

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON PRELIMINARY PREFERRED MANAGEMENT MEASURE FOR 2019-2020 FISHERIES

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) has reviewed the documents under this agenda item and received an overview from Mr. John DeVore of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) staff. We have organized and numbered our comments in the order that is presented in [Agenda Item F.5, Supplemental Attachment 3](#). This report covers Items 16 through 21, new management measures, with the exception of issues related to salmon mitigation, which are covered in Report 3 ([Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 3, April 2018](#)).

Below, the GMT provides a brief summary of the new management measures, the range of alternatives (ROA), and recommendations for Council consideration. These measures were forwarded by the Council in November 2017. See Appendix C for details on each of the management measures ([Agenda Item F.5, Attachment 2, April 2018](#)). The GMT notes that one new management measure, the prohibition of crab retention by trawl fishermen in California waters, was unable to be analyzed for inclusion in the 2019-2020 biennium.

Additionally, the GMT discusses the associated workload and potential benefits of each of the new management measures, and provides some qualitative information that may assist with prioritization at the end of this report. Given the analytical requirements associated with the alternative yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan and salmon mitigation measures, the GMT acknowledges it is unlikely we could complete analysis on the full suite of new management measures (Items 16 through 21) in time for the June Council meeting advanced briefing book deadline (May 11).

16.a. Salmon Incidental Take Statement: Mitigation Measures and Reserve Rule Analysis

See [Agenda Item F.5, Supplemental GMT Report 3](#).

16.b. Stock complex Restructuring Summary

This proposed new management measure is a reorganization of stock complexes based on requests and rationale from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW; [Agenda Item E.9.a, Supplemental ODFW Report 1, September 2017](#) and [Agenda Item F.6.a, WDFW Report 1, November 2017](#), respectively). Two separate proposals are being considered that would affect several stocks that mainly occur in nearshore state waters.

These stock complex proposals pertain primarily to the nearshore and recreational fisheries, as these shallow water stocks are infrequently encountered by trawls or other fisheries which have <1 mt removal of each per year for nearly all species. Although leopard shark removals have been as high as 5-10 mt for the shoreside trawl sectors, California halibut trawl, and incidental open access (IOA) fisheries, these removals are not noteworthy since total removals by all fisheries have been 15 percent or less of the leopard shark component ACL contribution to the complex during the past five years.

Range of Alternatives

Two separate proposals are being considered that affect several stocks that mainly occur in nearshore state waters.

Proposal 1: Nearshore Rockfish complex north of 40° 10' N. lat.

In Proposal 1, Oregon blue/deacon rockfish (BDR) could continue to be managed within the Nearshore Rockfish complex north of 40° 10' N. lat. (status quo) or be removed from the complex and paired with Oregon black rockfish to form a new Oregon black/BDR complex (Option 1). The GMT notes that blue and deacon rockfishes are now considered separate species scientifically, but are referred to collectively because they were assessed together and therefore have joint harvest specifications.

Proposal 2: Other Fish complex

There are three options for Proposal 2 that pertain to the Other Fish complex.

Option 1 is the ODFW proposal to remove Oregon kelp greenling from the Other Fish complex and pair it with Oregon cabezon to form a new Oregon kelp greenling/cabezon complex.

Option 2 is the WDFW proposal to remove Washington kelp greenling and Washington cabezon from the Other Fish complex and pair both together to form a new Washington kelp greenling/cabezon complex.

Option 3 includes both Option 1 and Option 2.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends that the Council adopt Option 2 of Proposal 2 (WDFW) for the stock complexes. This better meets the complex definitions and provides enhanced protection for these stocks due to being separated from leopard shark, a potential inflator, in the Other Fish complex.

The GMT does not have a recommendation for the Oregon options (Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 Option 1, since we believe this is a policy risk call. These options could provide lesser protections for Oregon black rockfish and Oregon cabezon since they would be paired with potential inflators. This is no different for the majority of groundfish stocks that are managed within complexes. However, unlike most stocks managed in complexes, the analysis documents that ODFW would manage to the ACL contributions and describes numerous mitigation measures that are being adopted to prevent overages such as those that occurred in 2017 for Oregon black rockfish and Oregon cabezon.

