



Report of the 89th Session of the IPHC Conference Board (CB089)

Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, 29-30 January 2019

DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Session
Members of the Commission
IPHC Secretariat

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IPHC 2019. Report of the 89th Session of the IPHC Conference Board. Victoria, Canada, 29-30 January 2019. *IPHC-2019-CB089-R*, 22 pp.



INTERNATIONAL PACIFIC
HALIBUT COMMISSION

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication and its lists do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This work is protected by copyright. Fair use of this material for scholarship, research, news reporting, criticism or commentary is permitted. Selected passages, tables or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgment of the source is included. Major extracts or the entire document may not be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the Executive Director, IPHC.

The IPHC has exercised due care and skill in the preparation and compilation of the information and data set out in this publication. Notwithstanding, the IPHC, its employees and advisers, assert all rights and immunities, and disclaim all liability, including liability for negligence, for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon any of the information or data set out in this publication, to the maximum extent permitted by law including the International Organizations Immunities Act.

Contact details:

International Pacific Halibut Commission
2320 W. Commodore Way, Suite 300
Seattle, WA, 98199-1287, U.S.A.
Phone: +1 206 634 1838
Fax: +1 206 632 2983
Email: secretariat@iphc.int
Website: <http://iphc.int/>

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------|--|
| AM | Annual Meeting, of the IPHC |
| CB | Conference Board |
| CPUE | Catch per unit effort |
| FCEY | Fishery Constant Exploitation Yield |
| FISS | Fishery-independent setline survey |
| IPHC | International Pacific Halibut Commission |
| MSAB | Management Strategy Advisory Board |
| NPFMC | North Pacific Fishery Management Council |
| NPUE | Number Per Unit Effort |
| SB | Spawning Biomass |
| SRB | Scientific Review Board |
| SPR | Spawning Potential Ratio |
| TCEY | Total Constant Exploitation Yield |
| WPUE | Weight Per Unit Effort |

DEFINITIONS

A set of working definitions are provided in the IPHC Glossary of Terms and abbreviations: <https://iphc.int/the-commission/glossary-of-terms-and-abbreviations>

HOW TO INTERPRET TERMINOLOGY CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

This report has been written using the following terms and associated definitions so as to remove ambiguity surrounding how particular paragraphs should be interpreted.

- Level 1: RECOMMENDED; RECOMMENDATION; ADOPTED** (formal); **REQUESTED; ENDORSED** (informal): A conclusion for an action to be undertaken, by a Contracting Party, a subsidiary (advisory) body of the Commission and/or the IPHC Secretariat.
- Level 2: AGREED:** Any point of discussion from a meeting which the Commission considers to be an agreed course of action covered by its mandate, which has not already been dealt with under Level 1 above; a general point of agreement among delegations/participants of a meeting which does not need to be elevated in the Commission's reporting structure.
- Level 3: NOTED/NOTING; CONSIDERED; URGED; ACKNOWLEDGED:** General terms to be used for consistency. Any point of discussion from a meeting which the Commission considers to be important enough to record in a meeting report for future reference. Any other term may be used to highlight to the reader of an IPHC report, the importance of the relevant paragraph. Other terms may be used but will be considered for explanatory/informational purposes only and shall have no higher rating within the reporting terminology hierarchy than Level 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| REPORT OF THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089) | 1 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 4 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION | 7 |
| 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION | 7 |
| 3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION | 7 |
| 4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES | 7 |
| 5. MANAGEMENT STRATEGY EVALUATION | 8 |
| 6. MORTALITY LIMITS | 8 |
| 6.1 <i>Coastwide perspectives</i> | 8 |
| 6.2 <i>Regulatory Area perspectives</i> | 11 |
| 7. REGULATORY PROPOSALS FOR 2018 | 12 |
| 7.1 <i>IPHC Secretariat regulatory proposals</i> | 12 |
| 7.2 <i>Contracting Party regulatory proposals</i> | 13 |
| 7.3 <i>Other Stakeholder regulatory proposals</i> | 13 |
| 8. BYCATCH | 14 |
| 9. OTHER BUSINESS | 14 |
| 9.1 <i>Annual Meeting documents</i> | 14 |
| 9.2 <i>MSAB position</i> | 15 |
| 10. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 88TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB088) | 15 |
| APPENDIX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089) | 16 |
| APPENDIX II AGENDA FOR THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089) | 19 |
| APPENDIX III PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2019 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY CATCH LIMITS | 20 |
| APPENDIX IV CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089) (29-30 JANUARY 2019) | 21 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 89th Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB089) was held in Victoria, Canada, from 29-30 January 2019. A total of 70 (78 in 2018) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. Canada accredited 2 new members and the USA accredited 5 new members, for participation in the 2019 Conference Board proceedings. The meeting was opened by Mr. Jeff Kaufman (U.S.A.) and Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants to Victoria, Canada.

The following are a subset of the complete recommendations and requests for action from the CB089, which are provided at [Appendix IV](#).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates

CB089-Rec.02 ([para. 14](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2019:

- a) Opening: 02 March
- b) Closing: 30 November

Mortality limits

CB089-Rec.04 ([para. 28](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following TCEY mortality limits for the 2019 fishing period as provided in [Table 1](#), which translate to the mortality estimates by sector (as provided by the IPHC Secretariat) provided in [Appendix III](#) and an SPR of 46%.

