

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Clement V. Tillion, Chairman
Jim H. Branson, Executive Director

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3136DT
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Suite 32, 333 West 4th Avenue
Post Office Mall Building

Telephone: (907) 274-4563
FTS 265-5435



CERTIFIED:

Clement V. Tillion, Chairman

MINUTES of
Twenty-third Plenary Session
NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Sheffield House
Anchorage, Alaska
February 22-23, 1979

The regular monthly meeting of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council was held in Anchorage, Alaska, at the Sheffield House Hotel on February 22-23, 1979. An attendance roster of Council members, the Scientific and Statistical Committee and Advisory Panel and the public is attached at Appendix A.

The Council meeting was called to order on Thursday, February 22, at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Clement V. Tillion. The SSC met in the Council office on Wednesday, February 21, and again on Thursday, February 22. The Advisory Panel, chaired by Keith Specking, met at the Sheffield Hotel Windsor Room on February 21, and again in the Council offices on February 22.

The preliminary agenda for the Council meeting was approved and is included as Appendix B. Minutes of the January 25-26, 1979, meeting were approved with changes and are included as Appendix C.

AGENDA #3, Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Jim H. Branson highlighted staff travel, progress on the Halibut and Troll Salmon FMPs, and completion of the new Conference Room located across the hall from Council headquarters in the Post Office Mall Building. The report is attached as Appendix D.

Mr. Branson also announced a Finance Committee meeting for 7:00AM, Friday (February 23) in the Penthouse of the Sheffield Hotel; the upcoming 200-Mile Conference in Seattle; the March 13 public hearing in Washington, D.C. on P. L. 95-354 (Interim Final Regulations); and the upcoming Alaska Board of Fisheries meetings in Anchorage (April).

AGENDA #4, Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report

Preliminary domestic groundfish catches for January were presented by Guy Thornburgh, ADF&G Extended Jurisdiction Coordinator, and are included as Appendix E. Mr. Thornburgh also briefly reviewed Alaska Board of Fisheries shellfish proposals promising a more formal and annotated presentation for the March meeting in Juneau.

AGENDA #5, National Marine Fisheries Service

Craig Hammond and Phil Chitwood (NMFS, Juneau) presented the regular NMFS foreign fishery report for Alaska. Mr. Chitwood told the Council that in general, foreign fishing in the Gulf remained at an extremely low level through the first two months of 1979, with no nation reporting any catch greater than 13% of the total allocation to that country, with the exception of the Soviet Union's pollock catch in the Kodiak area. This report, including the catch statistics, is Appendix F. Mr. Chitwood discussed a February 15th table showing the original Gulf of Alaska groundfish optimum yield (OY), domestic annual harvest (DAH), reserves, and total allowable level foreign fishing figures (TALFF), the January reserve release and the possible March release figures. The table, Chitwood said, while outlining the status of allocations, reserves, and potential releases to come, was a document to be used for Agenda #10--The discussion of the possible March 2 release of reserves to TALFF for the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP.

AGENDA #6, U.S. Coast Guard Report

Commander Pete Buscik told the Council that two South Korean vessels had been issued reports of violations for failure to return salmon and halibut to the sea in a timely manner--the KYUNG YANG HO and the CHEOG YANK HO. Of a more serious nature, Commander Buscik described the seizure of two Japanese trawlers, the TSUDA MARU and the FUKUI MARU NO. 8, both for grossly underlogging or misreporting their catches.

The very serious nature of the alleged underlogging of catches by the two Japanese trawlers was discussed at some length by the Council. Councilman McKernan raised the question of whether civil or criminal penalties would be filed against the two Japanese vessels. NOAA Council Kim White explained the procedure whereby the U.S. Department of Justice, with advice from the National Marine Fisheries Service, makes the determination for criminal or civil penalties.