On the other hand, the Oregon options would also better meet the complex definitions and provide enhanced management flexibility that could increase fishery stability. That is because a more holistic longer-term evaluation of conservation objectives (i.e., multi-year ACL contribution attainments) could be used to define how severe inseason mitigation responses should be.

17.a. Eliminate Daily Vessel Limits for Rebuilt Species or for All Species

Summary

Vessel limits in vessel accounts restrict the amount of Quota Pounds (QPs) that any vessel can catch or hold. Annual QP vessel limits are a set percentage of the Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) sector allocation, and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) annually calculates and publishes the QP equivalents. Unused QP vessel limits, also called “daily vessel limits”, apply to overfished species and cap the balance of overfished species QPs that any vessel can have in an account on a given day. This daily limit is lower than the annual QP vessel limit. The Council and NMFS established daily vessel limits to prevent hoarding of available overfished species QPs in any one vessel account due to the low IFQ sector allocations of some overfished species. Daily QP limits would be eliminated under Alternative 1 for newly rebuilt species: bocaccio (south), darkblotched rockfish, and Pacific ocean perch (POP). Under Alternative 2, all daily limits would be eliminated for all IFQ categories, including Alternative 1 species and Pacific halibut individual bycatch quota (IBQ), cowcod (south), and yelloweye rockfish. Only the shorebased trawl IFQ sector will be affected, with a geographic scope of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Range of Alternatives

Alternative 1: Status quo (removal of daily limits for rebuilt species).

Alternative 2: Eliminate daily limits (for all species).

Recommendation

After reviewing available analysis, **the GMT recommends Alternative 2, eliminate daily limits for all species**, as the daily limits do not appear to accomplish their intended purpose, and may incur more administrative costs to NMFS and vessel account owners rather than benefits to the fishery.

17.b. Implement Survival Credits for Discarded Lingcod and Sablefish

Summary

This management measure would provide IFQ survival credits for discards of lingcod and sablefish. Vessels are currently debited 100 percent for all discards whether they are alive or dead, which stemmed from an Amendment 20 goal to minimize discards. However, estimates of discard mortality used elsewhere in management (e.g., stock assessments and groundfish mortality reports) are based on SSC-approved discard mortality rates (DMRs) that are less than 100 percent (Table 1). Alternative 1 would debit QP based on these lesser DMRs, which would result in them “getting-back” a portion of QP of their discards, or a survival credit. This could allow vessels to increase landings of sablefish, lingcod, and co-occurring stocks constrained by sablefish in order

to better meet Amendment 20 and Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act goals of optimal yields.

Table 1. Alternative 1 Proposed DMRs for lingcod and sablefish.

Gear	Lingcod	Sablefish
Fixed	7%	20%
Bottom Trawl	50%	50%

Range of Alternatives

No Action: 100 percent debiting of QP for all discards of sablefish and lingcod.

Alternative 1: IFQ QP would be debited based on the DMRs in Table 1.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends that the Council adopt Alternative 1 as the PPA. Alternative 1 would align catch accounting practices in the IFQ program, stock assessments, and the groundfish mortality report. As described in [Appendix C](#), the primary concern with survival credits would be dramatic rises in discarding due to high-grading. Following the implementation of the IFQ program, there was a sharp decline in discarding with the 100 percent DMR and individual accountability standards. Discarding is not expected to subsequently increase with Alternative 1, as the costs of attempting to high-grade are expected to be greater than revenue benefits of retaining lower-value sablefish. The GMT does note that the application of these rates for the Vessel Accounting System will need to be coordinated with the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) and the Electronic Monitoring Program at the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC).

The GMT believes the workload associated with these changes for WCGOP and PSMFC will be low, but the precise timeline for implementation will be determined by the individual organizations. The GMT notes that these would be scientific changes that do not require rulemaking by NMFS, so we do not believe adoption of the credits would delay the 2019-2020 harvest specifications and management measures.