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2019.

| IPHC Regulatory Area | Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlbs) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2A | 1.65 |
| 2B | 7.38 |
| 2C | 6.30 |
| 3A | 13.81 |
| 3B | 3.12 |
| 4A | 1.90 |
| 4B | 1.50 |
| 4CDE | 3.94 |
| Total (IPHC Convention Area) | 39.60 |

Fishery Limits (Sect. 4)

CB089-Rec.05 ([para. 30](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 6](#).

IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

CB089-Rec.06 ([para. 35](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA3.

Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A

CB089-Rec.07 ([para. 38](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropB1.

Minimum TCEY in IPHC Regulatory Area 2A

CB089-Rec.08 ([para. 40](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission does not adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC1.

IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Quota Proposal

CB089-Rec.09 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt an earlier start date (second half of May) for the IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Non-Treaty directed commercial fishery's initial fishing period.

Bycatch

CB089-Rec.11 ([para. 48](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission communicate these concerns to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council:

- a) New work by the IPHC Secretariat indicates that U26 bycatch impacts the spawning potential of the Pacific halibut stock on a ratio of 1:1.8 –i.e., one pound of bycatch results in a 1.8-pound loss of future Pacific halibut yield to the directed fisheries (TCEY), noting that 65% of the U26 Pacific halibut mortality occurs in IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE, where observer coverage on groundfish vessels is high and bycatch reduction incentive programs are in place. Approximately 28% of the U26 bycatch occurs in Region 3, where observer coverage on trawl vessels is lower.

CB089-Rec.12 ([para. 49](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission strongly recommend that the NPFMC:

- a) prioritize Pacific halibut bycatch reduction in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, and take meaningful action to protect the future potential of the Pacific halibut stock and the directed fisheries.
- b) Increase observer coverage on Gulf of Alaska trawl vessels to more accurately account for bycatch and its impacts on the Pacific halibut stock and directed Pacific halibut fisheries.

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 89th Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB089) was held in Victoria, Canada, from 29-30 January 2019. A total of 70 (78 in 2018) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. Canada accredited 2 new members and the USA accredited 7 new members, for participation in the 2019 Conference Board proceedings. The list of participants is provided at [Appendix I](#). The meeting was opened by Mr Jeff Kaufman (U.S.A.) and Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants to Victoria, Canada.
2. In accordance with Appendix IV, Section III of the IPHC Rules of Procedure (2017), the CB **NOTED** the requirement to elect Co-Chairpersons, and the option to elect up to two (2) Vice-Chairpersons, of the CB until the beginning of the next Session in 2020.
3. The CB **CALLED** for nominations for the positions of Co-Chairpersons of the CB until the opening of the next session in 2020. Mr Jim Lane (Canada) and Mr Jeff Kauffman (United States of America) were nominated, seconded and elected as Co-Chairpersons.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

4. The CB **ADOPTED** the Agenda as provided at [Appendix II](#), which include an item to discuss the current work by the IPHC on Management Strategy Evaluation. The documents provided to the CB089 are those submitted for the 95th Session of the Annual Meeting (AM095).
5. The CB **ACKNOWLEDGED** the attendance of long-time CB participant, Mr Clem Tillion and his continued and past insightful contributions to the CB.

3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION

6. The CB **NOTED** paper IPHC-2019-AM095-11 Rev_1 which provided an introduction and usage guide for the IPHC's web-based mortality projection tool (<https://iphc.int/data/projection-tool>).
7. The CB **NOTED** the summary of IPHC Regulatory Area-specific mortality projections for 2019 based on the interim management procedure and other alternatives.

IPHC Rules of Procedure

8. The CB **NOTED** paper IPHC-2019-AM095-20 which provided an opportunity to consider proposed amendments to the IPHC Rules of Procedure (2017).
9. The CB **AGREED** to facilitate inter-sessional communication with the IPHC Secretariat, and among all CB members by providing contact names and email addresses in the CB report list of participants ([Appendix I](#)).
10. The CB **NOTED** that an ad-hoc working group would be formed to consider specific topics with five CB members from Canada (Gerry Kristianson, Chris Sporer, Chuck Ashcroft, Bill Shaw and Jim Lane) and six CB members from U.S.A (Kathy Hansen, Duncan Fields, Jim Johnson, Angel Drobnica, Rebecca Skinner and Linda Behnken) to work through the year to develop a set of recommendations on the terms of reference and an accreditation process for CB members in the interim to be brought to CB090 for action.
11. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission defer the revised IPHC Rules of Procedure (2019) to AM096 for adoption, specifically related to the CB, with respect to the terms of reference as the ad-hoc group that was formed felt that the changes are more than clarifying or technical in nature. [**Canada**: In favour=unanimous][**USA**: In favour=unanimous]

4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES

12. The CB **AGREED** that, for both opening and closing, the dates should emphasize the longest fishing period possible. The following reasons were given for this rationale:
 - a) Maximize time to catch quota
 - b) Longer season for market and bycatch considerations

13. The CB **NOTED** that several members expressed concern regarding the time the USA may require to have fishing permits ready for an early March opening.

Recommendation

14. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2019:

- a) Opening: 02 March [in favour=56; against=1; abstain=13]
- b) Closing: 30 November [in favour=53; against=1; abstain=16]

5. MANAGEMENT STRATEGY EVALUATION

15. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission does the following: [in favour=68; against=1; abstain=1]
- a) supports the work to date by the MSAB and their identified goals and objectives;
 - b) support prioritization of conservation over fishery performance objectives;
 - c) support preliminary SPR target of 42-43% and SPR range of 40-46%; and
 - d) support goal of restraining annual variability to 15% or less, and encourage MSAB to continue to develop management procedures that control annual variability, such as those presented at this meeting (AM095).

