

DRAFT FOR SECRETARIAL REVIEW

Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Harvest Specifications for 2015–2016

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

October, 2014

Lead Agency National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Alaska Regional Office
Juneau, Alaska

Responsible Official Dr. James Balsiger
Regional Administrator, Alaska Regional Office

For Further Information Contact Dr. Ben Muse
National Marine Fisheries Service
P.O. Box 21668
Juneau, AK 99802
907-586-7228

Abstract: This document contains an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) for the groundfish harvest specifications in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands for the years 2015 and 2016. This IRFA identifies the small entities that may be directly regulated by this action, and describes the significant alternatives to the action that meet the objectives of the action and their relative economic impacts on directly regulated small entities. This IRFA addresses the statutory requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601-612).

[this page intentionally left blank]

1 Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

1.1 Introduction

The action under consideration is adoption of harvest specifications pursuant to the strategy to govern the harvest of groundfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) management area, adopted by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) in December 2006. The harvest strategy is one in which total allowable catches (TACs) fall within the range of acceptable biological catches (ABCs) recommended by the Council's BSAI Groundfish Plan Team, and its Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), and TACs recommended by the Council. This action is taken in accordance with the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI FMP) (Council 2014), recommended by the Council pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (NMFS 2007c).

The preliminary survey information and analysis were evaluated by the Council's BSAI Groundfish Plan Team at its meeting in Seattle, Washington, September 23 through September 25, 2014. The Plan Team recommended 2015 and 2016 overfishing levels (OFLs) and ABCs for the species included in the BSAI FMP. The Plan Team's recommendations were reviewed by the SSC at the Council's October 2014 meeting in Anchorage, Alaska. The SSC recommended species OFLs and ABCs, which were adopted by the Council. In addition, the Council, with input from its SSC, its industry Advisory Panel (AP), and following public testimony, adopted recommendations for TACs for the individual species. Under this proposed action, the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) would adopt the Council's October 2014 OFL, ABC, and TAC recommendations.

Alaska Fishery Science Center (AFSC) analysts are currently updating their models, and their OFL and ABC recommendations, in light of further analysis of information collected from fishery surveys in the summer of 2014, and information on fishery harvests in calendar year 2014. The Council's BSAI Plan Team will meet again from November 17 through 21, 2014, to review the updated analyses, and revise its 2015 and 2016 OFL and ABC recommendations, as necessary. The Council, SSC, and AP will review the updated Plan Team recommendations at the Council's December 2014 meeting in Anchorage, and the Council may revise its OFL, ABC, or TAC recommendations at that time. The final harvest specifications will take any December revisions into account.

This Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) addresses the statutory requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) of 1980, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601-612).¹

1.2 The purpose of an IRFA

The RFA, first enacted in 1980, was designed to place the burden on the government to review all regulations to ensure that, while accomplishing their intended purposes, they do not unduly inhibit the ability of small entities to compete. The RFA recognizes that the size of a business, unit of government, or nonprofit organization frequently has a bearing on its ability to comply with a Federal regulation. Major goals of the RFA are (1) to increase agency awareness and understanding of the impact of their

¹ National Marine Fisheries Servies (2007d) provides current NOAA Fisheries guidance for preparation of an IRFA; Queirolo (2014) provides a more accessible overview.

regulations on small business, (2) to require that agencies communicate and explain their findings to the public, and (3) to encourage agencies to use flexibility and to provide regulatory relief to small entities. The RFA emphasizes predicting impacts on small entities as a group distinct from other entities and on the consideration of alternatives that may minimize the impacts while still achieving the stated objective of the action.

On March 29, 1996, President Clinton signed the SBREFA. Among other things, the new law amended the RFA to allow judicial review of an agency's compliance with the RFA. The 1996 amendments also updated the requirements for a final regulatory flexibility analysis, including a description of the steps an agency must take to minimize the significant (adverse) economic impacts on small entities. Finally, the 1996 amendments expanded the authority of the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA) to file *amicus* briefs in court proceedings involving an agency's alleged violation of the RFA.

