



## Report of the 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the IPHC Conference Board (CB092)

---

Meeting held electronically, 25-27 January 2022

### Commissioners

Canada	United States of America
Paul Ryall	Glenn Merrill
Neil Davis	Robert Alverson
Peter DeGreef	Richard Yamada

### Executive Director

David T. Wilson, Ph.D.

---

#### DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Session  
Members of the Commission  
IPHC Secretariat

#### BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IPHC 2022. Report of the 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the IPHC Conference Board (CB092). Electronic meeting, 25-27 January 2022.  
*IPHC-2022-CB092-R, 23 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](mailto:secretariat@iphc.int)  
Website: <https://www.iphc.int/>

---

## ACRONYMS

AM	Annual Meeting, of the IPHC
CB	Conference Board
FCEY	Fishery Constant Exploitation Yield
FISS	Fishery-independent setline survey
IPHC	International Pacific Halibut Commission
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://www.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

<b>REPORT OF THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1. OPENING OF THE SESSION</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.1 <i>Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25): new members</i> .....	7
<b>2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 <i>Mortality Limits and TCEY</i> .....	7
3.2 <i>MSE update</i> .....	7
3.3 <i>Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA)</i> .....	7
<b>4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>5. MORTALITY LIMITS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
5.1 <i>Coastwide perspectives</i> .....	8
5.2 <i>Regulatory Area perspectives</i> .....	9
5.2.1 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 2A (U.S.A.)</i> .....	9
5.2.2 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 2B (Canada)</i> .....	9
5.2.3 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 2C (U.S.A.)</i> .....	10
5.2.4 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 3A (U.S.A.)</i> .....	10
5.2.5 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 3B (U.S.A.)</i> .....	11
5.2.6 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 4A (U.S.A.)</i> .....	11
5.2.7 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 4B (U.S.A.)</i> .....	11
5.2.8 <i>IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE (U.S.A.)</i> .....	11
5.3 <i>TCEY Recommendations</i> .....	12
<b>6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020-21 PROCESS</b> .....	<b>12</b>
6.1 <i>IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals</i> .....	12
6.2 <i>Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals</i> .....	13
6.3 <i>Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals</i> .....	14
<b>7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH)</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>8. OTHER BUSINESS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>APPENDIX II AGENDA FOR THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX III PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2022 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY MORTALITY LIMITS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>APPENDIX IV CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092) (25-27 JANUARY 2022)</b> .....	<b>22</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB092) was held electronically from 25-27 January 2022. A total of 60 (66 in 2021) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. The meeting was opened by Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) and Ms. Linda Behnken (U.S.A.) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants.

The following are a subset of the complete recommendations and requests for action from the CB092, which are provided at [Appendix IV](#).

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### *Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates*

CB092-Rec.01 ([para. 11](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2022:

- a) Opening: 06 March
- b) Closing: 07 December

CB092-Rec.02 ([para. 13](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission **ADOPT** IPHC Regulatory Area 2A changes and actions for the recreational and Non-Treaty Directed Fishery proposed by PFMC [*Canada: In favour=1; against=0; abstain=18;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=24; against=0; abstain=3*]

### *Mortality limits*

CB092-Rec.03 ([para. 15](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission **ADOPT** an F43 for the 2022 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds. [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=1;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=26; against=3; abstain=0*]

CB092-Rec.04 ([para. 22](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adhere to the interim agreement, a fixed TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A of 1.65 million pounds [*Canada: In favour=21; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=27; against=1; abstain=3*].

CB092-Rec.05 ([para. 23](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt a TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2B of 7.56 million pounds as determined by the 2019 interim agreement [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=2; against=29; abstain=2*].

CB092-Rec.06 ([para. 32](#)) The CB members from the USA **RECOMMENDED** the following 2022 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A and 4CDE from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4B ([Appendix III](#)).

### *IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)*

CB092-Rec.07 ([para. 35](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in Section 5.3), but also include all mortality (e.g. subsistence, bycatch, and non-guided sport) in annual summary framework table [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

### *IPHC Fishery Regulations: Commercial fishing periods (Sect. 9)*

CB092-Rec.08 ([para. 36](#)) The CB **NOTED** and **RECOMMENDED** that Commission adopt fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA2](#), which specified fishing periods for the

commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments***

CB092-Rec.09 ([para. 38](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA3](#) as written in Appendix I. [*Canada: unanimous; U.S.A.: unanimous*]

***Recreational (sport) fishing for Pacific halibut—IPHC Regulatory areas 2c, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e (sect. 29) - Recordkeeping for charter Pacific halibut annual limits***

CB092-Rec.10 ([para. 40](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB1 Rev 1](#). [*Canada: In favour=5; against=0; abstain=11*][*U.S.A.: In favour=30; against=0; abstain=2*]

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)***

CB092-Rec.11 ([para. 42](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB2](#). [*Canada: In favour=3; against=0; abstain=16*][*U.S.A.: In favour=28; against=0; abstain=2*]

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Fishing gear (Sect. 18) – Trap gear use in IPHC Regulatory Area 2b***

CB092-Rec.12 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB3](#), as written in Appendix 1. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]

***Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E (Sect. 29) - Processing Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation***

CB092-Rec.13 ([para. 56](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** no action be taken at this time by the Commission on IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1, but that additional work be done to engage enforcement from both Contracting Parties, address deficiencies in the proposal, and the proposal come back for consideration at IPHC-2022-IM098. CB members were primarily interested in finding an enforceable regulation change that would allow consumption on board of a reasonable amount of Pacific halibut. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]

CB092-Rec.14 ([para. 57](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission ask the domestic management agencies to look at the issue addressed in [IPHC-2022-AM098-INF01](#), Appendix II and come back with additional information for further consideration. That information should include a definition of rental boat and impacts of increasing harvest in the unguided rental boat sector. Concern expressed that this sector is unlimited and growing; other US CB members noted that the NPFMC has considered this issue and failed to clearly define the problem or potential solutions. [*Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18*][*U.S.A.: In favour=16; against=9; abstain=3*]

## 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Conference Board (CB092) was held electronically from 25-27 January 2022. A total of 60 (66 in 2022) members attended the Session from the two (2) Contracting Parties. The list of participants is provided at [Appendix I](#). The meeting was opened by Mr. Jim Lane (Canada) and Ms Linda Behnken (U.S.A.) (Co-Chairpersons), who welcomed participants.

### 1.1 Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25): new members

2. Canada accredited 0 new members and the USA accredited 0 new members, for participation in the 2022 Conference Board proceedings.
3. The CB **RECOGNISED** the recent passing of long time CB members Mr Clem Tillion and Mr Ludger Dochtermann with a moment of silence to begin the proceedings.