6. MORTALITY LIMITS

16. The CB **NOTED** paper IPHC-2019-AM095-11 Rev_1 which provided an introduction and usage guide for the IPHC's web-based mortality projection tool (<https://iphc.int/data/projection-tool>).

6.1 Coastwide perspectives

17. The CB **NOTED** that U.S.A. put forth a motion to recommend an SPR of 48% with a Coastwide TCEY of 38.23 million pounds with the following rationale: [**Canada:** In favour=0; against=35; abstain=0; **USA:** In favour=33; against=0; abstain=0]
- a) the goal of establishing a conservative overall number as the first step, to be followed by a decision on distribution, which is the IPHC recommended process under the adopted SPR management approach;
 - b) recognition that to a large degree the determination that 2018 fishing intensity is F48 depends on the estimated strength of the incoming 2011 and 2012 year classes, noting the significant uncertainty associated with the size of the 2011 and 2012 year classes at this time, that this uncertainty is expected to be resolved with additional years' data, and recognizing the need to be conservative until the strength of these two years classes is confirmed; and
 - c) the overly optimistic estimation of the 2005/06 year classes resulted in fishing intensity over the target rates and a significant retrospective bias to the detriment of the Pacific halibut stock.
18. The CB **NOTED** the following perspectives shared by U.S.A. CB members:
- a) encouraged by improvements in precision the enhanced FISS has achieved, however note stock is facing a series of incoming weak year classes from 2006 to 2010 that will reduce spawning biomass in the near term,
 - b) in response to the weak incoming year classes, the FISS NPUE is at a 20-year low and showed continued decline in most management areas and coast wide;
 - c) FISS WPUE also declined in five of the eight management areas, and showed an overall 7% decline coast wide;
 - d) commercial WPUE are at low levels and showed decline in many areas;
 - e) support of the slow up/fast down management procedure to smooth annual variability in catch limits and account for survey encounter variability and imprecision (Slow up means the TCEY is

set 1/3 of the way up from last year's TCEY to this year's TCEY by area; fast down means the TCEY is set half way between last year's TCEY and this year's TCEY); and

- f) slow up/fast down adds conservation benefits by dampening potential increases, particularly notable in 2019 for Area 3A, where the SPR46 reference level would have resulted in a 30% TCEY increase in this area instead of the 10% increase included in this motion.

19. The CB **NOTED** the following perspectives shared by U.S.A. CB members:

- a) appreciation for the work of the MSAB and the results put forward by the MSE process noting this is ongoing and final recommendation on scale and distribution are expected within one to two years;
- b) support for the goals established by the MSAB relating to conservation and fishery performance; and the prioritization of conservation objectives over fishery performance as necessary;
- c) support for the MSE process's introduction of management procedures to define coast wide scale and distribution results;
- d) belief this process will improve the quality and equity of the annual mortality limit setting process, while preserving the ability of the CB to recommend, and the Commissioners to consider short term tactical changes;

20. The CB **NOTED** that Canada moved to approve a TCEY of 7.38 million pounds for Canada (IPHC Regulatory Area 2B). [**Canada:** In favour=35; against=0; abstain=0; **USA:** In favour=0; against=30; abstain=3]

21. The CB **NOTED** the following perspectives shared by the CB members from Canada:

- a) Canada supported the proposed IPHC Regulatory Area 2A TCEY of 1.65 M lbs for 2019; however, as the USA refused to divide their proposal (paragraph 17, above) so that a separate vote was held on the allocation to IPHC Regulatory Area 2A, Canada could not support the motion as proposed to that area that was consistent with the approach Canada was taking because the "apportionment" method for coastwide distribution was unsuitable. Canada noted this inconsistency in the US approach.
- b) Support for the work of the MSAB and their recommendations, which call for a target SPR of 42-43 for a long term harvest policy, but also include a range of SPR 40-46 to allow for short term tactical decisions,
- c) that a good choice at the coastwide level does not necessarily result in good outcomes given how the harvest is presently allocated and that there are concerns about the TCEY that results from the target SPR of the MSAB recommendation,
- d) that there is concern regarding
 - i. allocating large amounts to the western areas given FISS results and the continued downward trend; and
 - ii. poor recruitment, and that we should see another year of the 2011/12 year class before relying on it too heavily,
- e) comfort with what was being seen and experienced on the IPHC Regulatory Area 2B grounds this year.

22. The CB **NOTED** that Canadian CB members have never agreed with the '*apportionment*' methodology and the following perspectives shared by the CB members from Canada:

- a) There is no agreement or (biological justification) on the current distribution procedure (*apportionment*) to allocate to the Regulatory Area level;

- b) as a result, Canada initially proposed a 20% share of the coastwide TCEY for Canada (that has been the annual average for Canada for the past five to six years) and based on an SPR 46, which is consistent with the MSAB recommendations and having heard concerns from some Conference Board members about a 20% share, Canada amended its proposal to an 18.5% share, which, at an SPR 46, results in an IPHC Regulatory Area 2B TCEY of 7.38 M lbs;
- c) the MSAB has not commented on a Slow Up/Fast Down adjustment mechanism and notes it will be taken to MSAB for evaluation (as noted in the 2008 peer review of the coast wide stock assessment, it was ad hoc and had never been formally evaluated); and
- d) The proposed Area 2B TCEY is also responsive to FISS results; it represents a 4% increase in the IPHC Regulatory Area 2B TCEY and the FISS [O32 WPUE] increased by 6% compared to last year.