In determining the scope or “universe” of the entities to be considered in an IRFA, NMFS generally includes only those entities that can reasonably be expected to be directly regulated by the proposed action. If the effects of the rule fall primarily on a distinct segment, or portion thereof, of the industry (e.g., user group, gear type, geographic area), that segment would be considered the universe for the purpose of this analysis. NMFS interprets the intent of the RFA to address negative economic impacts, not beneficial impacts and, thus, such a focus exists in analyses that are designed to address RFA compliance.

Data on cost structure, affiliation, and operational procedures and strategies in the fishing sectors subject to the proposed regulatory action are insufficient, at present, to permit preparation of a “factual basis” upon which to certify that the preferred alternative does not have the potential to impose “significant economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities” (as those terms are defined under RFA). Because, based on all available information, it is not possible to “certify” this outcome, should the proposed action be adopted, a formal IRFA has been prepared and is included in this package for Secretarial review.

1.3 What is required in an IRFA?

Under 5 U.S.C., Section 603(a) and (b) of the RFA, each IRFA is required to contain:

- A description of the reasons why action by the agency is being considered;
- A succinct statement of the objectives of, and the legal basis for, the proposed rule;
- A description of and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply including a description of the adverse economic impacts of the proposed rule on directly regulated small entities;
- A description of the projected reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities that will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record;
- An identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed rule;
- A description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rule that accomplish the stated objectives of the proposed action, consistent with applicable statutes, and that would minimize any significant adverse economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities. Consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, the analysis shall discuss significant alternatives, such as:

1. The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities;
2. The clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for such small entities;
3. The use of performance rather than design standards;
4. An exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.

1.4 What is a small entity?

The RFA recognizes and defines three kinds of small entities: (1) small businesses, (2) small non-profit organizations, and (3) small government jurisdictions.

Small businesses. Section 601(3) of the RFA defines a ‘small business’ as having the same meaning as ‘small business concern’, which is defined under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (SBA). ‘Small business’ or ‘small business concern’ includes any firm that is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation. The SBA has further defined a “small business concern” as one “organized for profit, with a place of business located in the United States, and which operates primarily within the United States or which makes a significant contribution to the U.S. economy through payment of taxes or use of American products, materials or labor...A small business concern may be in the legal form of an individual proprietorship, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, joint venture, association, trust or cooperative, except that where the firm is a joint venture there can be no more than 49 percent participation by foreign business entities in the joint venture.”

The SBA has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the United States, including fish harvesting and fish processing businesses. Effective July 14, 2014, a business involved in *finfish harvesting* is a small business if it is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and if it has combined annual gross receipts not in excess of \$20.5 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. A business involved in *shellfish harvesting* is a small business if it is independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and if it has combined annual gross receipts not in excess of \$5.5 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. (79 FR 33647; June 12, 2014) A *seafood processor* is a small business if it is independently owned and operated, not dominant in its field of operation, and employs 500 or fewer persons on a full-time, part-time, temporary, or other basis, at all its affiliated operations worldwide. A business that *both harvests and processes* fish (i.e., a catcher/processor) is a small business if it meets the criteria for the applicable fish harvesting operation (i.e., finfish or shellfish). A wholesale business servicing the fishing industry is a small business if it employs 100 or fewer persons on a full-time, part-time, temporary, or other basis, at all its affiliated operations worldwide.

The SBA has established “principles of affiliation” to determine whether a business concern is “independently owned and operated.” In general, business concerns are affiliates of each other when one concern controls or has the power to control the other, or a third party controls or has the power to control both. The SBA considers factors such as ownership, management, previous relationships with or ties to another concern, and contractual relationships, in determining whether affiliation exists. Individuals or firms that have identical or substantially identical business or economic interests, such as family members, persons with common investments, or firms that are economically dependent through contractual or other relationships, are treated as one party with such interests aggregated when measuring the size of the concern in question. The SBA counts the receipts or employees of the concern whose size

is at issue and those of all its domestic and foreign affiliates, regardless of whether the affiliates are organized for profit, in determining the concern's size. However, business concerns owned and controlled by Indian Tribes, Alaska Regional or Village Corporations organized pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601), Native Hawaiian Organizations, or Community Development Corporations authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9805 are not considered affiliates of such entities, or with other concerns owned by these entities solely because of their common ownership.

