

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Agenda C-5 - FUTURE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Terry Thomas, Seattle. Against any form of limited access. All investments in the fisheries were made under the existing rules. Mr. Thomas gave facts and figures citing factory trawler investment in coastal communities through the purchase of fuel, supplies, and other support services.

Buster McNabb, Golden Pices, Inc. Against limited access. If limited access is implemented there should be definite guidelines as soon as possible and the issue of grandfather rights should be addressed.

David Harville, Kodiak Western Trawlers. Opposes any form of limited access. Suggested the Council drop the whole issue for a minimum of two years. Council should support money for research and management, i.e., observer programs. There should be 100% observer coverage available in all fisheries. The problem of overcapitalization is past solving; shorebased processors should be given preference in their area.

Ted Smits, North Pacific Fishing Vessel Owners Assn. Limited access reduces breadth of opportunity to fishermen to make a living. Resource conservation should be the focus of the fishery management process.

James Wexler, Seattle. Prefer open access even though the interests he represents would qualify under a limited access program. If there is a limited access program he is concerned that the requirements for eligibility be as complete as possible. Also, it should be determined whether limited access is really necessary before the Council goes any further. If a program is instituted, he prefers a January 1, 1991 cut-off date.

Eric Maisonpierre, Seattle. Represents a small fleet of factory trawlers. The request for shoreside processor preference is a symptom of overcapitalization and an attempt at allocation. If a cut-off date is necessary, grandfather rights should be included.

Bert Larkin, Marine Resources Int'l. Supports NPFVOA (Ted Smits) comments on limited access. Also against any form of preference for any one segment of the fleet.

Ralph Hoard, Icicle Seafoods. It's too late to implement a limited access program; does not support a cut-off date of any kind. Council should discontinue study of limited access systems and get on with other management options.

Doug Gordon, American High Seas Fisheries Assn. Concerned over what happens to the equity vessels in his association have built up under any limited access system the Council might choose. Not sure about the viability of a shorebase preference but support the examination of the options.

Vic Horgan, Ocean Beauty Seafoods. Ocean Beauty is an all-Alaskan operation. Options the Council is considering will not benefit Alaska. He strongly supports status quo; no cut-off date is needed. A well-thought-out license limitation program, if supported by fishermen (which it isn't at this time), might be an option.

Mike Snigaroff, Atka Fishermen's Assn. Against limited access because they are trying to develop their economy and get into the fishing industry. They are putting in a new processing plant this year.

Ron Pauley, OceanTrawl, Inc. They cannot support management measures which give preference to any user group. It's a dangerous precedent and seems in direct conflict with the encouragement given to industry to Americanize which the factory trawler group is substantially responsible for. Council should manage the fishery resources under the existing quota system, based on biological and scientific information, without regard to user groups.

Brad Resnick, Aleutian Dragon Fisheries. In favor of preference for shorebased processors. Supports open access for fishermen and processors but not when there is blatant disregard for the resource as happened in the pollock roe stripping incident in the Gulf.

Arne Aadland, NPFVOA. Their association is against limited access, license limitation, and quota systems. Fishermen should have the ability to attain "the great American dream" of owning their own boat. Urged Council to get a GAO audit to determine the extent of foreign ownership in American fishing operations.

Perfenia Pletnikoff, Pribilof Island fishermen. In the absence of the traditional fur seal harvest they must develop their fishing industry; adopting of the January 16, 1989 cut-off date would not be fair to them, nor is the current "pipeline" definition. They have also invested in a larger harbor. Under the Fur Seal Act they believe the Council is obligated to give them preference.

Jim Ellis, Pacific Bounty. A cut-off date must go through the regulatory process; the Supreme Court has recently ruled that an agency cannot use a retroactive cut-off date unless that agency has regulatory authority.

Chris Blackburn, Kodiak City Council. A shorebase processor preference is the only way Kodiak will be able to survive economically.

Al Burch, Alaska Draggers Assn. Supports the Advisory Panel's recommendation that the Council discontinue work on limited access systems. If the Council continues to pursue this type of management system, however, they should keep the January 16, 1989 cut-off date and develop a system to weed out those who are not really eligible. Supports shorebase preference for all Alaska coastal communities.