## 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

4. The CB **ADOPTED** the Agenda as provided at [Appendix II](#), with the addition of a future management procedure discussion under agenda item 8.1. The documents provided to the CB092 are those submitted for the 98<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Annual Meeting (AM098). To assist the CB in navigating its meeting, all documents relevant to the agenda were posted as links on the CB webpage: <https://www.iphc.int/venues/details/92nd-session-of-the-iphc-conference-board-cb092>.
5. The CB **NOTED** that it will convene on Thursday (27 January) morning to adopt the report of the CB092, for presentation to the Commission on Thursday afternoon.

## 3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION

### 3.1 Mortality Limits and TCEY

6. The CB **NOTED** the informal presentation by Dr Ian Stewart (IPHC Quantitative Scientist), and the subsequent question and answer period which included outlining the IPHC definitions of total mortality and TCEY as follows:
  - a) **Total mortality:** Consists of all sources and sizes of dead Pacific halibut in two categories - 1) the TCEY and 2) U26 discard mortality in non-directed fisheries;
  - b) **Total Constant Exploitation Yield (TCEY):** The current basis for Commission mortality limits. Includes all sources and sizes of mortality, except U26 discards in non-directed fisheries.

### 3.2 MSE update

7. The CB **NOTED** the review of the MSE process and question and answer session provided by Dr Allan Hicks (IPHC Quantitative Scientist). Regarding the MP development for size limits, the CB asked if the MP was on a coast wide scale or to regions or regulatory areas. Dr. Hicks responded the current operating model can look at size limits at many scales, but they had only been asked to investigate at the coast wide scale.

### 3.3 Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA)

8. The CB **NOTED** the information presentation by Dr Barbara (Basia) Hutniczak (IPHC Branch Manager) which included a broad overview of her current work to better understand the economic contribution of Pacific halibut and the connectivity to the supply chain with initial focus on the commercial fishery.

## 4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES

9. The CB **NOTED** an initial motion for the following fishing periods for 2022. Opening: 06 March, Closing: 20 November. The opening date was voted on with [*Canada: In favour=17; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=21; against=6; abstain=2*]

10. The CB **AGREED** to an amendment of the original motion by changing the Closing date from 20 November to 07 December [*Canada: In favour=15; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=26; against=0; abstain=2*]
11. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2022:
- a) Opening: 06 March
  - b) Closing: 07 December
12. The CB **NOTED** favorable tides for opening date; also that longer season may be needed to allow full harvest with large sablefish TAC in Alaska and impacts of COVID.
13. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission **ADOPT** IPHC Regulatory Area 2A changes and actions for the recreational and Non-Treaty Directed Fishery proposed by PFMC [*Canada: In favour=1; against=0; abstain=18;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=24; against=0; abstain=3*]

## 5. MORTALITY LIMITS

14. The CB **NOTED** the IPHC's web-based mortality projection tool for use in the CB092 and AM098 (<https://www.iphc.int/data/projection-tool>).

### 5.1 Coastwide perspectives

15. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission **ADOPT** an F43 for the 2022 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds. [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=1;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=26; against=3; abstain=0*]
16. The CB **NOTED** that stakeholders are encouraged by the presence of a strong 2005 and 2012 year classes which bring the prospect of a relatively stable and/or rebuilding spawning biomass to the B36 target in the coming years.
17. The CB **NOTED** F43 was vetted by the MSE process and adopted by Commission at AM097 as the reference harvest strategy.
18. The CB **NOTED** that there was a less than an 1% chance of the stock status being below the B20 threshold in the next 3 years at an F43 harvest rate, and that there was a roughly 50/50 chance that the fishery TCEY would decline by more than 10% over the same time period at F43 (slide 46).
19. The CB **NOTED** that the change in biomass is driven by recruitment strength, with less than 40% probability of spawning biomass falling below B30.
20. The CB **NOTED** that Dr Stewart indicated that the stock is being harvested close to surplus production levels at this rate and seems to be sustaining this rate as the abundance trend levels off.
21. The CB **NOTED** the following from some (minority) USA CB members expressing the following concerns regarding F43 TCEY:
- a) Concerns that adopting the 41.22 million pound TCEY resulting from the F43 reference level is too aggressive at this time;
  - b) Intensifying the harvest rate at a time of historical low abundance is not good policy, regardless of what long term computer modelling suggests;
  - c) The realized fishing intensity was estimated to be 48% in 2020 and 46% in 2021 (IPHC-2022-SA-01) and NPFA supports maintaining similar intensities as targets going forward.
  - d) We are concerned that estimated spawning biomass relative to unfished ratios are too close to SB30 to warrant fishing at F43 (Slide 46 IPHC-2022-AM098-10);
  - e) The decision table regarding the stock trend shows a 50% chance of a three-year surplus at F46 which is where we would like to be on the table.



## 5.2 *Regulatory Area perspectives*

### 5.2.1 IPHC Regulatory Area 2A (U.S.A.)

22. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adhere to the interim agreement, a fixed TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A of 1.65 million pounds [*Canada: In favour=21; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=27; against=1; abstain=3*].

### 5.2.2 IPHC Regulatory Area 2B (Canada)

23. The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt a TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2B of 7.56 million pounds as determined by the 2019 interim agreement [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=2; against=29; abstain=2*].
24. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 2B CB members:
- a) Apportionment (O32 stock distribution) has never been accepted by Canada as the way to allocate the coastwide TCEY, nor has it been adopted by the United States Commissioners.
  - b) Both Contracting Parties have deviated, and agreed to deviate, from O32 stock distribution, for distributing the coastwide TCEY since apportionment was introduced.
  - c) O32 stock distribution is not the only scientifically defensible way to distribute the available harvest; there are many scientifically defensible ways to distribute the available harvest.
  - d) Estimating how the O32 stock is distributed is one thing; distributing the coastwide TCEY (the available harvest) is something else. The two are separate; they are related but they are separate.
  - e) Estimating the distribution of the biomass is a science exercise, but TCEY distribution is a policy decision that is informed by science and socio-economic considerations. This is consistent with the conclusion of the IPHC Secretariat in IPHC-2018-SS01-02, which states that TCEY distribution is a management/policy decision where other objectives are considered (e.g. economic, social, etc.). It is also consistent with what has been discussed at the MSAB meetings where participants agreed that MPs for distributing the coastwide TCEY may be data-driven, policy-driven or some combination [Paragraph 40].
  - f) The interim agreement combines data-driven and policy driven elements and is scientifically defensible – as proven by the MSE process and evaluations.
  - g) It is also important to recognize that although the current agreement provides some mitigation of US bycatch on Canada, it is only partial and only for what is happening now – there has been no mitigation for what has happened for the last 20-30 years. Alaska benefited from this but Canada was not mitigated for the lost access.
  - h) It needs to be noted that there is scientific basis for the current interim management agreement (TCEY distribution using shares for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2A and 2B and O32 distribution for IPHC Regulatory Areas in Alaska). The agreement was evaluated through the MSE process. However, there is no scientific basis for moving TCEY between the US IPHC Regulatory Areas in Alaska – this was not evaluated through the MSE process. This is within the purview of the Commission and Canadian Commissioners have worked with the US Commissioners, however, we need to be careful and cautious when considering it.
25. The CB **NOTED** the following from USA CB members regarding IPHC Regulatory Area 2B:
- a) Slide 54 identifies that this TCEY reallocates 5% more of the coastwide TCEY to Canada than was found off 2B by the FISS, and 2 million more pounds relative to the O32 biomass distribution after application of the harvest rates by area with ½ million of that coming from 2C.
  - b) The interim agreement destabilizes the Alaska Pacific halibut industry and is unsustainable.
  - c) The need for a transparent process to establish a more equitable distribution of TCEY between contracting parties, particularly now that the US has significantly reduced bycatch.