17.c. Continue the Adaptive Management Program Pass- Through Summary

Under the Amendment 20 trawl rationalization program, the shoreside IFQ program includes a set-aside of 10 percent of the non-whiting quota shares (QS; including halibut IBQ) for an adaptive management program (AMP). Each year, QP are issued for the AMP QS. The annually-issued AMP QP are distributed to address the following objectives: community stability; processor stability; conservation; unintended/unforeseen consequences of IFQ management; and facilitation of new entrants. However, criteria for distribution of AMP QP have yet to be developed. Therefore, the QP associated with this program have been passed through to QS holders on a pro rata basis in proportion to their QS holdings. The Council record indicates that it intended the pass-through to continue until after the five year program review and be the first action taken pursuant to that review, but the NMFS record indicates that the pass-through was to continue until changed. This action is to clarify the record and proper interpretation of the regulations.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: Council decision record indicates pass-through terminates, while NMFS decision record indicates the pass-through continues until changed (interpretation uncertain).

Alternative 1: Continue the pass-through until an alternative use of AMP is implemented.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends the Council adopt Alternative 1, continue AMP pass-through, as PPA. This would clarify the record and allow the Council and advisory bodies to continue to consider other uses for AMP.

18. Remove Automatic Authority Established in Conjunction with Amendment 21-3 for Darkblotched Rockfish and Pacific Ocean Perch in the At-Sea Sector

Summary

Through Amendment 21-3 to the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP), POP and darkblotched rockfish are now managed as sector-specific set-asides for the at-sea sectors based on the percentages outlined in Section 6.3.2.3 of the FMP and regulations at 660.55. Set-asides will be managed on an annual basis, unless a harvest specification risks being exceeded, an unforeseen impact on another fishery occurs, or conservation concerns become apparent, in which case inseason action may be taken. However, NMFS has the automatic authority to close either at-sea sector if a sector was projected to exceed their set-aside value and the buffer for either species. There is currently no buffer proposed for 2019-2020, and therefore, in essence, darkblotched rockfish and POP would be managed as allocations for the at-sea sectors. Under this new management measure, the Council is considering removing the automatic authority for these species so that they are managed like all other at-sea set-asides.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: Maintain automatic authority in regulation to close the at-sea sectors when the combined set-asides plus the buffer are taken for both POP and darkblotched rockfish.

Alternative 1: Remove automatic authority provision from regulation.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends the Council select Alternative 1 as the PPA. With no buffers proposed in 2019-2020, sectors have increased risk of reaching their sector-specific set aside values determined by the Amendment 21 formula for darkblotched rockfish and being closed due to the automatic authority provision. A significant amount of Council, NMFS, and advisory body time and resources has been used to prevent closures of the fisheries, which already operate under cooperative-style management to voluntarily avoid high bycatch areas. There is little to no risk of exceeding the IFQ sector allocation, trawl allocation, or the ACL (as shown in [Appendix C](#)). Additionally, if a situation were to arise inseason, the Regional Administrator of the NMFS West Coast Region has the authority to implement area restrictions, season closures, or other measures to prevent the trawl sectors (shorebased IFQ, mothership, and catcher/processor) in aggregate or

individually from exceeding an ACL or other formal allocation (see 660.150(a)(5) and 660.160(a)(5)).

19.a. Adjustment to the Seaward Boundary Non-Trawl Rockfish Conservation Area in California North of 40° 10' N. lat.

Summary

This management measure would modify the commercial seaward boundary of the non-trawl Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) from the California/Oregon border (42° N. lat.) to Cape Mendocino (40° 10' N. lat.). The non-trawl RCAs are currently in place from 30 fathoms to 100 fathoms; this action would modify the seaward boundary from 100 fathoms to 75 fathoms and would only apply to non-trawl commercial fisheries. The seaward boundary modification would provide more opportunity to target healthy shelf species stocks, such as yellowtail and widow rockfish, by allowing access to depths in which they are most prevalent. The targeting of such stocks will increase catch, but trip limit management should ensure it remains within allowable harvest limits. Canary rockfish is likely to be encountered and retained, which is expected to lead to impacts higher than those in 2017 but within allowable limits for 2019 and 2020. The non-trawl RCA adjustment would also apply to and could provide increased opportunities for the directed Pacific halibut fishery.