Barry Ohai, F/V STARBOUND. Favors open access. Supports observer program and prohibition of roe stripping.

Bob Watson, F/V SEAWOLF. Opposed to limited access; supports full utilization, 100% observer coverage, and prohibition of roe stripping.

Peter Block, Northern Deep Sea Fisheries. Overcapitalization is at the root of the limited access proposals. He's opposed to limited access because he feels the future under it would not be any better than under open access. Council should concentrate on full utilization policy and other management regimes.

Phil Chitwood, Arctic Alaska. Council should invest time and effort in developing management plans that will provide equal opportunity for all segments of the industry. Against limited access.

Forrest Gould, Kodiak. Suggested that under any license limitation system he would oppose a size class on permits.

Kenneth Allread, Western Alaska Fisheries. Council doesn't have adequate research at this time. Need onboard observers to collect data for rational management decisions. Supports the idea of shoreside preference.

John Sevier, Alaska Pacific Seafoods. Kodiak processors have a large impact on their local economy and should have preference. More money and vessels should be allocated to investigate the pollock stocks in the Gulf. Supports Advisory Panel recommendation to abandon study of limited access systems.

Vince Curry, Alaska Factory Trawlers Assn. AFTA is opposed to the cut-off date. Limited access is a difficult and complex issue. The present date is not fair to fishermen who have invested money and time in the fisheries as encouraged under the MFCMA. Currently, the "pipeline" definition is overly vague. If the Council decides to pursue limited access systems, AFTA would support analysis of fleet rationalization of all segments prior to adopting a cut-off date.

Tom Casey, Seattle. IFQs are not working that well in New Zealand. Hopes Council will concentrate on the critical problems facing them and not try to institute a complex system like ITQs.

Dave Fraser, Cape Flattery Fisheries. Although limited access seems not to be the choice of most fishermen he's talked to, he thinks it's the Council's responsibility to the resource to curtail overcapitalization. Suggested the Council declare a cut-off date immediately and follow it with a moratorium.

Wally Pereyra, ProFish Int'l. Supports efforts of the Council to develop limited access alternatives for the fisheries; continuation of open access will lead to gross overcapitalization in the fisheries. He provided the Council with a written alternative for the current cut-off date and pipeline definition.

Steve Hughes, Midwater Trawlers. They favor the establishment of a cut-off date of January 16, 1989 for all king crab, tanner crab and groundfish vessels exceeding 50 ft in length. Favor qualifications based on proof of

groundfish and crab landings as of a certain date, with no exceptions, and a two-year "cooling-off period during which; time a suite of limited access options would be developed for full Council consideration. Any new "in the pipeline" vessels would have to enter as processors only.

Stan Hovik, Arctic Storm, Inc. In favor of a moratorium on new entry while the open access system can be scrutinized. There is more than adequate capitalization in the fishery now. Not in favor of shoreside preference.

Karl Ohl, Aide to Senator Zharoff. Introduced a letter signed by eight Alaskan legislators encouraging the Council to consider the welfare of coastal communities in any system they may adopt.

Wayne Marshall, City Manager of King Cove. Their biggest concern is that many of the limited access systems the Council is considering would exclude their fishermen. Supports a shoreside preference proposal. If the Council does consider limited access, he asked that the cut-off date be moved back to at least December 1990 to allow their residents to expand their fisheries.

Arni Thomson, ACC. There have been some management measures that came out of the Future of Groundfish Committee that might be useful. However, the groundfish and crab fisheries should be allowed to level off before limited access systems are considered.

Bob Miller, ACC. ACC does not favor a cut-off date or ITQs. The priority of the Council at this time should be development of an observer program for DAP fisheries.

Paul Fuhs, Unalaska. In favor of some type of shoreside preference. Prefer Council put it in form of an amendment rather than a study group. In the absence of limited access or shoreside preference, the Council needs to get on with other management measures to address immediate problems.

Michael Reif, Sitka. Submitted a written proposal for a competitive bid plan.

Jessie Nelson, North Pacific Fisheries Coalition. They do not support the cut-off date because they want to use part participation through ITQs if they're adopted. NPFC supports an observer program.

Neil Shuckerow, Int'l Seafoods. They are concerned with the issues of roe stripping and waste and support full utilization of the resource and shoreside preference.