Affiliation may be based on stock ownership when (1) a person is an affiliate of a concern if the person owns or controls, or has the power to control 50 percent or more of its voting stock, or a block of stock which affords control because it is large compared to other outstanding blocks of stock, or (2) if two or more persons each owns, controls, or has the power to control, less than 50 percent of the voting stock of a concern, with minority holdings that are equal or approximately equal in size, but the aggregate of these minority holdings is large as compared with any other stock holding, each such person is presumed to be an affiliate of the concern.

Affiliation may be based on common management or joint venture arrangements. Affiliation arises where one or more officers, directors, or general partners, controls the board of directors and/or the management of another concern. Parties to a joint venture also may be affiliates. A contractor and subcontractor are treated as joint venturers if the ostensible subcontractor will perform primary and vital requirements of a contract or if the prime contractor is unusually reliant upon the ostensible subcontractor. All requirements of the contract are considered in reviewing such relationship, including contract management, technical responsibilities, and the percentage of subcontracted work.

Small organizations. The RFA defines "small organizations" as any not-for-profit enterprise that is independently owned and operated, and is not dominant in its field.

Small governmental jurisdictions. The RFA defines "small governmental jurisdictions" as governments of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with populations of fewer than 50,000.

1.5 Why the action is being considered

The proposed action is the implementation of the Council's 2006 harvest strategy choice for the federally managed groundfish fisheries in the BSAI management area in 2015 and 2016. This strategy determines annual harvest specifications in compliance with Federal regulations, the BSAI FMP, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The Secretary approves the harvest specifications based on the recommendations of the Council. As described in the environmental impact statement (EIS) prepared when the Council chose its strategy,² the action is:

Set TACs that fall within the range of ABCs recommended through the Council harvest specifications process and TACs recommended by the Council. Under this scenario, F is set equal to a constant fraction of $maxF_{ABC}$. The recommended fractions of $maxF_{ABC}$ may vary among species or stocks, based on other considerations unique to each. This is the method for determining TACs that has been used in the past.³

² The EIS, and a relevant erratum are available on the NMFS Alaska Region's web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/analyses/specs/eis/default.htm>. (NMFS 2007a, NMFS 2007b)

³ This was the status quo and preferred alternative before the Council and Secretary in 2006–07. At the time, this was Alternative 2. The significant alternatives to the proposed action (Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5) are listed below, in Section 1.10 of this IRFA.

The harvest strategies are applied to the best available scientific information to determine the harvest specifications, which are the annual limits on the amount of each species of fish, or of each group of species, that may be taken. Harvest specifications include the TACs, their seasonal apportionments and allocations, and prohibited species catch (PSC) limits. Groundfish harvests are controlled by the enforcement of TAC, bycatch and incidental catch limits, PSC allowances⁴, and apportionments of each among seasons, fishing sectors, and areas.

TACs set upper limits on total (retained and discarded) harvest for a fishing year. TACs are set for each “target species” category defined in the FMPs or harvest specifications. TAC seasonal apportionments and allocations are specified by regulations at 50 CFR part 679.

Prohibited species include halibut, herring, salmon, steelhead, king crab, and Tanner crab. A target fishery that has caught the seasonal (or annual) PSC limit apportioned to an area is closed in that area for the remainder of the season (or year). PSC limits are specified in the BSAI FMP or regulations. The Council apportions PSC limits among seasons and target fisheries, following criteria in the Federal regulations.

The Council’s Groundfish Plan Teams use stock assessments to calculate biomass, OFLs, and ABCs, for each target species or species group for specified management areas of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) off Alaska. OFLs and ABCs are published with the harvest specifications, and provide the foundation for the Council and NMFS to develop the TACs. OFL and ABC amounts reflect fishery science, applied in light of the requirements of the FMPs.

The TACs associated with the preferred harvest strategy are those adopted by the Council in October 2013. OFLs and ABCs for the species were based on recommendations prepared by the Council’s BSAI Plan Team in September 2013, and reviewed and modified by the Council’s SSC in October 2013. The Council based its TAC recommendations on those of its AP, which were consistent with the SSC’s OFL and ABC recommendations.