The essence of the Council's discussion can be summarized by Professor McKernan, who pointed out that since the Council depends heavily on catch data reported by the nations fishing off Alaska, this type of violation could have the greatest lasting effect on the resource and on proper scientific management of any violation that could be expected. Additionally, it was pointed out that under-reporting of the magnitude involved in the

WYOMING - A. Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report

... were presented for January were presented in ...
... Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report ...
... presented for the ...

WYOMING - A. Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report

... presented the ...
... Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report ...
... presented for the ...

WYOMING - A. Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report

... presented the ...
... Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report ...
... presented for the ...

... presented the ...
... Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report ...
... presented for the ...

... presented the ...
... Alaska Department of Fish & Game Report ...
... presented for the ...

two seizures could involve many hundreds of thousands of tons of fish over the year if the type of violation is general throughout the fleet. Many members of the Council felt that this type of under-reporting was endemic and of wholesale proportions. The last point brought out in the Council discussion was that besides the obvious problems dealing with fisheries management, no fee was being paid on the fish not recorded: i.e., all revenue on the unreported catch is lost to the United States.

Following the discussion, the Council unanimously agreed to send their recommendations in two letters: one to the Justice Department requesting criminal and civil penalties be assessed against vessels grossly under logging their catches; and the other to the Secretary of Commerce urging revocation of permits of vessels caught for such violations. Copies of these letters were to be sent to the Department of State, the Congressional Delegation, and others concerned in these matters.

The Coast Guard once again received laudatory praise from the Council through Professor McKernan who congratulated them on the fine job they were doing on the enforcement and surveillance duties on the high seas. The Executive Director pointed out that the National Marine Fisheries Service Enforcement Section had also been involved in these cases and was deserving of some praise as well. All concurred. The Coast Guard Report is attached as Appendix G.

AGENDA #7, Scientific and Statistical Committee Report

The Scientific and Statistical Committee Report was read by Chairman Steve Pennoyer and is attached as Appendix H. Pertinent parts of the report are included in these minutes with the appropriate agenda items. Mr. Pennoyer discussed with the Council an SSC request that those government employees on the SSC be allowed an alternate for attendance at SSC meetings. The Council discussed this, asked the staff to investigate the matter and approved alternates for those members of the SSC who were government employees.

Pennoyer also told the Council that the SSC had discussed review procedures for Fishery Management Plans and other lengthy reports. The SSC is continually plagued with insufficient lead time to study these documents and was therefore assigning to subcommittees the study and review of these plans and documents. The first subcommittee, Pennoyer said, would be Frank Fukuhara, Jack Lechner, Don Bevan and George Rogers, who would meet in Seattle to study the King Crab Plan and make recommendations to the SSC at the March meeting.

The SSC also reviewed the Plan Drafting Team's recommendations on Bering Sea/Aleutian Island groundfish management options. The report is included

...the estimate could have been made of thousands of dollars over the year if the type of utilization as reported throughout the fiscal year were of the same order of magnitude as that reported in the first few months of the fiscal year. The fact that the estimate was made in the first few months of the fiscal year is a serious matter. It is all revenue on the amount of the estimated amount of the fiscal year.

Following the discussion, the Council members discussed the various recommendations in the report. One of the recommendations was that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration.

The Council also discussed the various recommendations in the report. It was suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL COMMITTEE REPORT

The Administrative and Financial Committee report was read by Chairman ... The report was read by Chairman ... The report was read by Chairman ... The report was read by Chairman ... The report was read by Chairman ...

The report also discussed the various recommendations in the report. It was suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration.