23. The CB **NOTED** the following perspectives shared by U.S.A. CB members:

- a) that the same management procedure adopted and implemented in Alaska should be adopted and implemented in Canada, and that the full rationale from above supports consistent treatment of Canada and Alaska areas;
- b) Surveyed distribution provides an objective measure of stock distribution and an equitable basis for TCEY distribution. In recent years, the FISS has found 11-13% of the Pacific halibut stock in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B. The IPHC Regulatory Area 2B TCEY should be proportional to abundance. A TCEY in excess of 13% of total is unfair to other harvesters and unacceptable to the USA;
- c) The enhanced FISS conducted in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B in 2018 indicated that there has been a chronic overestimation of abundance in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B by the FISS. Catch levels similar to last year will result in harvest level even farther above reference levels than previously assumed;
- d) Canada points to bycatch in Alaska as rationale for harvest above the reference SPR, but recent data supplied by the IPHC Secretariat indicate that the Alaska bycatch impact on IPHC Regulatory Area 2B is in the 400,000 pound range, not the 1-2 million pound extra mortality Canada has imposed on the Pacific halibut stock. In addition, both IPHC Regulatory Area 2A and 2C have addressed and controlled bycatch, with IPHC Regulatory Area 2C eliminating trawling and responsible for the lowest bycatch levels of any area;
- e) FISS stations along the border between IPHC Regulatory Area 2B and 2C showed significant decline, which may be associated with excess fishing pressure by lodges and other harvesters in this area. IPHC Regulatory Areas 2A and 2C are concerned overharvest by IPHC Regulatory Area 2B fishermen are negatively impacting Region 2 Pacific halibut abundance;
- f) IPHC Regulatory Area 2B FISS WPUE is significantly lower than IPHC Regulatory Area 2C even with the 2018 drop in IPHC Regulatory Area 2C WPUE and the 2018 increase in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B. Allocating a higher percentage of total to IPHC Regulatory 2B than 2C does not reflect relative health of the stock between the two areas;
- g) Canada's request for SPR 46% and 7.38 million pounds can only be achieved with a 6.2% reduction in the US TCEY. This is inequitable to US fishermen; and
- h) recognizes Treaty rights of IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Tribes and for 2019 will support 1.65 TCEY.

24. The CB **NOTED** that U.S.A. moved to approve an U.S.A. TCEY of 32.22 million pounds with the following TCEYs for each of the IPHC Regulatory Areas in U.S.A.:

- a) IPHC Regulatory Area 2A TCEY of 1.65 million pounds;
- b) IPHC Regulatory Area 2C TCEY of 6.30 million pounds;
- c) IPHC Regulatory Area 3A TCEY of 13.81 million pounds;
- d) IPHC Regulatory Area 3B TCEY of 3.12 million pounds;
- e) IPHC Regulatory Area 4A TCEY of 1.90 million pounds;
- f) IPHC Regulatory Area 4B TCEY of 1.50 million pounds; and

g) IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE TCEY of 3.94 million pounds with the resulting votes:

Canada: In favour=0; against=36; abstain=0

USA: In favour=34; against=0; abstain=0

25. The CB **NOTED** the following perspectives shared by U.S.A. CB members:

- a) use of O32 WPUE proportion in each IPHC Regulatory Area;
- b) use of relative harvest rates by IPHC Regulatory Area (2A-3A=1, 3B-4=0.75);
- c) the use of the following management procedures;
 - a. initial SPR of F 46 with distribution based default mortality percentage from the IPHC mortality tool;
 - b. slow-up, Fast Down smoothing procedure based on 50% down and 33% up on difference between 2018 and 2019 reference F 46 TCEY; and
 - c. an IPHC Regulatory Area 2A adjustment of 0.6 million pounds in addition.
- d) belief the catch limits recommended by this motion incorporate many of the recommendations of the MSAB by:
 - a. Using repeatable management procedures and data sources to consistently and equitably set the scale and distribution of mortality limits;
 - b. Starting with a Reference SPR value of F 46, which is the current IPHC reference harvest rate, within the range recommended by the MSAB and appropriately precautionary given the stock status considerations noted above;
 - c. Using the existing interim stock distribution inputs of O32 distribution and relative harvest rates among management areas;
 - d. Using a smoothing management procedure to reduce annual variability to acceptable levels;
 - e. further prioritizing conservation over fishery performance in recommending a final harvest rate of F 48 after slow up/fast down is applied.

6.2 *Regulatory Area perspectives*

IPHC Regulatory Area 2A

26. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 2A harvesters:

- a) allocation less than this make it extremely difficult to implement the fisheries off the west coast of U.S.A. under the catch share plan among the tribes, recreational and commercial users;
- b) average removals over time has been 1.79 million pounds which suggest the area can sustain this level of removals;
- c) the Makah unrestricted directed fisheries CPUE is up 200% since 2013;
- d) there is trawl rationalisation on the west coast and since its implementation there have been dramatic increases in Pacific halibut abundance along with a dramatic decrease in Pacific halibut bycatch (by 800,000 pounds);
- e) That this is a terminal fishery such that other areas do not have to pay for this increase; and
- f) the spawning biomass is between 150 and 250 million pounds such that this small increase has no statistical influence on the spawning biomass.