The Federal regulations at 50 CFR part 679 provide specific constraints for the harvest specifications by establishing management measures that create the framework for the TAC apportionments and allocations. Specifically, the Federal regulations establish the general limitations, bycatch management, PSC allowances, area closures, seasons, gear limitations, and inseason adjustments.

Table 1 shows the Council’s recommended harvest specifications for 2015 and 2016.

⁴ The Magnuson-Stevens Act defines bycatch as fish which are harvested in a fishery, but which are not sold or kept for personal use, and includes economic discards and regulatory discards (section 3). Regulations at 50 CFR 679.2 define incidental catch as fish caught and retained while targeting on some other species, but does not include discard of fish that were returned to the sea. Regulations at § 679.2 also define prohibited species catch (PSC) as species listed in Table 2b of § 679, including various species of crab, Pacific halibut, Pacific herring, various species of Pacific salmon, and steelhead trout. PSC species must be avoided, to the extent practicable, and must be discarded, unless legally authorized to retain for donation to a charitable food organization. These definitions are used in this IRFA.

Table 1. BSAI OFL, ABC, and TAC recommendations for 2015 and 2016. Includes 2014 for reference.

Species	Area	2014			2015			2016		
		OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC	OFL	ABC	TAC
Pollock	BS	2,795,000	1,369,000	1,267,000	2,693,000	1,258,000	1,258,000	2,693,000	1,258,000	1,258,000
	AI	42,811	35,048	19,000	47,713	39,412	19,000	47,713	39,412	19,000
	Bogoslof	13,413	10,059	75	13,413	10,059	75	13,413	10,059	75
Pacific cod	BS	299,000	255,000	246,897	319,000	272,000	251,712	319,000	272,000	251,712
	AI	20,100	15,100	6,997	20,100	15,100	6,487	20,100	15,100	6,487
	BS	1,584	1,339	1,339	1,432	1,210	1,210	1,432	1,210	1,210
Sablefish	AI	2,141	1,811	1,811	1,936	1,636	1,636	1,936	1,636	1,636
	BSAI	259,700	239,800	184,000	268,900	248,300	187,000	268,900	248,300	187,000
	BSAI	2,647	2,124	2,124	3,864	3,173	3,173	3,864	3,173	3,173
Greenland turbot	BS	n/a	1,659	1,659	n/a	2,478	2,478	n/a	2,478	2,478
	AI	n/a	465	465	n/a	695	695	n/a	695	695
	BSAI	125,642	106,599	25,000	125,025	106,089	25,000	125,025	106,089	25,000
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	8,270	7,100	7,100	8,500	7,300	7,300	8,500	7,300	7,300
Kamchatka flounder	BSAI	228,700	203,800	85,000	213,310	190,100	85,000	213,310	190,100	85,000
Rock sole	BSAI	79,633	66,293	24,500	77,023	64,127	25,129	77,023	64,127	25,129
Flathead sole	BSAI	66,800	55,100	24,500	66,300	54,700	25,000	66,300	54,700	25,000
Alaska plaice	BSAI	16,700	12,400	2,650	16,700	12,400	3,000	16,700	12,400	3,000
Other flatfish	BSAI	39,585	33,122	33,122	37,817	31,641	31,641	37,817	31,641	31,641
Pacific ocean perch	BS	n/a	7,684	7,684	n/a	7,340	7,340	n/a	7,340	7,340
	EAI	n/a	9,246	9,246	n/a	8,833	8,833	n/a	8,833	8,833
	CAI	n/a	6,594	6,594	n/a	6,299	6,299	n/a	6,299	6,299
	WAI	n/a	9,598	9,598	n/a	9,169	9,169	n/a	9,169	9,169
Northern rockfish	BSAI	12,077	9,761	2,594	11,943	9,652	3,000	11,943	9,652	3,000
Rougheye rockfish	BSAI	505	416	416	580	478	478	580	478	478
	EBS/EAI	n/a	177	177	n/a	201	201	n/a	201	201
	CAI/WAI	n/a	239	239	n/a	277	277	n/a	277	277
Shortraker rockfish	BSAI	493	370	370	493	370	370	493	370	370
Other rockfish	BSAI	1,550	1,163	773	1,550	1,163	873	1,550	1,163	873
	BS	n/a	690	300	n/a	690	400	n/a	690	400
	AI	n/a	473	473	n/a	473	473	n/a	473	473
Atka mackerel	BSAI	74,492	64,131	32,322	74,898	64,477	32,491	74,898	64,477	32,491
	EAI/BS	n/a	21,652	21,652	n/a	21,769	21,769	n/a	21,769	21,769
	CAI	n/a	20,574	9,670	n/a	20,685	9,722	n/a	20,685	9,722
	WAI	n/a	21,905	1,000	n/a	22,023	1,000	n/a	22,023	1,000
Skates	BSAI	41,849	35,383	26,000	39,746	33,545	26,000	39,746	33,545	26,000
Sculpin	BSAI	56,424	42,318	5,750	56,424	42,318	5,750	56,424	42,318	5,750
Sharks	BSAI	1,363	1,022	125	1,363	1,022	125	1,363	1,022	125
Squids	BSAI	2,624	1,970	310	2,624	1,970	325	2,624	1,970	325
Octopuses	BSAI	3,450	2,590	225	3,450	2,590	225	3,450	2,590	225
Total	BSAI	4,196,553	2,572,819	2,000,000	4,107,104	2,472,832	2,000,000	4,107,104	2,472,832	2,000,000