Modifications to RCAs are designated as routine management measures in the groundfish FMP. NMFS has routinely made modifications to RCAs via inseason action for commercial trawl, commercial fixed gear, and recreational fisheries. Because the seaward boundary of the non-trawl RCA in the proposed area has been in place for over a decade, the analysis in [Appendix C](#) (pages 93-109) was completed to help inform potential impacts of this action.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: The seaward boundary of the non-trawl RCA in California north of 40° 10' N. lat. would remain at 100 fathoms.

Alternative 1: The seaward boundary of the non-trawl RCA would be modified from 100 fathoms to 75 fathoms in California north of 40° 10' N. lat.

Recommendation

The GMT believes the analysis in [Appendix C](#) (pages 93-109) may have underestimated the potential impacts to yelloweye rockfish, since the analysis is based on the assumption that little rocky habitat in the area would translate to low yelloweye rockfish interactions. According to the available substrate data, about 32 percent of the 0.3 percent of the portion of hard habitat proposed to be open will remain closed because of the Mattole Canyon State Marine Reserve. Midwater rockfishes (e.g., yellowtail, widow, and canary rockfishes) can congregate near these rocky habitats where yelloweye rockfish co-occur, and therefore any increased targeting near these areas may lead to increased yelloweye rockfish impact. By opening the non-trawl RCA, the industry could benefit by targeting underutilized shelf and midwater rockfish as well as Pacific halibut. Communities such as Eureka may be able to access historical fishing grounds that were closed off when the non-trawl RCA went into place. However, given limited data, the GMT acknowledges that projected impacts to yelloweye rockfish are difficult to quantify. The GMT also recognizes that the nearshore fishery has low observer coverage, so future estimates of yelloweye rockfish

bycatch in this sector will remain highly uncertain and precise impacts of these management changes will be difficult to assess.

In order to provide a more robust assessment of potential yelloweye rockfish impacts, the GMT believes it would be prudent to examine better proxy bycatch rate data that reflect the expected gears and fishing strategy. For instance, since fishermen are expected to target rockfish using fixed gears over rocky habitat in the 75-100 fathom depths, it would be better to use bycatch data from those types of trips.

When assessing the risk of this management measure, the Council should consider the risk to the yelloweye rockfish non-nearshore share, the non-trawl allocation, and the overall ACL. Under the No Action Alternative for yelloweye rockfish, there is currently a projected 0.3 mt residual from the non-nearshore share.

The GMT does not have a recommendation on this management measure at this time, as it is seen as a Council call on risk tolerance. If the Council decides to move this measure forward, the GMT recommends additional analysis to better estimate projected yelloweye rockfish impacts.

19.b. Modify Commercial Fixed Gear Depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area

Summary

This management measure would modify the allowable fishing depths for the commercial fixed gear fishery inside the western Cowcod Conservation Area (CCA) from 20 fathoms to 30 fathoms or 40 fathoms, and add new waypoints approximating 30 and 40 fathoms depth contours around Santa Barbara Island, San Nicolas Island, Tanner Bank, and Cortes Bank. Nearshore rockfish, shelf rockfish, cabezon, kelp greenling, California scorpionfish, and lingcod can be retained shoreward of the 20 fathoms depth contour within the CCA. Other Flatfish may also be taken year round at any depths when using no more than 12 #2 or smaller hooks.

While 30 and 40 fathom depth contours are currently specified in regulation at 50 CRF 660.71-660.73, none have been specified inside the CCA, which are proposed to be used by recreational and commercial fisheries. This management measure proposes to add new waypoints to approximate the 30 fathom and 40 fathom depth contours inside the CCA.

This management measure is expected to increase catch of shelf rockfish, bocaccio, and deeper nearshore rockfish, cabezon, kelp greenling, and California scorpionfish, but mortality is expected to be well within the non-trawl allocations and harvest specifications. A significant increase in catch of cowcod is not expected, because (1) the highest densities are found in depths of 100 fathoms to 130 fathoms out of their 22 fathom to 270 fathom depth range ([SAFE 2016](#)); (2) no cowcod catch has been documented in the very small number of WCGOP-observed fixed gear sets made in the western CCA between 2002 and 2016, and (3) the Northwest Fisheries Science Center hook-and-line survey has sampled the 20 to 125 fathom depth range outside of the CCA since 2004 and within the CCA since 2014 and has never encountered cowcod at depths shallower than 40 fathoms.