IPHC Regulatory Areas 4B

27. The CB **NOTED** the following from Regulatory Area 4A, 4B and 4CDE harvesters:

- a) the burden of conservation in Alaska biological areas has fallen hardest on IPHC Regulatory Area 4B in relative distribution terms with a direct application of a 46 SPR providing a 4.9% distribution while applying the slow up/fast down approach resulted in a 4% distribution; and
- b) this is a separate biological area and allowing a higher catch at the full 4.9% distribution level would have been appropriate given the 17% increase in the FISS together with increases in FISS and commercial WPUE's and NPUE's.

Recommendation

28. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following TCEY mortality limits for the 2019 fishing period as provided in [Table 1](#), which translate to the mortality estimates by sector (as provided by the IPHC Secretariat) provided in [Appendix III](#) and an SPR of 46%.

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2019. See previous paragraphs for voting.

| IPHC Regulatory Area | Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlbs) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2A | 1.65 |
| 2B | 7.38 |
| 2C | 6.30 |
| 3A | 13.81 |
| 3B | 3.12 |
| 4A | 1.90 |
| 4B | 1.50 |
| 4CDE | 3.94 |
| Total (IPHC Convention Area) | 39.60 |

7. REGULATORY PROPOSALS FOR 2018

7.1 IPHC Secretariat regulatory proposals

7.1.1 Fishery Limits (Sect. 4)

29. The CB **NOTED** regulatory proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA1, which aimed to improve clarity and transparency of fishery limits in the IPHC Fishery Regulations.
30. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 6](#)). [in favour=unanimous]

7.1.2 Commercial fishing periods (Sect. 9)

31. The CB **NOTED** regulatory proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA2, which specified fishing periods for the commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations.
32. The CB **NOTED** no action was taken on IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA2, which specified fishing periods for the commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations.
33. The CB **NOTED** there was a willingness to explore fixed dates to allow for improved business planning. However, the dates in this proposal were not supported.

7.1.3 IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

34. The CB **NOTED** regulatory proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA3 which proposed amendments to ensure clarity and consistency in the IPHC Fishery Regulations.

35. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA3. [in favour=unanimous]
36. The CB **NOTED** their support and appreciation for efforts to simplify and clarify existing regulations.

7.2 Contracting Party regulatory proposals

7.2.1 Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A

37. The CB **NOTED** regulatory proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropB1, which proposed IPHC Regulation changes for charter Pacific halibut fisheries in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A, in order to achieve the charter Pacific halibut allocation under the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council's (NPFMC) Pacific halibut Catch Sharing Plan.
38. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropB1.

Canada: abstain=all

USA: In favour=32; against=0; abstain=3

7.3 Other Stakeholder regulatory proposals

7.3.1 Minimum TCEY in IPHC Regulatory Area 2A

39. The CB **NOTED** regulatory proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC1, which proposed adopting a TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A that supports a FCEY no lower than 1.5Mlb. In years when the distribution would indicate a FCEY higher than 1.5Mlb is available, that number would be adopted.
40. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission does not adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC1.
- Canada:** In favour=4; against=17; abstain=8]
- USA:** In favour=11; against=14; abstain=7
41. The CB **NOTED** that there was general support for the proposed IPHC Regulatory Area 2A TCEY level, but not within a regulatory framework with both a fixed lower limit and no defined term.
42. The CB **NOTED** the following minority statement:

“The Regulatory Proposal for a minimum TCEY for the 2A Region was presented by the Makah Tribe at the Conference Board yesterday but was not supported by a majority of either of the Contracting Parties. We find that unfortunate. The item was brought forth at the end of a long and tiring day and followed a contentious discussion of the TCEY allocations between the Alaska and Canadian Representatives. It was apparent that while there was overwhelming support by most members for 2A to be granted the 1.66 mlbs TCEY and 1.5 mlbs FCEY as requested, a multi-year, minimum floor TCEY concept for a 3-5 five year period was lacking support. There was considerable confusion by many over the concept and skepticism of the request. This latter statement is what we wish to address. The Makah Tribe is making this request for the entire 2A Area, consisting of the three Pacific States. The Tribes are not just stakeholders in this process, but are in fact, Co-Managers, with a long and respected history of fishery Management. They work in conjunction with the three State Governments, the Federal Government and the IPHC for sustainable conservation policies and best practices management goals regarding harvest of pacific halibut. They have developed a short term, responsible, and thoughtful proposal for Management, that was developed with the cooperation of the IPHC Secretariat and included principles suggested by the MSAB. Their concept is to present a short term solution for management in an area that is at the Southern end of the p. halibut range, has no conservation concerns to the stock, stays within the SPR 46% stated goals of the MSAB, and smooths out the annual variation of the FISS data and patchiness of population density that is prevalent in the 2A area. This is "pilot program" of an alternative management concept, proposed for a short duration, under the full review and control of the Commission and Secretariat. This does not affect other Regulatory Areas and is unique in in both situation and location. We in the 2A area support the

concept, and believe it should be give the opportunity to see if it is a successful management scenario for this unique area.

The principle objection at the Conference Board seemed to center around this being a multi-year proposal. The Contracting Parties wanted the opportunity to consider a TCEY request annually, but voiced support for the 1.66 mt TCEY. A secondary issue was the concern that if this short term minimum TCEY proposal was adopted that level would be held in perpetuity, until such time as a Regulatory change was passed to remove the minimum. This is not in the proposal, nor was it stated in the motion on the floor to support this Regulatory Proposal. But, the concern lingered on and confused many and created uncertainty and suspicion.

We in 2A believe this concept justifies consideration by the Commission and a minority of the Conference Board supports adoption, with a time period selected at the discretion of the Commission with Secretariat advice.”