Sources: 2014 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are from harvest specifications adopted by the Council in December 2013; 2015 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are those adopted by the Council in December 2013. 2016 OFLs, ABCs, and TACs are rolled over from the Council's December 2013 harvest specifications for 2015.

1.6 The objectives of, and the legal basis for, the proposed rule

Objectives

The purpose of the TACs adopted pursuant to the harvest strategy, is to provide for orderly and controlled commercial fishing for groundfish (including Community Development Quota [CDQ] fishing); promote sustainable incomes to the fishing, fish processing, and support industries; support sustainable fishing communities; and provide sustainable flows of fish products to consumers. The harvest strategy balances groundfish harvest in the fishing year with ecosystem needs (such as target and non-target fish stocks, marine mammals, seabirds, and habitat) (NMFS 2007a: 1–4). The objectives of the proposed action are to allow commercial fishing for the groundfish stocks in the BSAI, while protecting the long run health of the fish stocks, and the social and ecological values that those fish stocks provide.

The BSAI FMP imposes procedures for setting the harvest specifications. Of particular importance are the definitions of areas and stocks (Section 3.1), procedures for determination of harvest levels (Section 3.2), rules governing time and area restrictions (Section 3.5), and rules governing catch restrictions (Section 3.6). (Council 2014)

Legal basis

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 USC 1801 *et seq.*), the United States has exclusive fishery management authority over all marine fishery resources found within the EEZ, which extends between 3 nautical miles and 200 nautical miles from the baseline used to measure the territorial sea (NMFS 2007c).

The management of these marine resources is vested in the Secretary and regional fishery management councils. In the Alaska region, the Council has the responsibility to prepare FMPs for the marine resources it finds require conservation and management and for submitting its recommendations to the Secretary. NMFS is charged with carrying out the Federal mandates of the Department of Commerce with regard to marine fish. The Alaska Regional Office of NMFS and AFSC research, draft, and support the management actions recommended by the Council, upon approval by the Secretary.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires that the FMPs specify the optimum yield (OY) from each fishery to provide the greatest benefit to the Nation, and must state how OY may be harvested in U.S. waters. The FMPs must also specify the level of fishing that would constitute overfishing. Using the framework of the FMPs and current information about the marine ecosystem (stock status, natural mortality rates, and oceanographic conditions), the Council annually recommends to the Secretary, TAC specifications, PSC allowances, and/or fishery bycatch limits, based on biological and economic information provided by NMFS. The information includes determinations of ABC and OFL amounts for each of the FMP established target species or species groups.