- d) That Areas 2C and 3A charter fleets are suffering the direct effect of 2B TCEY levels under interim agreement that are higher than surveyed abundance. Charter operators are struggling with reduced ability to provide clients with harvesting opportunities and maintain viable charter operations.
- e) The USA CB members never agreed to the interim agreement and would never support a similar agreement going forward.
- f) The need for stability in all areas, and the inequity of providing that stability to some areas at the expense of all other areas.

### 5.2.3 IPHC Regulatory Area 2C (U.S.A)

26. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 2C CB members:

- a) Overall 2C stocks are reasonably healthy, 2C has the highest WPUE of all IPHC Areas. Figure A-2 from IPHC-2022-AM098-08 document establish a 3% increase in NPUE for 2C, but an overall decline in WPUE due to a lower average weight.
- b) Slide 17 of from [IPHC-2022-AM098-10](#) presentation of the stock assessment indicate a large decrease in average weight of landed fish (approximately 20%) in 2C as well, yet the commercial WPUE in 2C only declined by 2%. These factors imply increased abundance of smaller fish rather than a sharp decline in abundance.
- c) Dr. Stewart's response to Commissioner Yamada's question on the 2C reduction, noting that most of the TCEY reduction in 2C is being driven by the strong incoming 2012 year class which is still highly mobile.
- d) MSE model outputs showed that harvest levels associated with the interim agreement led to a 17% reduction in Region 2 spawning biomass and O32 abundance over the long term. If 2C is the only IPHC Regulatory Area in Region 2 with a TCEY based on survey abundance, it suffers from the reduced abundance caused by the interim agreement in addition to the direct yearly TCEY reductions to comply with the interim agreement. This causes the 2C reference TCEY to be lower than it would otherwise be in absence of the current interim agreement.
- e) 2C has the most individual commercial fishermen and charter operators of any IPHC Regulatory Area. Socioeconomic considerations led to additional TCEY being distributed to 2C from other Alaska areas.

### 5.2.4 IPHC Regulatory Area 3A (U.S.A)

27. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 3A CB members:

- a) Stocks in 3A are healthy and the stock center is starting to shift back to this region.
- b) The interim agreement creates an unsupportable and unsustainable situation for the Alaska areas.
- c) Support for additional control rules, but only as part of a comprehensive management procedure which is consistent across all areas. In the absence of such a policy, Alaska stakeholders are left with the willy-nilly approach that leads to tensions and inconsistencies.
- d) Support for this motion is a compromise that is necessary because some areas have a defined control rule that destabilizes the other areas.
- e) Importance and desire for long-term process for setting catch limits, that: (a) is science-based, (b) agreed upon by both parties, (c) eliminates or significantly reduces the annual haggling process over catch limits; (d) essentially codifies what Commission adjustments from science-based reference levels are allowed, and the acceptable size of those adjustments (these comments apply to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 3B, and 4A).
- f) Any adjustments to Reference Levels made by Commission should be of pre-determined nature and limited in scale. Those adjustments should be incorporated in MSE (see peer review document). Ad hoc changes should be eliminated or substantially reduced, and process should be across years and Areas (these comments apply to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 3B, and 4A).

- g) A paper that brings all of the information in one place relative to impacts of higher harvest levels in one biological region on other biological regions would be helpful moving forward. For example, for the last four years Area 2 has had higher harvest levels relative to biological/surveyed distribution. It is not clear what the impact is within Area 2 (for example, the impact of 2A on 2C), or what the impact is on other areas. We understand this issue was discussed at MSAB, but it would be very helpful to have it compiled into one document for those of us who were not part of the MSAB process. While our example is backward looking, we think this information will help us going forward as we hopefully develop a longer-term process (these comments apply to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3A, 3B, and 4A).

### 5.2.5 IPHC Regulatory Area 3B (U.S.A)

28. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 3B CB members:

- a) 2021 survey results indicate and increasing amount of Pacific halibut are in Area 3B. The partial survey in 2020 is crucial to informing our perspective and trust in such a big gain. Had a complete survey shown a 15-25% increase in 2020, the results of 2021 would have established a trend versus an outlier or anomalistic event in the historical trends.
- b) Improving catches in 3B over the last 5 years and efficient harvests of both large and small Pacific halibut depending on habitat selected.
- c) Slide 20 of [IPHC-2022-AM098-10](#) shows that the 2012 year class is 19% mature and Dr Stewart has noted the 2012 year class is still highly mobile and the 2021 distribution may not reflect where these fish settle long term.
- d) Harvest Rate of 0.75 acts as a precautionary buffer.
- e) IPHC Regulatory Area 3B reference TCEY represents a 90% increase over the 2021 TCEY. Many factors can make one years worth of survey data over/under estimate abundance in an IPHC Regulatory Area. IPHC policy has been to moderate increases until multiple years of data show a substantive trend. Upper limits of 15% on annual changes have been discussed at the MSAB. The IPHC previous SUFD rule limited increases to 1/3 of survey-based abundance increases.
- f) 3B FISS Modeled WPUE O32 5 Year +88%.
- g) 3B 2021 FISS O32 +57%
- h) 3B 2020 Incomplete Survey explains large 2022 increase
- i) 2021 3B Estimates 18.8 Percent of O32 Stock Distribution
- j) TCEY Recommendation of 4.06 equals 9.9 percent of Coastwide TCEY of 41.22

### 5.2.6 IPHC Regulatory Area 4A (U.S.A.)

29. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 4A:

- a) Support for TCEY reference level.
- b) 4A catch rates consistent with prior years.