7.3.2 IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Quota Proposal

43. The CB **NOTED** paper IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC2, which proposed an individual quota system for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A.
44. The CB **NOTED** that no action was taken on IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC2 at this time as the Chair of the Pacific Fisheries Management Council addressed the CB and stated their recommendation to the IPHC was not adopt any changes until more comprehensive consultations have been completed with all IPHC Regulatory Area 2A stakeholders.
45. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt an earlier start date (second half of May) for the IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Non-Treaty directed commercial fishery’s initial fishing period.

Canada: abstain=all

USA: In favour=15; against=0; abstain=9

8. BYCATCH

46. The CB **NOTED** the presentation by the Amendment 80 Group detailing their Bycatch Avoidance measures, including the most recent results of the Experimental Fishing Permit on deck sorting.
47. The CB **NOTED** continued concern regarding bycatch impacts to the Pacific halibut stock.
48. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission communicate these concerns to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council:
 - a) New work by the IPHC Secretariat indicates that U26 bycatch impacts the spawning potential of the Pacific halibut stock on a ratio of 1:1.8 –i.e., one pound of bycatch results in a 1.8-pound loss of future Pacific halibut yield to the directed fisheries (TCEY), noting that 65% of the U26 Pacific halibut mortality occurs in IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE, where observer coverage on groundfish vessels is high and bycatch reduction incentive programs are in place. Approximately 28% of the U26 bycatch occurs in Region 3, where observer coverage on trawl vessels is lower.
49. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission strongly recommend that the NPFMC:
 - a) prioritize Pacific halibut bycatch reduction in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, and take meaningful action to protect the future potential of the Pacific halibut stock and the directed fisheries.
 - b) Increase observer coverage on Gulf of Alaska trawl vessels to more accurately account for bycatch and its impacts on the Pacific halibut stock and directed Pacific halibut fisheries.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 Annual Meeting documents

50. The CB **URGED** the Commission to have the IPHC Secretariat provide a printed streamlined paper version of annual meeting documents for CB members that contains relevant documents in regard to TCEY

discussions such as SPR ratios, decision tables, risk tables, WPUE commercial graphs and time series of data by regulatory area, O32 FISS data, NPUES FISS data and FCEY/TCEY conversions for previous years, fishery average fish weight by regulatory area, time series of total removals by regulatory area and recent reference TCEY by regulatory area and adopted TCEY.

51. The CB **NOTED** their request for at least one hard copy of a RARA be available for reference and that the IPHC Secretariat provide a method to produce adequate paper copies of requested documents to CB members in future meetings. This would likely be a 25 page document. If this is a financial hardship, the Commission could, at the time of registration, ask if an individual wanted a copy of this modified document that they agree to purchase at the cost of printing.
52. The CB **NOTED** the IPHC Secretariat's indication that it continues to publish the blue book each year, as document [IPHC-2019-AM095-00](#), which is a compendium of annual meeting documents (the former bluebook), 30 days prior to the annual meeting, for download and possible printing by users.

9.2 MSAB position

53. The CB **URGED** the Commission to consider Angel Drobnic or Forrest Braiden for a seat on the MSAB.

10. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 88TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB088)

54. The report of the 89th Session of the IPHC Conference Board (IPHC-2019-CB089-R) was **ADOPTED** via correspondence on 07 February 2019, including the consolidated set of recommendations and requests arising from CB089, provided at [Appendix IV](#).

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089)

Officers

| | |
|--|--|
| Co-Chairperson Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) | Co-Chairperson Mr. Jeff Kauffman (United States of America) |
|--|--|

CB Members

| Canada | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| Member | Representative | Email |
| Ahousaht First Nation | Andrew Webster | Bigmack.ahousat@gmail.com |
| A`Tlegay Fisheries Society | Christa Rusel | christarusel@shawcable.com |
| Amalgamated Conservation Society | Tom Cole | ttbc@shaw.ca |
| Annieville Halibut Association | Terry Henshaw | Tonic1949@gmail.com |
| Area F Troll Association | Esther Sample | esthersample@gmail.com |
| BC Commercial Integrated Groundfish Society | Bruce Turriss | bruceturriss@shaw.ca |
| BC Halibut Longline Fisherman's Assoc. | Loren Iverson | lorneiverson@telus.net |
| BC Longline Fisherman's Association | Colleen van der Heide | eric@egoodman.ca |
| BC Tuna Fisherman's Association | Tiare Boyes | tiare@leewardltd.com |
| BC Wildlife Federation | Ted Brookman | tedbrookman6@gmail.com |
| Canadian Sablefish Association | Gary Williamson | riverone@telus.net |
| Council of Haida Nation | Shawn Cowpar | Shawn.cowpar@haidanation.com |
| Ditidaht First Nation | Phillip Edgar | mlucas@ditidaht.ca |
| Esquimalt Anglers Association | Gary Caton | gcaton@shaw.ca |
| FAS Seafood Producers | William Woodbury | wwoodbury@fasseafood.com |
| Gulf Trollers Association | Angus Grout | rommel@telus.net |
| Halibut Advisory Board | David Boyes | mcboyes@telus.net |
| Hook and Line Groundfish Association | Ken Wing | kwing@dccnet.com |
| Huu-Ay-Aht First Nation | Edward Johnson | Edjohnson.northstar@gmail.com |
| IMAWG | Carl Edgar | carledgarjr@gmail.com |
| Northern Halibut Producer's Assoc. | Alan Carl | porchers@citytel.net |
| Northern Trollers Association | | |
| North Pac Halibut Fisherman's Assn | | |
| Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council | Cliff Atleo | c.atleo71@shaw.ca |
| Pacific Coast Fishing Vessel Owners Guild | Quincy Sample | quintonsample@gmail.com |
| Pacific Trollers Association | | |
| PHMA | Chris Sporer | phma@telus.net |
| Sidney Anglers' Association | Grant MacPherson | bigbass@shaw.ca |
| Sport Fishing Advisory Board – Main | Gerry Kristianson | gerrykr@telus.net |
| Sport Fishing Advisory Board – South | Chuck Ashcroft | chuckashcroft@telus.net |
| Sport Fishing Advisory Board – North | Doug Daugert | Kumdis2@haidagwaii.ca |
| Steveston Halibut Assoc. | Tim Courtier | timcourtier@gmail.com |
| Sport Fishing Institute of BC | Owen Bird | birdo@sportfishing.bc.ca |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| South Vancouver Island Anglers Coalition | Chris Bos | chris@anglerscoalition.com |
| Ucluelet First Nation | | |
| UFAWU | Russell Cameron | russelljcameron@yahoo.ca |
| Vancouver Island Longline Assoc. | Lyle Pierce | Lyle_p@shaw.ca |
| West Coast Fishing Guides Association | Bill Shaw | bill@wfms.ca |