Pursuant to Magnuson-Stevens Act section 301, the FMP and regulations promulgated to implement the FMP must be consistent with the National Standards for fishery conservation and management. Upon approval by the Secretary, NMFS is charged with carrying out the Federal mandates of the Department of Commerce with regard to marine and anadromous fish.

The groundfish fisheries in the BSAI region of the EEZ off Alaska are managed under the BSAI FMP (Council 2012). Actions taken to amend FMPs or implement other regulations governing these fisheries must meet the requirements of Federal laws and regulations.

TACs adopted pursuant to the harvest strategy meet the need for the management of the groundfish fisheries and the conservation of marine resources, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and as described in the management policy, goals, and objectives in the FMPs, and comply with other relevant laws, the groundfish FMPs, and applicable Federal regulations.

TACs adopted pursuant to the harvest strategy meet the Magnuson-Stevens Act's ten national standards for fisheries conservation and management. Perhaps the most influential of these is National Standard 1, which states "conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the OY from each fishery for the United States fishing industry" (16 U.S.C. 1851).

TACs adopted pursuant to the harvest strategy comply with provisions of the groundfish FMPs. The FMPs contain management objectives to guide fishery management decision-making. These objectives were embodied in the BSAI and Gulf of Alaska (GOA) groundfish FMPs by Amendments 81 and 74, respectively (69 FR 31091, June 2, 2004, approved August 26, 2004). The environmental impacts of managing fisheries to meet these objectives were evaluated in the Alaska Groundfish Fisheries Programmatic Supplemental EIS (NMFS 2004).

1.7 Number and description of small entities directly regulated by the proposed action

Entities directly regulated by the groundfish harvest specifications include: (a) entities operating vessels with groundfish FFPs catching FMP groundfish in Federal waters; (b) all entities operating vessels, regardless of whether they hold groundfish FFPs, catching FMP groundfish in the state-waters parallel fisheries; (c) all entities operating vessels fishing for halibut inside three miles of the shore (whether or not they have FFPs).⁵ ⁶ (NMFS 2014)

Table 2 summarizes estimates of the numbers of small entities active in the BSAI groundfish fisheries in 2013. These estimates account for corporate affiliations among vessels, and for cooperative affiliations among fishing entities. Since NMFS may have been unable to identify all relevant affiliations among entities, these estimates may overstate the numbers of small entities. Moreover, these counts of small entities take into account all estimates of all fishing revenues for the entities in Federal and state waters off of Alaska, and off of the U.S. West Coast. However, to the extent that entities may have non-fishing revenues, or of fishing revenues from other regions of the country, the analysis may have counted some large entities as small. To the extent this occurred, this would also tend to lead to an overstatement of the number of small entities.

Table 2. Estimated numbers of small entities directly regulated by this action

Gear type	All vessels	Catcher/processors	Catcher vessels
All Gear	357	4	353
Hook & Line (including jig)	317	3	314

⁵ This definition is assumed to include all vessels directed fishing for halibut.

⁶ State of Alaska Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) fisheries are conducted independently of the Federal groundfish fisheries under the direct regulation of the State of Alaska, and vessels operating in these fisheries, but not falling into the categories above, are not considered directly regulated by this action. State of Alaska parallel fisheries are managed in close coordination with the fisheries in Federal waters, and are treated here as directly regulated by this action for this reason. Vessels fishing for crab or trolling for salmon catch some FMP groundfish and estimates of these catches are used for groundfish OFL and ABC determinations. However, these catches are not actively monitored in-season, and groundfish in-season management would only affect these operations under very unusual circumstances. This activity is not considered to be directly regulated by this action.

Pot	33	1	32
Trawl	18	0	18

Source: AFSC preliminary estimates for 2014 Groundfish Economic SAFE; based on activity in 2013.

Revenue data for catcher/processors are not reported, due to confidentiality considerations. However, average gross revenue data for 2013 may be reported for catcher vessels: average gross revenues were \$320,000 for small hook-and-line vessels, \$1.25 million for small pot vessels, and \$3.56 million for small trawl vessels.⁷

Through the CDQ program, the Council and NMFS allocate a portion of the BSAI groundfish TACs, and apportion prohibited species halibut and crab PSC limits, to 65 eligible Western Alaska communities. These communities work through six non-profit CDQ groups, and are required to use the proceeds from the CDQ allocations to start or support activities that will result in ongoing, regionally based, commercial fishery or related businesses. The CDQ groups receive allocations through the harvest specifications process, and are directly regulated by this action, but the 65 communities are not directly regulated. Because they are nonprofit entities, the CDQ groups are considered small entities for RFA purposes.