### 5.2.7 IPHC Regulatory Area 4B (U.S.A.)

30. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 4B:

- a) Support O32 based distribution and harvest policy that is consistent across all area.
- b) Stability is important to all areas, but particularly in remote 4B communities.
- c) 15% increase reflects moderate approach, given the 30 percent increase in the reference TCEY.
- d) The Commissioners should recognize Alaska areas are making painful compromises to address socioeconomic impacts.

### 5.2.8 IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE (U.S.A)

31. The CB **NOTED** the following from IPHC Regulatory Area 4CDE CB members:

- a) Area stakeholders have worked hard to successfully reduce trawl bycatch in their area which benefits the resource Coastwide.
- b) Current bycatch removals use three-year average that includes high 2019 levels.
- c) Many survey stations missed in 2021; may have missed small fish.
- d) Setting TCEY at 3.81 million pounds sets the FCEY above 1.67 and allows area catch sharing plan to provide opportunity to Area 4E, which benefits rural and mostly indigenous communities.
- e) Reference level TCEY for Area 4CDE created unsupportable socioeconomic impacts; appreciate the support from other AK areas and recognize that support comes at a cost.

### 5.3 TCEY Recommendations

32. The CB members from the USA **RECOMMENDED** the following 2022 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A and 4CDE from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4B ([Appendix III](#)).

**Table 1.** Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2022.

IPHC Regulatory Area	Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlb)
2C	5.49
3A	14.87
3B	4.06
4A	2.18
4B	1.6
4CDE	3.81
<b>Total (IPHC Convention Area)</b>	<b>41.22</b>

**Canada:** In favour=13; against=7; abstain=1

**U.S.A.:** In favour=33; against=0; abstain=1

33. The CB members from the USA **NOTED** the following perspectives from IPHC Regulatory Area 3A members:
- a) USA CB members support for all areas being at or close to the reference levels provided by the IPHC Secretariat, and that the recommended Alaska TCEY are a major compromise between all Alaska areas.

## 6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020-21 PROCESS

### 6.1 IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals

#### 6.1.1 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)

34. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA1](#), which provides the mortality and fishery limits framework for population at AM098.
35. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in Section 5.3), but also include all mortality (e.g. subsistence, bycatch, and non-guided sport) in annual summary framework table [*Canada: unanimous*]/[*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

#### 6.1.2 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Commercial fishing periods (Sect. 9)

36. The CB **NOTED** and **RECOMMENDED** that Commission adopt fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA2](#), which specified fishing periods for the commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations. [*Canada: unanimous*]/[*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

### 6.1.3 IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments

37. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA3](#), which proposed amendments to ensure clarity and consistency in the IPHC Fishery Regulations.
38. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA3](#) as written in Appendix I. [*Canada: unanimous; U.S.A.: unanimous*]

## 6.2 Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals

### 6.2.1 Recreational (sport) fishing for Pacific halibut—IPHC Regulatory areas 2c, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e (sect. 29) - Recordkeeping for charter Pacific halibut annual limits

39. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB1 Rev\\_1](#), which proposed establishing recordkeeping requirements needed to enforce Pacific halibut annual limits for recreational (sport) fishing for halibut in Convention waters in and off Alaska.
40. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB1 Rev\\_1](#). [*Canada: In favour=5; against=0; abstain=11*][*U.S.A.: In favour=30; against=0; abstain=2*]

### 6.2.2 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)

41. The Commission **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB2](#), which proposed IPHC Regulation changes for charter recreational Pacific halibut fisheries in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A, to achieve the charter Pacific halibut allocation under the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council's (NPFMC) Pacific halibut Catch Sharing Plan.
42. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB2](#). [*Canada: In favour=3; against=0; abstain=16*][*U.S.A.: In favour=28; against=0; abstain=2*]
43. The CB USA members **NOTED** the hard work by the Halibut Charter Management Committee and the ADF&G staff to arrive at complex management measures designed to maintain as much access as possible at these low levels of abundance and support viable charter businesses.

### 6.2.3 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Fishing gear (Sect. 18) – Trap gear use in IPHC Regulatory Area 2b

44. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB3](#), which proposed IPHC Regulation changes to allow trap gear use on directed commercial trips in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B.
45. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB3](#), as written in Appendix 1. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]
46. The CB **NOTED** this change would establish equity with IPHC regulations with respect to US pot gear and may minimize bycatch and reduce whale depredation.

### 6.2.4 IPHC Fishery Regulations: Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific halibut – IPHC Regulatory Area 2B (Sect. 28) – Daily bag limit

47. The Commission **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB4](#), which proposed IPHC Regulation changes for to allow a daily bag limit of three fish per person in IPHC Regulatory Area 2B.
48. Canada CB members **NOTED** that Canada does not distinguish between lodges, guides or for lack of a better description- general unguided fishers. It is one fishery with the same rules, fishing the same finite quota. The ability to adjust the 2B recreational fishery daily limits to 3 daily is critical as we do strive to forecast and design our fishery in a very conservative manner to start the season in an attempt to design a fishery that leaves a buffer in case it is needed.
49. Canada CB members also **NOTED** it uses a hybrid model of size limits and bag limits, but under Canadian regulations, size limits cannot be adjusted in-season, but bag limits can. Canada also noted each recreational angler has an annual limit of 10 fish and there is an overage provision policy in place (the

only regulatory area to have this mechanism for the recreational fishery). The overage provision provides the Department of Fisheries the process to reduce the recreational TAC for the following year by the amount of the overage from the previous year. This creates a powerful incentive for the fishery to stay within its allocation.

50. USA CB members **EXPRESSED** concern/opposition that three fish limit would allow unfair marketing advantage for charter sector, may result in allocation overages (insufficient information available to determine impacts), and allowed recreational sector to take an allocation that many in the US side consider disproportionately large as a result of the interim agreement.
51. USA CB members **NOTED** concern over limited analysis on the impact of a three fish bag limit to angler behaviour under normal non-pandemic conditions.
52. The CB **CONSIDERED** an amendment to the IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB4 limiting the implementation of a three fish bag limit until after 01 September. [*Canada: In favour=20; against=0; abstain=0*][*U.S.A.: In favour=10; against=16; abstain=5*]
53. The CB **CONSIDERED** proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB4](#). [*Canada: In favour=19; against=0; abstain=0*][*U.S.A.: In favour=4; against=27; abstain=4*]

### 6.3 Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals

#### 6.3.1 Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E (Sect. 29) - Processing Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation

54. The CB **NOTED** fishery regulation proposal IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1, which proposed an exception that allows recreational fishermen on pleasure craft in Alaska Regulatory Area to process Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation, subject to measures to facilitate enforcement of the applicable daily bag limits.
55. The CB **NOTED** that there are incorrect statements in [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1](#) regarding to the reference of IPHC Regulatory Area 2A.
56. The CB **RECOMMENDED** no action be taken at this time by the Commission on IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1, but that additional work be done to engage enforcement from both Contracting Parties, address deficiencies in the proposal, and the proposal come back for consideration at IPHC-2022-IM098. CB members were primarily interested in finding an enforceable regulation change that would allow consumption on board of a reasonable amount of Pacific halibut. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]
57. The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission ask the domestic management agencies to look at the issue addressed in [IPHC-2022-AM098-INF01](#), Appendix II and come back with additional information for further consideration. That information should include a definition of rental boat and impacts of increasing harvest in the unguided rental boat sector. Concern expressed that this sector is unlimited and growing; other US CB members noted that the NPFMC has considered this issue and failed to clearly define the problem or potential solutions. [*Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18*][*U.S.A.: In favour=16; against=9; abstain=3*]

## 7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH)

58. The CB **RECEIVED** an update from NOAA representative Alicia Miller on NPFMC actions to reduce Bering Sea Pacific halibut bycatch in the flatfish and Pacific cod targets. Ms Miller provided an estimate of the implementation timeline for Council approved actions and reported to the CB on observer/EM program improvements.
59. The CB **NOTED** Alaska's Governor recently established a bycatch task force to elevate the importance of addressing bycatch.
60. Canada CB members **NOTED** they were pleased to hear about the abundance-based management measures that have been developed by the NPFMC for the Amendment 80 fleet in Bering Sea/Aleutian

Islands and the measures being considered for the P-Cod trawl fishery in this area. We look forward to hearing more about the effectiveness of these measures at future meetings. However, there remains concern about monitoring of the non-directed fisheries, particularly Gulf of Alaska trawl fisheries. As noted in [IPHC-2022-AM098-06-Rev 1](#). The partial coverage leads to increased uncertainty in these non-directed commercial discard mortality estimates and to potential for bias.

61. Canada CB members **NOTED** this concern was also expressed at an NPFMC/IPHC Workshop on Pacific Halibut Bycatch Estimation (April 2012), where it was noted, “*The estimation of total halibut bycatch mortality in the GOA therefore rests on the assumption that observations on observed vessels are representative of fishing activities and halibut bycatch estimates for unobserved vessels. There is ample evidence and analyses to deny the validity of this assumption. The biases in observer deployment and behavioral modifications noted above make it impossible to estimate the magnitude of bias embedded in current estimation procedures.*” It was further **NOTED**, “...that it isn’t possible to quantify the observer effect, since it is not consistent from trip to trip, and that bootstrapping would just assess whether the estimator is biased, not quantify the observer bias.”
62. Canada CB members **NOTED** that, based on comments from the USA, the reduction in bycatch reported in the Gulf of Alaska in recent years may more be the result of reduced trawl fisheries for certain species, and may not necessarily attributed to new monitoring or management measures. We appreciate hearing about some of the actions being undertaken or considered to the US to try to address bycatch issues and we look forward to learning more about them. But remain concerned over the non-directed mortalities in the Gulf of Alaska, particularly by the trawl fisheries.
63. US CB members **NOTED** that the AK Observer Program undergoes an annual scientific review process where statistical reliability is explicitly evaluated. In 2022 the Gulf of Alaska trawl coverage is 30%, and Bering Sea coverage is at least 100% and in some fisheries it is 200%.

## 8. OTHER BUSINESS

### 8.1.1 Longer-term Distribution of TCEY

64. The Canada CB members **NOTED** the following considerations for distributing mortality limits:
- a) Start an early initiation of negotiations by the Contracting Parties to develop a new agreement for distributing the coastwide mortality limits, recognizing that the current agreement is set to expire at the end of the 2022 season.
  - b) Primary goals for a future agreement for distributing the coastwide TCEY should include:
    - i. The coastwide mortality limit and regulatory area mortality limits must be informed by science advice.
    - ii. The coastwide mortality limit is shared fairly between the Contracting Parties through national shares that takes into account factors such as history of fishing and social and economic considerations.
    - iii. Mortality limits must include all sources and sizes of mortality (U26 and O26) within each regulatory area.
    - iv. The Contracting Parties be directly responsible for all their fishing mortalities and the uncertainty associated with the accuracy and precision of their estimated fishing mortalities in their area.
    - v. All removals from both directed and non-directed fisheries be monitored to defined minimum standards of accuracy and precision.
    - vi. Actions in one Contracting Party’s area that result in negative impacts on the available harvest to the other Contracting Party’s area be mitigated.
  - c) A multi-year agreement be adopted to provide longer term stability.
65. The Canada CB members also **NOTED** that halibut are a highly migratory species that migrate throughout their whole lives, even as adults. IPHC Secretariat have even said that within the year halibut can move

throughout a region. The IPHC Secretariat have also stated that there is no biological basis for the IPHC Regulatory Areas and that is why results should be considered at the regional level. These need to be kept in mind when considering distribution just on abundance indices. Also, that additional direction from the Commissioners is needed to guide next steps, and that MSE work plan has already been finalized.

66. The USA CB members **NOTED** the following regarding Canada CB member statements:
- a) In agreement with point 1 above.
  - b) Canada's position never mentions abundance while US focuses on abundance, as measured by the FISS or a three-year average of the FISS, as fundamental to distribution/apportionment—THIS is the gap that must be bridged to find agreement.
  - c) U26 and O26 are fully accounted for in TCEY process.
  - d) Uncertainty would suggest lower harvest, not more to either contracting party.
  - e) Questions regarding the “standard” for monitoring confidence and how/who would determine.
67. The USA CB members **NOTED** that a long-term distribution policy between the contracting parties should:
- a) Consider both science-based indices, such as the FISS, stock assessment, and explicit policy considerations;
  - b) Generally, reflect the abundance of halibut within each contracting parties' waters;
  - c) Ensure that one contracting parties' apportionment does not result in negative impacts to the halibut resource within the other contracting parties' waters (i.e. that harvest by one contracting party beyond the yield found in that contracting party's waters does not negatively impact the halibut resource within the other contracting party's waters.)
  - d) Consider smoothing elements at the coastwide scale to minimize SPR variability due to uncertainty in recruitment estimates (ex. a 15% max TCEY annual change or SUFD);
  - e) Consider smoothing elements at the regulatory area scale to minimize variability in survey abundance indices (ex. a 3 yr rolling average or SUFD)
68. The US CB members further **NOTED** that the long-term distribution policy within US waters should:
- a) Be compromised of science-based indices, while allowing a limited range of explicit policy choices addressing socioeconomic factors to provide some level of predictability and stability in the US TCEY distribution process. This will reduce the need for large scale “ad-hoc” decisions within the distribution procedure. Long-term, the effect of these policy choices should be evaluated using the MSE framework.
  - b) Be developed in a transparent process with adequate input from stakeholders.
69. The CB **EXPRESSED** its appreciation for the assistance provided by the IPHC Secretariat, and for in-session presentations and support by Dr Ian Stewart, Dr Allan Hicks, Dr Barbara (Basia) Hutniczak, Mr Colin Jones, Mr Ed Henry, Ms Rachel Rillera, Ms Lauri Sadorus and the Secretariat support behind the scenes.