| United States of America | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| Member | Representative | Email |
| Adak Commercial Development Corporation | Rick Koso | rrk@mooseak.com |
| Alaska Charter Association | Jim Martin | flatland@mcn.org |
| Alaska Longline Fisherman's Association | Dan Falvey | myriadfisheries@gmail.com |
| Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association | Rebecca Skinner | execdir@alaskawhitefishtrawlers.org |
| Aleut Corporation | Clem Tillion | tillionc@xyz.net |
| Aleutian Pribilof Island Community Development Association | Angel Drobnica | adrobnica@apicda.com |
| Area 4 Harvesters Alliance | Leonard Herzog | Herzog.lenny@gmail.com |
| Central Bering Sea Fishermen's Association | Ray Melovidov | raymelovidov@cbsfa.com |
| Coastal Conservation Association | Dave Croonquist | dcroonquist@gmail.com |
| Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific | Jeff Peterson | dsfu@dsfu.org |
| Edmonds Veteran Indev Longliners | Paul Clampitt | Pfishcl@gmail.com |
| Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc. (FVOA) | Per Odegaard | vanseeeodegaard@hotmail.com |
| Freezer Longliner Coalition | Chad See | chadsee@freezerlongline.biz |
| Halibut Coalition | Linda Behnken | alfafish@acsalaska.net |
| Homer Charter Association | Mike Flores | mike@niniichik.com |
| Humbolt Area Saltwater Anglers | Mary Marking | Ma5marking@gmail.com |
| North Pacific Fisheries Association | Malcolm Milne | milnemarine@yahoo.com |
| Petersburg Vessel Owners Association | Megan O'Neil | pvoa@gci.net |
| Puget Sound Anglers | John Beath | jbeath@gmail.com |
| Seafood Producers Coop | Carter Hughes | carterhughes@hotmail.com |
| SE Alaska Fishermen's Alliance | Kathy Hansen | seafa@gci.net |
| Sitka Halibut & Blackcod Marketing Assoc. | Phillip Wyman | philwyman@hotmail.com |
| St. Paul Fishermen's Association | Myron Melovidov | mmelovidov@cbsfa.com |
| Tribal Government of St. Paul | Simeon Swetzof JR. | swetzof@hotmail.com |
| West Brothers Group | James Whitethorn | Kiviok4@aol.com |
| Yukon Delta Fisheries Association | Landry Price | Landry.ydfda@gmail.com |
| Southeast Alaska guides (SEAGO) | Forrest Braden | director@seagoalaska.org |
| Westport charter boat association | Jonathan Sawin | jonathansawin@gmail.com |
| Cape Barnabas, Inc | Duncan Fields | dfields@ptialaska.net |
| Next Generation | Garrett Elwood | fvwesternfreedom@gmail.com |
| BBEDC | Gary Cline | gary@bbedc.com |
| Recreational Fishing Alliance - CA | Tom Marking | tmmarking@sbcglobal.net |
| Kodiak Longliners Association | Lu Dochterman | dochtermannludger@gmail.com |

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Newport Oregon Longliners | Mike Pettis | mkpettis@charter.net |
|---------------------------|-------------|--|

IPHC Secretariat

| Participant | Title | Email |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Ms Lara Erikson | Branch Manager, Fisheries Statistics and Services | lara.erikson@iphc.int |
| Mr Eric Soderlund | Fisheries Data Specialist | eric.soderlund@iphc.int |

APPENDIX II**AGENDA FOR THE 89TH SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089)****Date:** 29–30 January 2019**Location:** Victoria, BC, Canada.**Venue:** Fairmont Empress; Room: Crystal Ballroom**Time:** 29th: 13:30-17:30; 30th: 09:00-17:00**Co-Chairpersons:** Mr. Jim Lane (Canada); Mr. Jeff Kauffman (United States of America)**Vice-Chairpersons:** Nil*Note: All sessions are open to observers and the general public.*