The Aleut Corporation is an Alaska Native Corporation that receives an allocation of pollock in the Aleutian Islands. The Aleut Corporation is a holding company and evaluated according to the SBA criteria at 13 CFR 121.201, using a \$7 million gross annual receipts threshold for “Offices of Other Holding Companies” (NIACS code 551112). Aleut Corporation revenues exceed this threshold (Aleut Corporation, 2011), and the Aleut Corporation is considered to be a large entity. This follows the analysis in the RFA certification for BSAI FMP Amendment 82. (NMFS 2005: 413).

1.8 Recordkeeping and reporting requirements

The IRFA should include “A description of the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities that will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record...” This action does not modify recordkeeping or reporting requirements.

1.9 Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with proposed action

An IRFA should include “An identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant Federal rules that may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed rule...” This analysis did not reveal any Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed action.

1.10 Description of significant alternatives and their effects on small entities

An IRFA should include, “A description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rule that accomplish the stated objectives of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and any other applicable statutes and that would minimize any significant (implicitly adverse) economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities.” This section provides a general descriptive statement regarding the effects of the alternatives on small entities, because quantification is not practical or reliable at this time.

⁷ These vessel count and revenue estimates take account of known affiliations between entities, including corporate affiliations of individual fishing vessels, and cooperative affiliations. Gross revenues include gross revenues from all known fishing sources, including fishing in Federal waters off of Alaska, in Alaskan state waters, and in Federal and state waters off of the U.S. West Coast.

The significant alternatives were those considered as alternative harvest strategies when the Council selected its preferred harvest strategy in December 2006. These included the following:

- Alternative 1: Set TACs to produce fishing mortality rates, F , that are equal to $\max F_{ABC}$, unless the sum of the TACs is constrained by the OY established in the FMPs. This is equivalent to setting TACs to produce harvest levels equal to the maximum permissible ABCs, as constrained by OY. The term “ $\max F_{ABC}$ ” refers to the maximum permissible value of F_{ABC} under Amendment 56 to the groundfish FMPs. Historically, the TAC has been set at or below the ABC, therefore, this alternative represents a likely upper limit for setting the TAC within the OY and ABC limits.
- Alternative 3: For species in Tiers 1, 2, and 3, set TAC to produce F equal to the most recent 5-year average actual F . For species in Tiers 4, 5, and 6, set TAC equal to the most recent 5-year average actual catch. For stocks with a high level of scientific information, TACs would be set to produce harvest levels equal to the most recent five year average actual fishing mortality rates. For stocks with insufficient scientific information, TACs would be set equal to the most recent five year average actual catch. This alternative recognizes that for some stocks, catches may fall well below ABCs, and recent average F may provide a better indicator of actual F than F_{ABC} does.
- Alternative 4: (1) Set TACs for rockfish species in Tier 3 at $F_{75\%}$. Set TACs for rockfish species in Tier 5 at $F=0.5M$. Set spatially explicit TACs for shortraker and rougheye rockfish in the BSAI. (2) Taking the rockfish TACs as calculated above, reduce all other TACs by a proportion that does not vary across species, so that the sum of all TACs, including rockfish TACs, is equal to the lower bound of the area OY (1,400,000 mt in the BSAI and 116,000 mt in the GOA). This alternative sets conservative and spatially explicit TACs for rockfish species that are long-lived and late to mature, and sets conservative TACs for the other groundfish species.
- Alternative 5: Set TACs at zero.

Alternative 2, which was described in Section 1.5, is the preferred alternative chosen by the Council.

Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 do not both meet the objectives of this action and have a smaller adverse economic impact on small entities. All were rejected as harvest strategies by the Council in 2006 and by the Secretary in 2007.