## **9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 92ND SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)**

70. The report of the 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the IPHC Conference Board ([IPHC-2022-CB092-R](#)) was **ADOPTED** on 27 January 2022, including the consolidated set of recommendations and requests arising from CB092, provided at Appendix IV. [*Canada: In favour=unanimous*]/[*U.S.A.: In favour=unanimous*]



## APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)

## Officers

Co-Chairperson	Co-Chairperson
Mr. Jim Lane (Canada)	Ms. Linda Behnken (United States of America)

## CB Members

Canada		
Member	Representative	Email
Annieville Halibut Association (AHA)	Terry Henshaw	<a href="mailto:tonic1949@gmail.com">tonic1949@gmail.com</a>
A-Tlegay Fisheries Society (AFS)	Christa Rusel	<a href="mailto:christarusel@shawcable.com">christarusel@shawcable.com</a>
BC Northern Trollers Association (NTA)	Robert Hauknes	<a href="mailto:robert_hauknes@hotmail.com">robert_hauknes@hotmail.com</a>
BC Wildlife Federation (WF)	Ted Brookman	<a href="mailto:tedbrookman6@gmail.com">tedbrookman6@gmail.com</a>
BC Halibut Longline Fisherman's Assoc. (BHLF)	Lorne Iverson	<a href="mailto:lorneiverson@telus.net">lorneiverson@telus.net</a>
BC Integrated Groundfish Society	Bruce Turriss	<a href="mailto:bruceturriss@shaw.ca">bruceturriss@shaw.ca</a>
Canadian Sablefish Association (CSA)	Tom Russel	<a href="mailto:quatsinostar@gmail.com">quatsinostar@gmail.com</a>
Council of the Haida Nation (CHN)	Shawn Cowpar	<a href="mailto:chn.massett@haidanation.com">chn.massett@haidanation.com</a>
Halibut Advisory Board (HAB)	Dave Boyes	<a href="mailto:mcboyes@icloud.com">mcboyes@icloud.com</a>
Hook and Line Groundfish Association (HLGA)	Ken Wing	<a href="mailto:ken.wing@hotmail.com">ken.wing@hotmail.com</a>
Island Marine Aquatic Working Group (IMAWG)	Nicole Frederickson	<a href="mailto:nfrederickson.imawg@gmail.com">nfrederickson.imawg@gmail.com</a>
Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council (NTC)	Jim Lane	<a href="mailto:Jim.Lane@nuuchahnulth.org">Jim.Lane@nuuchahnulth.org</a>
Pacific Coast Fishing Vessel Owners Guild (PCFVOG)	Quinton Sample	<a href="mailto:quintonsample@gmail.com">quintonsample@gmail.com</a>
Pacific Halibut Management Association of BC (PHMA)	Chris Sporer	<a href="mailto:chris.sporer@phma.ca">chris.sporer@phma.ca</a>
Sport Fishing Advisory Board (SFABM) - Main Board	Gerry Kristianson	<a href="mailto:gerrykr@telus.net">gerrykr@telus.net</a>
Sport Fishing Advisory Board (SFABN) - North Coast Region	Mike Fowler	<a href="mailto:midon@protonmail.ch">midon@protonmail.ch</a>
Sport Fishing Advisory Board - South Coast Region (SFABS)	Chuck Ashcroft	<a href="mailto:chuckashcroft@telus.net">chuckashcroft@telus.net</a>
Steveston Halibut Association (SHA)	Angus Grout	<a href="mailto:rommel@telus.net">rommel@telus.net</a>
Sport Fishing Institute of BC (SFI)	Owen Bird	<a href="mailto:birdo@sportfishing.bc.ca">birdo@sportfishing.bc.ca</a>
South Vancouver Island Anglers Coalition (SVIAC)	Christopher Bos	<a href="mailto:chris@anglerscoalition.com">chris@anglerscoalition.com</a>
The United Fishermen And Allied Workers' Union – Unifor (UFAWU/UNIFOR)	Russell Cameron	<a href="mailto:russelljcameron@yahoo.com">russelljcameron@yahoo.com</a>
Vancouver Island Longline Association (VILA)	Lyle Pierce	<a href="mailto:Lyle_p@shaw.ca">Lyle_p@shaw.ca</a>
West Coast Fishing Guides Association (WCFGA)	Deryk Krefting	<a href="mailto:deryk@activetackle.com">deryk@activetackle.com</a>
United States of America		
Member	Representative	Email
Adak Community Development Corporation (ACDC)	Layton Lockett	<a href="mailto:ljlockett@gmail.com">ljlockett@gmail.com</a>
Alaska Charter Association (ACA)	Garrett Lambert	<a href="mailto:montana06@gmail.com">montana06@gmail.com</a>