The report also discussed the various recommendations in the report. It was suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration. It was also suggested that the various recommendations be assigned to the various departments for their consideration.

with the options paper to be presented to the Council at the March meeting. In summary, the SSC had the following comments on the Bering Sea Plan:

1. Regarding the winter halibut savings area, the SSC supports the Plan Drafting Team's recommendation that no foreign longlining be allowed in the winter halibut savings area.
2. Regarding foreign closures in the 3-12 mile Aleutian zone, the SSC believes the most recent proposal by the Plan Drafting Team is better than other suggestions, but reserves final judgment until data from other sources is received and reviewed.
3. Regarding the exemption of foreign longliners from national closures when certain allocations are reached, the SSC recommends that the foreign longline fishery not be closed unless the catch of the following longline target species exceeds the total national allocation: sablefish, Pacific cod, and turbot.
4. Regarding salmon savings closure, domestic catch reporting, limited entry, and marine mammal considerations, the SSC will consider these subjects at the March meeting when more information is available.

AGENDA #8, Advisory Panel Report

The full report of the Advisory Panel is attached as Appendix I, and was presented by Keith Specking, Chairman. Comments by the Panel relating to individual agenda items are included as the items appear in the minutes.

Additionally, Mr. Specking reported that Al Comiskey, of the National Weather Service, had talked with the Panel about new marine activities of the NWS in the North Pacific. These dealt with, among other things, development of radio facsimile transmission from Kodiak, a new NWS marine service unit to improve weather services to the mariner.

The Panel discussed the coming meeting of the DAH reassessment working group and would like to have the following members participate: Sig Jaeger, Al Otness, Shari Gross, Keith Specking, and Rick Lauber. They felt continuing reassessment of DAH and DAP provide a very critical factor in the understanding and planning, not only for joint ventures, but also for the release of reserves to TALFF.

AGENDA #9, Advisory Panel Appointments

The Council filled the two remaining vacancies on the Advisory Panel by appointing Jeffrey Stephan, Manager of the United Fishermen's Marketing Association, of Kodiak, and Jesse Foster of Quinhagak, to the Panel. In

with the cotton paper to be presented to the Council at the above meeting. In summary, the SAC had the following comments on the report:

1. Regarding the water table survey area, the SAC suggests that the water table survey be conducted in the water table area.
2. Regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone, the SAC believes the report is correct in the 1-11 mile zone. The SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone. The SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.
3. Regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone, the SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone. The SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.
4. Regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone, the SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone. The SAC believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.

ADVISORY BOARD REPORT

The full report of the Advisory Board is attached as Appendix 1 and was presented by Keith Johnson, Chairman. Comments by the Board related to individual items are included in the items appearing in the report.

Additionally, the Board reported that it had received information from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone. The Board believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.

The Board also received information from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone. The Board believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.

ADVISORY BOARD REPORT

The Board also received information from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding the water table survey in the 1-11 mile Alaskan zone. The Board believes that the water table survey should be conducted in the 1-11 mile zone.

the absence of the Nominations Subcommittee Chairman Charles Meacham, Mr. Lokken, acting chairman, said the committee was pleased with the selection and felt both Foster and Stephan were excellent additions to the Advisory Panel.

Mention was made by Councilman Campbell that neither individual represented the broad consumer interest, and that in the future he would be willing to suggest consumer representatives for vacancies on the Advisory Panel.

AGENDA #10, March 2nd Release of Reserves in the Gulf of Alaska

The Council discussed the proposed March 2nd release of Reserves to TALFF for all species in the Gulf of Alaska to recommend to the Regional Director, NMFS, release amounts. A summary table was prepared by NMFS, Juneau, dealing with original OY, DAH, Reserve, and TALFF figures; the amount of reserves released on January 2nd, the new reserve balance and revised TALFF, and the amounts available for the March 2nd release. Additionally, the Council considered the projected U.S. catch by two joint ventures (KMIDC and Marine Resources Co., Inc.), the current U.S. and foreign catch, and the processor preference amendment. The Council also considered their previous recommendation for a full 25% release of the Reserve on January 2nd and none on March 2nd.

