom, using bait.

The GAP requests this be added to the workload list and moved forward. While the longleader gear was developed over years using an EFP, the nearly identical gear has been used by commercial fisheries that now use natural bait. The GAP believes an analysis of the gear types and natural bait use should result in medium workload and without necessitating a subsequent EFP.

Open access registration

[NMFS Report 1](#) raises the consideration of a registration system for the open access sector. The GAP supports adding this to the workload list, for all the reasons mentioned in that report. We recognize the value of creating a registration system for better fisheries management and to better account for fishing effort, especially in light of competing ocean uses.

PFMC  
03/07/23