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION**
 - 1.1 Election of Co-Chairpersons
 - 1.2 Accreditation of Membership for CB089
- 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION**
- 3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION**
- 4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES**
- 5. MANAGEMENT STRATEGY EVALUATION**
- 6. MORTALITY LIMITS**
 - 6.1 Coastwide perspectives
 - 6.2 Regulatory Area perspectives
- 7. REGULATORY PROPOSALS FOR 2019**
 - 7.1 IPHC Secretariat regulatory proposals
 - 7.2 Contracting Party regulatory proposals
 - 7.3 Other Stakeholder regulatory proposals
- 8. BYCATCH**
- 9. OTHER BUSINESS**
 - 9.1 Annual meeting documents
 - 9.2 MSAB position
- 10. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 89th SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089)**

APPENDIX III**PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2019 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY CATCH LIMITS**

Note: All values reported in millions of net pounds. Provided by the IPHC Secretariat based on the CB 2019 TCEY recommendations.

| | 2A | 2B | 2C | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 4CDE | Total |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Commercial discard mortality | 0.02 | 0.14 | NA | NA | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.52 |
| O26 Bycatch | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 1.28 | 0.36 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 1.87 | 4.33 |
| Non-CSP Recreational (+ discards) | NA | 0.09 | 1.38 | 1.74 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.21 |
| Subsistence | NA | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 1.14 |
| Total Non-FCEY | 0.15 | 0.90 | 1.85 | 3.24 | 0.58 | 0.29 | 0.24 | 1.96 | 9.21 |
| Commercial discard mortality | NA | NA | 0.06 | 0.32 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.38 |
| CSP Recreational (+ discards) | 0.60 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 1.89 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 4.23 |
| Subsistence | 0.03 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.03 |
| Commercial Landings | 0.86 | 5.56 | 3.58 | 8.36 | 2.54 | 1.61 | 1.26 | 1.98 | 25.75 |
| Total FCEY | 1.50 | 6.48 | 4.45 | 10.57 | 2.54 | 1.61 | 1.26 | 1.98 | 30.39 |
| TCEY | 1.65 | 7.38 | 6.30 | 13.81 | 3.12 | 1.90 | 1.50 | 3.94 | 39.60 |
| U26 Bycatch | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 1.12 | 1.73 |
| Total Mortality | 1.65 | 7.40 | 6.30 | 14.18 | 3.23 | 2.00 | 1.51 | 5.06 | 41.33 |

APPENDIX IV

**CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 89TH SESSION OF THE
IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB089) (29-30 JANUARY 2019)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

IPHC Rules of Procedure

CB089-Rec.01 ([para. 11](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission defer the revised IPHC Rules of Procedure (2019) to AM096 for adoption, specifically related to the CB, with respect to the terms of reference as the ad-hoc group that was formed felt that the changes are more than clarifying or technical in nature.

Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates

CB089-Rec.02 ([para. 14](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2019:

- a) Opening: 02 March
- b) Closing: 30 November

Management Strategy Evaluation

CB089-Rec.03 ([para. 15](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission does the following:

- a) supports the work to date by the MSAB and their identified goals and objectives;
- b) support prioritization of conservation over fishery performance objectives;
- c) support preliminary SPR target of 42-43% and SPR range of 40-46%; and
- d) support goal of restraining annual variability to 15% or less, and encourage MSAB to continue to develop management procedures that control annual variability, such as those presented at this meeting (AM095).

Mortality limits

CB089-Rec.04 ([para. 28](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following TCEY mortality limits for the 2019 fishing period as provided in [Table 1](#), which translate to the mortality estimates by sector (as provided by the IPHC Secretariat) provided in [Appendix III](#) and an SPR of 46%.

Table 1. Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2019. See previous paragraphs for voting.

| IPHC Regulatory Area | Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlbs) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2A | 1.65 |
| 2B | 7.38 |
| 2C | 6.30 |
| 3A | 13.81 |
| 3B | 3.12 |
| 4A | 1.90 |
| 4B | 1.50 |
| 4CDE | 3.94 |
| Total (IPHC Convention Area) | 39.60 |

Fishery Limits (Sect. 4)

CB089-Rec.05 ([para. 30](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in [Section 6](#)).

IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

CB089-Rec.06 ([para. 35](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropA3.

Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A

CB089-Rec.07 ([para. 38](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropB1.

Minimum TCEY in IPHC Regulatory Area 2A

CB089-Rec.08 ([para. 40](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission does not adopt proposal IPHC-2019-AM095-PropC1.

IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Quota Proposal

CB089-Rec.09 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt an earlier start date (second half of May) for the IPHC Regulatory Area 2A Non-Treaty directed commercial fishery's initial fishing period.

Bycatch

CB089-Rec.11 ([para. 48](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission communicate these concerns to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council:

- a) New work by the IPHC Secretariat indicates that U26 bycatch impacts the spawning potential of the Pacific halibut stock on a ratio of 1:1.8 –i.e., one pound of bycatch results in a 1.8-pound loss of future Pacific halibut yield to the directed fisheries (TCEY), noting that 65% of the U26 Pacific halibut mortality occurs in IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE, where observer coverage on groundfish vessels is high and bycatch reduction incentive programs are in place. Approximately 28% of the U26 bycatch occurs in Region 3, where observer coverage on trawl vessels is lower.

CB089-Rec.12 ([para. 49](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission strongly recommend that the NPFMC:

- a) prioritize Pacific halibut bycatch reduction in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, and take meaningful action to protect the future potential of the Pacific halibut stock and the directed fisheries.
- b) Increase observer coverage on Gulf of Alaska trawl vessels to more accurately account for bycatch and its impacts on the Pacific halibut stock and directed Pacific halibut fisheries.

REQUESTS

Nil