Agenda C-7 - EMERGENCY ACTION REQUESTS - POLLOCK

Mike Haggren, Kodiak. Roe stripping is a problem that must be addressed. Will need pollock bycatch in other fisheries, for instance the Pacific cod fishery.

Spike Jones, Oregon. The Council needs to stop roe stripping now; full utilization of the resource is very important to fishermen for many different reasons.

Tim Black, John Sevier, Ken Allread, representing three major shoreside processors in Kodiak. In 1988 they submitted five proposals, one of which was to prohibit roe stripping. The Council did not take action on it and now there is a problem. They asked the Council to direct staff to begin development of a shoreside preference amendment for review at the June Council meeting.

Chris Blackburn, Alaska Groundfish Data Bank. Regulations for bycatch management were developed to deal with bycatch species which have a high value, not the low valued species such as pollock that cannot be avoided. Fishermen need bycatch quotas for pollock for the remainder of the year. Also, there is a lack of survey data to guide the Council in setting an accurate pollock TAC.

Al Burch, Alaska Dragger Assn. He agrees with the testimony of the shoreside processors from Kodiak. Also supports 20% retention for pollock, full utilization of the resource, and a prohibition of roe stripping.

Doug Gordon, American High Seas Fisheries Assn. They support the goal of moving toward reasonable full utilization regulations. Urged prohibition of roe stripping unless full utilization of the carcass is required. Also suggested the effect of dumping carcasses on the grounds be investigated to determine whether it is detrimental to the environment.

Dave Harville, Kodiak Western Trawlers. He supports the testimony of the Kodiak shoreside processors and is very concerned about the harvesting of large quantities of large female pollock.

Reed Wasson, Eagle Fisheries. Supports testimony of Kodiak shoreside processors; roe stripping is symptomatic of highgrading and should be prohibited.

Vern Hall, Kodiak. Supports shoreside preference, full utilization and the prohibition of roe stripping. Also suggests a non-specific reserve for the Gulf and supports 20% bycatch for pollock and mandatory observers.

Harold Jones, Kodiak. Concerned because there were 35 factory ships on the grounds this year and the number is expected to double next year. Their year-round fishery was closed in 85 days.

Brad Resnick, Aleutian Dragon Fisheries. Supports Kodiak processors' stand on the unacceptability of roe stripping. Also supports the concept of full utilization but is concerned about how that would be defined.

Jerome Selby, Mayor, Kodiak Island Borough. Asked the Council to allocate 10,000 mt pollock for bycatch during the remaining cod and flatfish seasons, and in June to allocate an additional 35,000 mt for the remainder of the year for directed fishing if NMFS and observer data support it. Also asked that by January 1, 1990 the Council prohibit roe stripping of pollock, require full utilization of pollock, adopt a mandatory onboard domestic observer program, and a DAP shorebase processor preference which would reserve an adequate allocation for shorebased processors to operate year round.

Paul Fuhs, Mayor, Unalaska. Supports an emergency measure to prohibit roe stripping for both Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands. Also in favor of full utilization. Thinks there is a basis for the emergency ruling both on socioeconomic and biological bases.

Wayne Marshall, Peninsula Fishermen's Marketing Association. His association includes fishermen from King Cove, Sand Point, Akutan, Nelson Island and False Pass. There is more and more investment in the fishing industry in these communities. Their processing plant is a large part of their economy and it's important that they have product for as much of the year as possible. Supports a shoreside preference policy, full utilization, and prohibition of roe stripping.

Neil Shuckerow, International Seafoods. Supports proposals of the Kodiak shoreside processors, specifically shoreside preference.

Alec Brindle, Wards Cove Packing Co. Supports the position of the Kodiak shoreside processors with regard to roe stripping and pollock bycatch.

Dave Fraser, Cape Flattery Fisheries. He has a small operation and it's important to capitalize on available opportunities; there was a higher price for roe, so they took advantage of that opportunity. The fisheries are a federal resource and should benefit anyone in the nation. It may be appropriate to investigate full utilization but it should be done through the amendment process, not by emergency order.

Henry Mason, Anchorage. Supports limiting the take of roe and requiring full utilization of pollock and cod. He also supports a domestic observer program and the use of bycatch rather than discarding it.