Alaska Longline Fisherman's Association (ALFA)	Dan Falvey	<a href="mailto:myriadfisheries@gmail.com">myriadfisheries@gmail.com</a>
Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association (AWTA)	Rebecca Skinner	<a href="mailto:execdir@alaskawhitefishtrawlers.org">execdir@alaskawhitefishtrawlers.org</a>
Aleutian Pribilof Island CDA (APICDA)	Angel Drobnica	<a href="mailto:adrobnica@apicda.com">adrobnica@apicda.com</a>
Aleut Corporation of Saint Paul Island (ACSPI)	Myron Melovidov	<a href="mailto:mmelovidov@cbsfa.com">mmelovidov@cbsfa.com</a>
Area 4 Concerned Harvesters	Lenny Herzog	<a href="mailto:Herzog.lenny@gmail.com">Herzog.lenny@gmail.com</a>
Bristol Bay Economic Development Corporation (BBEDC)	Steve Ricci	<a href="mailto:steven@bbedc.com">steven@bbedc.com</a>
CATCH Association (CATCH)	Brian Richie	<a href="mailto:brainandrewritchie@gmail.com">brainandrewritchie@gmail.com</a>
Central Bering Sea Fishermen's Association (CBSFA)	Ray Melovidov	<a href="mailto:raymelovidov@cbsfa.com">raymelovidov@cbsfa.com</a>
Coastal Trollers Association (CTA)	Joel Kawahara	<a href="mailto:joelkaw@earthlink.net">joelkaw@earthlink.net</a>
Coastal Villages Region Fund (CVRF)	Paul Wilkins	<a href="mailto:paul_w@coastalvillages.org">paul_w@coastalvillages.org</a>
Cordova District Fishermen United (CDFU)	Marc Carrel	<a href="mailto:marc.carrel@gmail.com">marc.carrel@gmail.com</a>
Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific (DSFU)	John Bruce	<a href="mailto:onebigfisherman@gmail.com">onebigfisherman@gmail.com</a>
Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc. (FVOA)	Per Odegaard	<a href="mailto:roberta@fvoa.org">roberta@fvoa.org</a>
Freezer Longliner Coalition (FLC)	Chad See	<a href="mailto:chadsee@freezerlongline.biz">chadsee@freezerlongline.biz</a>
Juneau Charterboat Association (JCBA)	Kevin Burchfield	<a href="mailto:lostinalaska@gei.net">lostinalaska@gei.net</a>
Halibut Coalition Inc.(HC)	Tom Gemmell	<a href="mailto:Halibutcoalition@gmail.com">Halibutcoalition@gmail.com</a>
Homer Charter Association (HCA)	Daniel Donich	<a href="mailto:HCA99603@gmail.com">HCA99603@gmail.com</a>
Humbolt Area Saltwater Anglers (HASA)	Mary Marking	<a href="mailto:ma5marking@gmail.com">ma5marking@gmail.com</a>
K-Bay Fisheries Association (KFBA)	Kiril Basargin	<a href="mailto:wildlegacyseafoods@gmail.com">wildlegacyseafoods@gmail.com</a>
Kodiak Vessel Owners Association (KVOA)	Linda Kozak	<a href="mailto:lindakozak@gmail.com">lindakozak@gmail.com</a>
Kruzof Fisheries (KRUZOF)	Jim Hubbard	<a href="mailto:jim@kruzoffisheries.com">jim@kruzoffisheries.com</a>
Next Generation Fishermens Association (NGFA)	Garrett Elwood	<a href="mailto:fvwesternfreedom@gmail.com">fvwesternfreedom@gmail.com</a>
North Pacific Fisheries Association (NPFA)	Malcolm Milne	<a href="mailto:npfahomer@gmail.com">npfahomer@gmail.com</a>
Petersburg Vessel Owners Association (PVOA)	Megan O'Neil	<a href="mailto:pvoa@gei.net">pvoa@gei.net</a>
Recreational Fishing Alliance - National (RFAN)	Jim Martin	<a href="mailto:flatland@mcn.org">flatland@mcn.org</a>
Recreational Fishing Alliance – California (RFAC)	Tom Marking	<a href="mailto:Tmmarking@gmail.com">Tmmarking@gmail.com</a>
Sablefish and Halibut Pot Association (SHPA)	Paul Clampitt	<a href="mailto:pfishcl@gmail.com">pfishcl@gmail.com</a>
Seafood Producers Coop (SPC)	James Carter Hughes	<a href="mailto:carterhughes@hotmail.com">carterhughes@hotmail.com</a>
SE Alaska Fishermen's Alliance (SEAFa)	Kathy Hansen	<a href="mailto:kathy@seafa.org">kathy@seafa.org</a>
Sitka Halibut & Sablefish Marketing Association (SHSMA)	Phillip Wyman	<a href="mailto:philwyman@hotmail.com">philwyman@hotmail.com</a>
Southeast Alaska Guides Organisation (SEAGO)	Forrest Braden	<a href="mailto:forrest@seagoalaska.org">forrest@seagoalaska.org</a>

St. Paul Fishing Company (SPFC)	Jeff Kauffman	<a href="mailto:Jeff@spfishco.com">Jeff@spfishco.com</a>
United Fishermen's Marketing Association (UFMA)	Jeff Stephans	<a href="mailto:jeff.stephan@me.com">jeff.stephan@me.com</a>
Yukon Delta Fisheries Association (YDFA)	Landry Price	<a href="mailto:Landry.ydfda@gmail.com">Landry.ydfda@gmail.com</a>

**IPHC Secretariat**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Email</b>
Mr Colin Jones	Setline Survey Specialist	<a href="mailto:colin.jones@iphc.int">colin.jones@iphc.int</a>
Mr Edward Henry	Communications Specialist	<a href="mailto:edward.henry@iphc.int">edward.henry@iphc.int</a>
Dr. Allan Hicks	Quantitative Scientist	<a href="mailto:allan.hicks@iphc.int">allan.hicks@iphc.int</a>
Dr. Barbara Hutniczak	Branch Manager	<a href="mailto:Barbara.hutniczak@iphc.int">Barbara.hutniczak@iphc.int</a>
Dr. Ian Stewart	Quantitative Scientist	<a href="mailto:ian.stewart@iphc.int">ian.stewart@iphc.int</a>
Ms Lauri Sadorus	Communications/ Research Biologist	<a href="mailto:lauri.sadorus@iphc.int">lauri.sadorus@iphc.int</a>
Ms Rachel Rillera	Setline Survey Specialist	<a href="mailto:rachel.rillera@iphc.int">rachel.rillera@iphc.int</a>

---

**APPENDIX II**  
**AGENDA FOR THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092)**

**Date:** 25-26 January 2022

**Location:** Electronic

**Venue:** Adobe Connect

**Time:** 25<sup>th</sup>: 13:30-17:00; 26<sup>th</sup>: 09:00-17:00; If necessary: 27<sup>th</sup>: 09:00-12:00

**Co-Chairperson:** Mr Jim Lane (Canada); Ms Linda Behnken (United States of America)

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION (Co-Chairpersons)**
  - 1.1 Accreditation of CB Membership (2021-25): new members
- 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 3. IPHC SECRETARIAT INFORMATIONAL SESSION**
  - 3.1 Mortality Limits and TCEY (I. Stewart)
  - 3.2 MSE Update (A. Hicks)
  - 3.3 Pacific Halibut Multiregional Economic Impact Assessment (PHMEIA) (B. Hutniczak)
- 4. FISHING PERIODS: SEASON OPENING AND CLOSING DATES**
- 5. MORTALITY LIMITS (Co-Chairpersons)**
  - 5.1 Coastwide perspectives
  - 5.2 Regulatory Area perspectives
  - 5.3 TCEY Recommendations
- 6. IPHC FISHERY REGULATIONS: PROPOSALS FOR THE 2020/21 PROCESS**
  - 6.1 IPHC Secretariat fishery regulation proposals (B. Hutniczak)
  - 6.2 Contracting Party fishery regulation proposals (Contracting Parties)
  - 6.3 Other Stakeholder fishery regulation proposals (Stakeholders)
- 7. INCIDENTAL CATCH (BYCATCH) (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 8. OTHER BUSINESS (Co-Chairpersons)**
- 9. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092) (Co-Chairpersons; IPHC Secretariat)**