Regarding the KMIDC projected U.S. catch, the Council learned that information had been supplied to Harry Rietze, Regional Director, NMFS, Juneau, on the projected 1979 catch including identification of vessels, captains, and capacities. The project outlined 14 vessels and a possible harvest of up to 102,000 metric tons of pollock. The projected U.S. catch by Marine Resources Co., Inc., was 6,000 metric tons of assorted bottomfish, including 2,000 metric tons pollock, 1,900 metric tons Pacific cod, 1,400 metric tons Pacific ocean perch, 400 metric tons sablefish, 300 metric tons of other species.

Mr. Specking told the Council the Advisory Panel considered the matter and recommended to the Council that all of the proposed 25% reserve amount be withheld until the May 2nd release. Specking went on to say that the Panel was unclear as to the relationship of the processor preference amendment to the present Gulf groundfish FMP. The Panel did feel there was surplus U.S. harvesting capacity (DAH) above what could be processed by U.S. processors. Specking said the Panel's recommendation was based on the assumption that the reserve amount reflects a surplus domestic catching capacity above what will be domestically processed and that the opportunity to comment on proposed joint ventures in the Gulf of Alaska will bring about the most accurate and current assessment of the expected domestic catch.

The Council considered the Panel's recommendations and in addition heard public testimony indicating there was not only surplus catching capacity for bottomfish in the Gulf but also a very high domestic processing intent and capacity for sablefish and cod. The Council also learned that due to

the low level of foreign fishing, no foreign operation would be jeopardized if the full 25% were withheld with the exception of sablefish.

The Council's recommendation was that a release of not more than one half of the 25% (12½%) scheduled for release was appropriate. The Council also felt that the release of the other half could be discussed at the March Council meeting.

AGENDA #11, Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP Amendments

The Council considered three amendments to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery FMP.

Amendment 1: A request by the North Pacific Longline Gillnet Association (Japan) to conduct a longline fishery landward of 500 meters between 140° and 157° W. longitude for Pacific cod.

Steve Pennoyer told the Council that the SSC found no scientific basis for rejecting the proposal after comparing data from the Shumagins and Chirikof areas. The data clearly demonstrated that a trawl fishery for cod causes a significantly greater loss of halibut than a directed longline fishery for cod. The Plan Development Team also estimated that halibut mortality would be reduced if the cod TALFF was allocated to longliners rather than the trawl fishery although savings would be small since the cod TALFF is small relative to the total groundfish allocation. The total catch of groundfish would not be increased if the longliners are allowed inside 500 meters--the longline catch would simply replace some of the trawl catch. However, Pennoyer said allocations already made might preclude any effective action on this prior to 1980.

Regarding the Advisory Panel report, Specking told the Council they had listened to Bert Larkins as he presented the results of a special working group who met in Seattle last week to discuss this proposal. The Panel learned that foreign trawl fisheries in the Gulf required approximately 5% cod as an incidental catch for the fishery to occur. Mr. Larkins also told the Panel that a savings of approximately \$500,000 (a quarter million pounds of halibut) would occur if a cod catch of 10,000 metric tons were taken by foreign longliners as opposed to foreign trawlers. Larkins also said that as a practical matter it would be difficult to implement an amendment to this year's FMP which would reallocate or redistribute TALFF among countries by gear types. He stated however that if any of the 15,000 metric tons of cod DAH is unused by the domestic fishery and transferred to TALFF that amount could be specified for longliners.

Several members of the Panel argued that while the idea of displacing foreign trawl vessels with directed cod longline fisheries was a good one, the actual end result might be more effort landward of 500 meters. Others felt that the directed longline cod fishery should be contemplated for a 1980 change to the FMP, as there were obvious benefits in having major cod allocations taken by directed cod fisheries.

This low level of production, no longer operation would be considered
to the full extent with the cessation of production.

The Council's recommendation was that a release of not more than one half
of the 100 (100) scheduled for release was appropriate. The Council also
felt that the release of the other half could be discussed at the next
Council meeting.

1. THE COUNCIL'S CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL

The Council considered three alternatives to the 50% proposal
which was 100.