During the 2009-2010 biennial specification and management measure process, a similar proposal to extend the RCA to 30 fathoms within the CCA was approved by the council but ultimately disapproved by NMFS in the final rule. The disapproval was attributed to concerns regarding impacts to juvenile cowcod that could impede rebuilding of a stock that at the time was at 4.5 percent of unfished biomass. The most current stock assessment (2013) suggested a significant improvement in the stock status resulting in 34 percent of unfished biomass and a projection to rebuild 48 years ahead of schedule (2020 versus 2068). In consideration of the GMT recommendation for a 6 mt ACT for cowcod ([Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1](#)), and the NMFS hook-and-line survey demonstrating zero cowcod impacts in the depths and region being proposed to be opened ([Appendix C](#), page 139), the GMT believes that additional impacts to cowcod would be minimal as a result of this action.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: Maintain allowable fishing depths for the commercial fixed gear fishery inside the western CCA from shore to 20 fathoms.

Alternative 1: Modify the allowable fishing depths for the commercial fixed gear fishery inside the western CCA from 20 fathoms to 30 fathoms, or 40 fathoms, and add new waypoints approximating 30 and 40 fathom depth contours around Santa Barbara Island, San Nicolas Island, Tanner Bank, and Cortes Bank.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends the Council consider Alternative 1 as the PPA. The GMT does not have a recommendation on 30 vs. 40 fathoms, as that decision would be dependent on the Council's risk tolerance.

20. Modify Recreational Fixed Gear Depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area

Summary

This management measure would modify the allowable fishing depths for the recreational fishery inside the western CCA from 20 fathoms to 30 fathoms or 40 fathoms and add new waypoints approximating the 30 and 40 fathom depth contours around Santa Barbara Island, San Nicolas Island, Tanner Bank, and Cortes Bank.

Under baseline Federal regulations, minor nearshore rockfish, cabezon, kelp greenling, lingcod, and shelf rockfishes can be retained shoreward of 20 fathoms from March 1 through December 31. California scorpionfish can be retained January 1 through August 31. Petrale sole and starry flounder may be taken year round at any depths within the CCA. Species in the Other Flatfish group may also be taken year round at any depth if using no more than 12 #2 or smaller hooks.

While 30 and 40 fathom depth contours are currently specified in regulation at 50 CRF 660.71-660.73, none have been specified inside the CCA. This management measure proposes to add new waypoints to approximate the 30 fathom and 40 fathom depth contours inside the CCA.

This management measure is expected to increase catch of shelf rockfishes, bocaccio, and deeper nearshore rockfish, but mortality is expected to be well within the non-trawl allocations and harvest specifications. No changes are expected for cabezon and kelp greenling, because they are already

accessible under the current depth restrictions. This measure could result in minor increased interactions with cowcod; however significant increases to cowcod impacts are not expected as the Recfish model projects impacts that encompass the entire southern management area at the allowable fishing depth (60 fathoms). Any additional cowcod impacts as a result of this proposal have already been accounted for by the model as it assumes the same depth restriction inside and outside the CCA.

As mentioned above in Agenda Item 19.b, the GMT notes the reason and rationale for the previous disapproval of a similar proposal are no longer applicable.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: Maintain allowable fishing depths for the recreational fishery inside the western CCA from shore to 20 fathoms.

Alternative 1: Modify the allowable fishing depths for the recreational fishery inside the western CCA from 20 fathoms to 30 fathoms or 40 fathoms and add new waypoints approximating 30 and 40 fathom depth contours around Santa Barbara Island, San Nicolas Island, Tanner Bank, and Cortes Bank.

Recommendation

The GMT recommends the Council consider Alternative 1 as the PPA. The GMT does not have a recommendation on 30 vs. 40 fathoms, as that decision would be dependent on the Council's risk tolerance.