**APPENDIX III****PACIFIC HALIBUT MORTALITY PROJECTED FOR 2022 BASED ON THE CB RECOMMENDED TCEY MORTALITY LIMITS**

**Note:** All values reported in millions of net pounds.

**RECOMMENDATION**

	<b>2A</b>	<b>2B</b>	<b>2C</b>	<b>3A</b>	<b>3B</b>	<b>4A</b>	<b>4B</b>	<b>4CDE</b>	<b>Total</b>
Commercial discard mortality	0.07	0.21	NA	NA	0.19	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.63
O26 Non-directed discard mortality	0.09	0.21	0.07	0.72	0.35	0.24	0.12	1.96	3.76
Recreational	NA	0.03	1.09	1.58	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	2.71
Subsistence	NA	0.41	0.29	0.18	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.94
<b>Total Non-FCEY</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>8.04</b>
Commercial discard mortality	NA	NA	0.12	0.42	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.54
Recreational	0.60	1.01	0.74	2.17	NA	NA	NA	NA	4.52
Subsistence	0.03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.03
Commercial Landings	0.86	5.70	3.18	9.80	3.50	1.84	1.42	1.78	28.09
<b>Total FCEY</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>6.71</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>12.39</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>1.42</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>33.18</b>
<b>TCEY</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>7.56</b>	<b>5.49</b>	<b>14.87</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>41.22</b>
U26 Non-directed discard mortality	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.29	0.07	0.08	0.01	0.74	1.23
<b>Total Mortality</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>7.59</b>	<b>5.49</b>	<b>15.16</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>1.61</b>	<b>4.55</b>	<b>42.45</b>

## APPENDIX IV

**CONSOLIDATED SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF THE 92<sup>ND</sup> SESSION OF THE  
IPHC CONFERENCE BOARD (CB092) (25-27 JANUARY 2022)**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

***Fishing periods: season opening and closing dates***

CB092-Rec.01 ([para. 11](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the following fishing period dates for 2022:

- a) Opening: 06 March
- b) Closing: 07 December

CB092-Rec.02 ([para. 13](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission **ADOPT** IPHC Regulatory Area 2A changes and actions for the recreational and Non-Treaty Directed Fishery proposed by PFMC [*Canada: In favour=1; against=0; abstain=18;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=24; against=0; abstain=3*]

***Mortality limits***

CB092-Rec.03 ([para. 15](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission **ADOPT** an F43 for the 2022 harvest rate along with the corresponding coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds. [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=1;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=26; against=3; abstain=0*]

CB092-Rec.04 ([para. 22](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adhere to the interim agreement, a fixed TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2A of 1.65 million pounds [*Canada: In favour=21; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=27; against=1; abstain=3*].

CB092-Rec.05 ([para. 23](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** the Commission adopt a TCEY for IPHC Regulatory Area 2B of 7.56 million pounds as determined by the 2019 interim agreement [*Canada: In favour=22; against=0; abstain=0;*][*U.S.A.: In favour=2; against=29; abstain=2*].

CB092-Rec.06 ([para. 32](#)) The CB members from the USA **RECOMMENDED** the following 2022 TCEYs for Alaska IPHC Regulatory Areas based on SPR 43 resulting in a Coastwide TCEY of 41.22 million pounds ([Table 1](#)). FCEYs for IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A include an adjustment for unguided angler estimates using a midpoint between ADFG high and low values, where the reference mortality table uses high values. An increase to IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A and 4CDE from the reference TCEY is offset by reducing increases to IPHC Regulatory Areas 3B and 4B ([Appendix III](#)).

**Table 1.** Conference Board (CB) recommended TCEY mortality limits for 2022.

IPHC Regulatory Area	Mortality limit (TCEY) (mlb)
2C	5.49
3A	14.87
3B	4.06
4A	2.18
4B	1.6
4CDE	3.81
<b>Total (IPHC Convention Area)</b>	<b>41.22</b>

**Canada:** In favour=13; against=7; abstain=1

**U.S.A.:** In favour=33; against=0; abstain=1

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Mortality and Fishery Limits (Sect. 5)***

CB092-Rec.07 ([para. 35](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA1, with the addition of the mortality limits for each Contracting Party, by sector, as detailed in Section 5.3), but also include all mortality (e.g. subsistence, bycatch, and non-guided sport) in annual summary framework table [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Commercial fishing periods (Sect. 9)***

CB092-Rec.08 ([para. 36](#)) The CB **NOTED** and **RECOMMENDED** that Commission adopt fishery regulation proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA2](#), which specified fishing periods for the commercial Pacific halibut fisheries. See [Section 4](#) for a summary of discussions and recommendations. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*].

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: minor amendments***

CB092-Rec.09 ([para. 38](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropA3](#) as written in Appendix I. [*Canada: unanimous; U.S.A.: unanimous*]

***Recreational (sport) fishing for Pacific halibut—IPHC Regulatory areas 2c, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e (sect. 29) - Recordkeeping for charter Pacific halibut annual limits***

CB092-Rec.10 ([para. 40](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB1 Rev 1](#). [*Canada: In favour=5; against=0; abstain=11*][*U.S.A.: In favour=30; against=0; abstain=2*]

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Charter management measures in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C and 3A (Sect. 29)***

CB092-Rec.11 ([para. 42](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB2](#). [*Canada: In favour=3; against=0; abstain=16*][*U.S.A.: In favour=28; against=0; abstain=2*]

***IPHC Fishery Regulations: Fishing gear (Sect. 18) – Trap gear use in IPHC Regulatory Area 2b***

CB092-Rec.12 ([para. 45](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt proposal [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropB3](#), as written in Appendix 1. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]

***Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E (Sect. 29) - Processing Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation***

CB092-Rec.13 ([para. 56](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** no action be taken at this time by the Commission on IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1, but that additional work be done to engage enforcement from both Contracting Parties, address deficiencies in the proposal, and the proposal come back for consideration at IPHC-2022-IM098. CB members were primarily interested in finding an enforceable regulation change that would allow consumption on board of a reasonable amount of Pacific halibut. [*Canada: unanimous*][*U.S.A.: unanimous*]

CB092-Rec.14 ([para. 57](#)) The CB **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission ask the domestic management agencies to look at the issue addressed in [IPHC-2022-AM098-INF01](#), Appendix II and come back with additional information for further consideration. That information should include a definition of rental boat and impacts of increasing harvest in the unguided rental boat sector. Concern expressed that this sector is unlimited and growing; other US CB members noted that the NPFMC has considered this issue and failed to clearly define the problem or potential solutions. [*Canada: In favour=0; against=0; abstain=18*][*U.S.A.: In favour=16; against=9; abstain=3*]

***REQUESTS***

Nil