Ted Evans/Sam Hjelle, Alaska Factory Trawlers Assn. They are in favor of a rational program for utilization of the resource. The Council set a TAC specifically designed to encourage fishing for pollock outside Shelikof and urged fishermen not to strip roe in Shelikof Strait, not outside. The TAC should be raised for the remainder of 1989 and full utilization should be addressed through the plan amendment cycle.

Sam Hjelle pointed out that not all vessels discarded the carcasses; some made surimi.

Chip Dennerlein, Alaska Joint Venture Seafoods. It's time the Council gave a strong signal on roe stripping; it's a waste of resource. Also thinks Council should move toward full utilization and make use of bycatch rather than discarding it. He thinks there's room to provide some measure of shoreside development opportunity without a preference measure.

Steve Hughes, Midwater Trawlers. The discrepancy in pollock surveys in the Gulf (every year in Shelikof and every three years in the Western/Central area) makes it difficult to manage the resource. Also, pollock should be allocated to the different areas of the Gulf, rather than have a combined TAC like this year. He supports the Kodiak request for 20% pollock bycatch.

D-2(a) - GROUND FISH AMENDMENTS

Ted Evans, AFTA. He's concerned about several of the alternatives in the data gathering amendment; thinks Council should only send out viable alternatives for public comment.

Vince Curry, AFTA. Requested that the EA/RIR for the amendment dealing with sablefish allocation in the BS/AI include data from a NWAFRC report on killer whale/sablefish interactions. On the walrus closure amendment, AFTA suggests that an additional alternative be developed to include all vessels, not just trawl. Under the fishing season framework amendment they recommend an alternative which would prohibit setting seasons that have an allocative impact because they feel that kind of regulation should go through the regular amendment cycle.

Harold Sparck, Yukon-Kuskokwim Task Force. With reference to the data gathering amendment, reporting discards in logbooks should be required.

Arni Thomson, Alaska Crab Coalition. Supports a sablefish allocation of 70% for fixed gear and the comprehensive data gathering program. Agrees with the AP's recommendation for a new alternative for public review.

John Coyne. Data on sablefish in the Bering Sea/Aleutians are not adequate. The area has supported a productive sablefish longline fishery for some time. More current data are needed to determine the status of stocks before making allocations by gear type.

D-2(b)(c)(d) - DIRECTED FISHING DEFINITION, BYCATCH MANAGEMENT, HERRING BYCATCH

Paul MacGregor, AFTA. Under the old definition of directed fishing every fisherman was in jeopardy. He supports the AP recommendation which is more reasonable. Regarding the emergency rule extending the closed area from 162° to 163°, they are concerned that it applies to all trawling, not just bottom trawling. The intent was to protect crab during the soft-shell period which would involve onbottom trawling, not midwater. Asked that the Council exempt midwater trawlers from this extension.

Tom Casey, Seattle. Pleased with the extension from 162° to 163° to protect crab; hopes Council stick with their December decision.

Jessie Nelson, North Pacific Fisheries Assn. Supports closure of Port Moller to trawling from June 15 to July 1 because it conflicts with the nearshore herring fishery at that time. Herring bycatch in trawl fisheries is higher than the catch of herring in the directed fishery.

Harold Sparck, Yukon-Kuskokwim Fisheries Task Force. Submitted a minority report to the Herring Bycatch Workgroup's meeting report. The minority report included requests for the Council to set a herring bycatch cap of 4,000 mt for 1989 (combined state and federal) in the Dutch Harbor fishery, to require a statistically significant rate of observer coverage and monitor shoreside deliveries, and after the 4,000 mt tons of herring have been caught, to institute mandatory time/area closures to halt fishing until herring have left the area in late September.

William Nicholson, Bristol Bay Herring Marketing Co-op. They have concerns over the herring bycatch levels and worry about a serious decline in the Togiak stocks. Have poor recruitment right now and the trawl fleet's bycatch of herring will have serious effects. Concurs with Mr. Sparck's testimony.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Ludger Dochtermann, Kodiak. He is concerned about trawlers fishing in the areas where halibut congregate and has had reports that the vessel REBECCA IRENE has been targeting on sablefish and halibut. Urged the Council to require observers on all factory trawlers to assess bycatch.