21. Incidental Lingcod Retention Ratio in the Salmon Troll Fishery

Summary

In March 2018 under the inseason agenda item, the Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) requested that the Council consider a change in the incidental lingcod retention ratio in the salmon troll fishery from one lingcod per 15 Chinook salmon to one lingcod per 5 Chinook salmon. The GMT consulted NMFS staff since that time and determined that the change could not be considered a routine inseason agenda item as the proposed ratio was outside of the previously analyzed range from the 2009-2010 biennium. WDFW provided a preliminary analysis and proposal to include this change within the 2019-2020 biennium ([Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental WDFW Report 2, April 2018](#)). Based on conversations with the SAS additional alternatives have been added to be considered as a part of this management. The intent of these alternatives was to provide a wide range of options to be able to consider inseason adjustments in the future.

Range of Alternatives

No Action: Retain the current trip limit of one lingcod per 15 Chinook salmon

Alternative 1: 1 lingcod for every 5 Chinook salmon, retain 10 lingcod trip limit

Alternative 2: 1 lingcod for every 2 Chinook salmon, no trip limit

All vessels are held to the monthly OA lingcod trip limit for all the alternatives.

Recommendation

The GMT believes that the range of alternatives is sufficient for analysis, but does not have a recommendation for a PPA at this time. If the Council were to move forward with this item, it is likely that the analysis will show a ratio and potentially a trip limit that falls within the OA lingcod monthly limit, and maintains the incidental nature of the fishery.

The GMT recognizes that any impacts to yelloweye rockfish and lingcod from this fishery would need to be accounted for as part of the incidental open access off-the-top deduction. Therefore, the set-aside would need to be recalculated based on the limited information available before the Council takes final action on allocations in June.

Prioritization and Workload Considerations

While it is the Council that ultimately decides on prioritization, the GMT provides is providing information on what we see as priorities. Given the mandatory salmon mitigation measures, the additional analysis needed to consider a change to the yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan, and the scope of proposed new management measures, the GMT anticipates that the Council will need to have some discussion on priorities, and the amount of work that can be completed by the advanced June briefing book deadline (May 11). To aid in that discussion, the GMT provides some qualitative information (Table 2) on the complexity and the remaining workload for the new management measures.

The GMT's overarching workload priority is the analysis supporting a change to the yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan, with the Council's PPA for yelloweye rockfish (Alternative 1) under the harvest specifications action item (Agenda Item F.2.) potentially providing large benefits to many fishery sectors and communities. Without this analysis, some of the proposed new management measures discussed above would not be feasible. The GMT had extensive discussions on the workload of each of the items, potential benefits of the measure, and how the Council may best prioritize management measures given the limited time and resources of NMFS, Council, and state agency staff.

Therefore, the GMT recommends that the Council consider, in addition to the analysis supporting a change to the yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan and the salmon mitigation measures, selecting the Western CCA (Items 19.b. and 20) and the Amendment 21-3 (Item 18) proposals as priorities.

The GMT believes this suite of management measures could provide benefits to the greatest number of sectors and communities across the West Coast. The proposed yelloweye rockfish ACLs, under all alternatives, would provide the ability to liberalize management measures in the non-trawl sectors and increase the volume of QP trading in the IFQ sector. Increasing the depths inside the Western CCA would provide opportunity to access areas closed to both commercial and recreational participants. Finally, the removal of the automatic authority for darkblotched rockfish and POP in the at-sea sectors would reduce the risk of closure of the fishery due to unanticipated bycatch without impacting the IFQ sector. Additionally, eliminating the automatic authority has the potential to minimize the number of inseason actions to find additional darkblotched rockfish allocation to flow to the at-sea sectors if constraining. We recognize that all of the new management measures under consideration would provide benefits to various sectors; however,

we believe that our recommendation provides a broad range of benefits to the most fishery participants.