Alternative 1 would lead to TACs whose sum exceeds the fishery OY, which is set out in statute and the BSAI FMP. As shown in Table 1, the sum of ABCs in 2015 and in 2016 would be about 2,472,832 metric tons, in excess of the 2,000,000 metric ton OY for the BSAI (Council 2014: ES-3). This would be inconsistent with the objectives of this action, in that it would violate statutory law and the BSAI FMP, which both set a 2,000,000 metric ton maximum harvest for BSAI groundfish.

Alternative 3 selects harvest rates based on the most recent five years’ worth of harvest rates (for species in Tiers 1 through 3) or for the most recent five years’ worth of harvests (for species in Tiers 4 through 6). This alternative is inconsistent with the objectives of this action because it does not take account of the most recent biological information for this fishery.

Alternative 4 would lead to significantly lower harvests of all species in order to reduce TACs from the upper end of the OY range in the BSAI, to its lower end (1.4 million metric tons) (Council 2014: ES-3). This would lead to significant reductions in harvests of species by small entities. While reductions of this size may be associated with offsetting price increases, the size of these increases is very uncertain, and

there can be no confidence that they would be sufficient to offset the volume decreases and leave revenues unchanged. Thus, this action would have an adverse economic impact on directly regulated small entities operating in the BSAI, compared to the preferred alternative.

Alternative 5, which sets all harvests equal to zero would have a significant adverse economic impact on small entities and would be contrary to obligations to achieve OY on a continuing basis, as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

2 Contributors

Jean Lee. Alaska Fisheries Information Network contractor with the NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center. Seattle, Washington.

Ben Muse, Ph.D. Industry Economist. Sustainable Fisheries Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office. Juneau, Alaska.

Lewis Queirolo, Ph.D. Regional Economist. National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office, Camano Island, Washington.

3 Persons Consulted

Gabrielle Aberle. Sustainable Fisheries Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office. Juneau, Alaska.

Mary Furuness. Sustainable Fisheries Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office. Juneau, Alaska.

Steve Whitney. Sustainable Fisheries Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office. Juneau, Alaska.

4 References

Aleut Corporation. 2011. Annual Report, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.aleutcorp.com/images/stories/11916_annual_report_webres.pdf on September 27, 2013.

National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office (NMFS). 2004. Programmatic Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Alaska Groundfish Fisheries Implemented Under the Authority of the Fishery Management Plans for the Groundfish Fishery of the Gulf of Alaska and the Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area. Juneau, Alaska. June. Retrieved from <http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/seis/final062004/COVER.pdf> on October 9, 2012.

National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Regional Office (NMFS). 2005. Environmental Assessment/Regulatory Impact Review for Amendment 82 to the BSAI FMP and regulatory amendments to allow the allocation of future Aleutian Islands pollock harvest to the Aleut Corporation as required by Public Law 108-199. Juneau, Alaska. January. Retrieved from

<http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/analyses/amd82/bsai82finalea0205.pdf> on October 9, 2012.

NMFS. 2007a. Alaska Groundfish Harvest Specifications Final Environmental Impact Statement. Juneau, Alaska. January 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/analyses/specs/eis/final.pdf> on October 9, 2012.

NMFS 2007b. Errata for the Alaska Groundfish Harvest Specifications Final Environmental Impact Statement (January 2007). Retrieved from <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/analyses/specs/eis/gfisherrata.pdf> on October 9, 2012.

NMFS. 2007c. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. As Amended Through January 12, 2007. May. Retrieved from http://www.nero.noaa.gov/sfd/MSA_amended_20070112_FINAL.pdf on October 9, 2012.

NMFS. (2007d). Guidelines for economic review of National Marine Fisheries Service regulatory actions. Washington, D.C.: National Marine Fisheries Service. Retrieved from http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/domes_fish/EconomicGuidelines.pdf.

North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council). 2014. Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. Anchorage, Alaska. April. Retrieved from <http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/fmp/BSAI/BSAImp.pdf> on September 9, 2012.

Queirolo, L. E. 2014. Conducting Economic Impact Analyses for NOAA Fisheries Service. National Marine Fisheries Service, P. O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802. August 27, 2014. Retrieved from http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/analyses/RIR_RFAAguidance.pdf on September 8, 2014.