As the Council considers issues of workload and priorities, **the GMT strongly recommends that the Council limit the number of new management measures forwarded for consideration in June to allow us to focus on the justification for changes to the yelloweye rockfish rebuilding plan and salmon mitigation measures to increase the likelihood of meeting the January 1, 2019 timeline for implementation.**

Table 2. List of remaining new management measures with qualitative information on remaining workload and some considerations, to help Council decision making. This does not include the salmon mitigation measures presented in Supplemental GMT Report 3 under this Agenda Item.

No.	Description	Remaining Workload for June BB deadline (H, M, L)	Considerations
16.b.	Stock complex restructuring	Low	High priority for OR fishery stability; lesser priority for WA
17.a.	Eliminate daily vessel limits for rebuilt or all species (Section C.3.7)	Low	Benefits are largely administrative
17.b.	Implement survival credits for discarded lingcod and sablefish (Section C.3.3)	Low; Implementation for WCGOP and EM	Science update that would not require rulemaking workload
17.c.	Continue the Adaptive Management Program pass-through	Low	Administrative clarification
18.	Removal of automatic authority established in conjunction with Amendment 21-3 for darkblotched rockfish and POP (Section C.3.2)	Low	Reduces at-sea constraints w/o harm to IFQ; saves inseason workload
19.a.	Adjustment to the non-trawl Rockfish Conservation Area in California north of 40° 10' N. lat. (Section C.3.4)	High	\$ to economically depressed communities; more analysis possible
19.b.	Modify commercial fixed gear depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area to either 30 or 40 fathoms (Section C.3.5)	Low	High priority for CA: provide additional access in areas that have been severely constrained
20.	Modify recreational fixed gear depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area to either 30 or 40 fathoms (Section C.3.5)	Low	High priority for CA: provide additional access in areas that have been severely constrained
21.	Incidental lingcod retention in the salmon troll fishery	High	\$ to help offset poor salmon seasons; more analysis required

Recommendation Summary

New Management Measures for Implementation in 2019-2020 GMT recommendations in bold			
#	Category	Sector	Measure
16		All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Salmon Incidental Take (Section C.1) see Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 3 b. Stock complex restructuring (Section C.3.1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends that the Council adopt Option 2 of Proposal 2 (WDFW) for the stock complexes. o The GMT does not have a recommendation for the Oregon options, since we believe this is a policy risk call.
17		Trawl, Shorebased IFQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Eliminate daily vessel limits for rebuilt or all species (Section C.3.7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends Alternative 2, eliminate daily limits for all species. b. Implement survival credits for discarded lingcod and sablefish (Section C.3.3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends that the Council adopt Alternative 1 as the PPA. c. Continue the Adaptive Management Program pass-through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends the Council adopt Alternative 1, continue AMP pass-through, as PPA.
18		Trawl, At-Sea	<p>Removal of automatic authority established in conjunction with Amendment 21-3 for darkblotched rockfish and POP (Section C.3.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends the Council select Alternative 1 as the PPA.

New Management Measures for Implementation in 2019-2020 GMT recommendations in bold			
#	Category	Sector	Measure
19		Commercial Non-Trawl	<p>a. Adjustment to the non-trawl Rockfish Conservation Area in California north of 40° 10' N. lat. (Section C.3.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT does not have a recommendation on this management measure at this time, as it is seen as a Council call on risk tolerance. If the Council decides to move this measure forward, the GMT recommends additional analysis to better estimate projected yelloweye rockfish impacts. <p>b. Modify commercial fixed gear depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area to either 30 or 40 fathoms (Section C.3.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends the Council consider Alternative 1 as the PPA. The GMT does not have a recommendation on 30 vs. 40 fathoms, as that decision would be dependent on the Council's risk tolerance.
20		CA Rec	<p>Modify recreational fixed gear depths inside the Western Cowcod Conservation Area to either 30 or 40 fathoms (Section C.3.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT recommends the Council consider Alternative 1 as the PPA. o GMT does not have a recommendation on 30 vs. 40 fathoms, as that decision would be dependent on the Council's risk tolerance.
21		Salmon Troll	<p>Incidental lingcod retention limits in the salmon troll fishery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The GMT believes that the range of alternatives is sufficient for analysis, but does not have a recommendation for a PPA at this time.