Alternative 1: A request by the North Atlantic Fisheries Commission
(NAFC) to conduct a long-term survey of 500 vessels
between 1980 and 1985. The survey would be conducted by the
Council.

Alternative 2: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 3: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 4: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 5: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 6: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 7: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 8: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 9: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 10: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.

Alternative 11: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 12: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 13: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 14: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 15: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 16: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 17: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 18: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 19: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 20: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.

Alternative 21: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 22: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 23: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 24: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.
Alternative 25: A request by the Council that the 50% level be maintained
for the purpose of the survey. The survey would be conducted by the
Council. The survey would be conducted by the Council.

Specking presented the following Panel recommendations. "If Pacific cod DAH is reallocated to TALFF, then we recommend to the Council that this amount be designated for a directed Pacific cod foreign longline fishery rather than a trawl fishery."

The Council also listened to Mr. Larkins who discussed halibut savings associated with major foreign trawl fisheries and major foreign longline fisheries. Larkins told the Council that some savings of halibut would occur if a large Pacific cod catch were taken by foreign longliners and not foreign trawlers. While the exact number or value of the halibut may be debatable, Larkins said there would be a halibut savings.

Harold Lokken questioned the eastern boundary (140° W. longitude) and whether or not it was an area of U.S. fishing interest. It appeared, however, that if this foreign longline fishery did not operate during the U.S. halibut season there would be no conflict with the U.S. fishery.

The Council on the basis of halibut savings arguments, consistence with regulations west of 157° W. longitude and in the absence of major U.S. gear conflicts unanimously approved an amendment to the Gulf FMP to allow foreign longlining in the area west of 140° W. longitude and seaward of 12 miles for a directed Pacific cod longline fishery during the closed U.S. halibut season.

Amendment 2: Increase the Atka mackerel OY by 2,000 metric tons to 26,800 metric tons with the increase to be allocated to the Southeastern and Yakutat regulatory areas and designated for incidental catch only.

Mr. Pennoyer told the Council that the SSC supports the MPDT recommendation that the Gulf-wide OY be increased by 2,000 metric tons (total 26,800 metric tons) all of the increase to be apportioned to the combined Yakutat-Southeast area. The increase, Pennoyer said, should not be used to initiate a target fishery. The Advisory Panel also recommended that OY in the Gulf of Alaska for Atka mackerel be increased by 2,000 metric tons, with the same caveats for the area and incidental fishery designations.

The Council accepted the recommendations of the AP and SSC and approved the amendment to increase the Atka mackerel OY by 2,000 metric tons to 26,800 metric tons with the increase to be allocated to the Southeastern-Yakutat regulatory area and designated for incidental catch only.

Amendment 3: A request from the North Pacific Longline Gillnet Association to allow foreign longlining on Davidson Bank.

The SSC report concluded that the amendment was not a scientific problem. Pennoyer said the Committee felt that the original purpose of the Davidson

Specialty processed the following items: ...
The Council also ...
associated with ...
fisheries ...
occurs in a large ...
not longer ...
may be detailed ...

The Council also ...
associated with ...
fisheries ...
occurs in a large ...
not longer ...
may be detailed ...

World Bank ...
whether or not ...
however, that ...
the U.S. ...

The Council on ...
negotiations ...
gear ...
allow foreign ...
of ...
U.S. ...

Amendment 2: ...
to ...
the ...
for ...

Mr. ...
that ...
would ...
Voluntary ...
to ...
of ...
some, with ...

The Council ...
to ...
would ...
to ...
regulatory ...

Amendment 3: ...
to ...

The ...
to ...

Bank sanctuary was to preserve an area rich in mixed stock fisheries for domestic fishing. Halibut savings does not appear to be an issue.

Regarding this proposal, the Advisory Panel explored the potential for a developing U.S. fishery in the area. Supporting the premise that this was an area of high potential for the U.S. catching and processing industry, representatives of Pacific Pearl Seafoods, Inc., NEFCO, Peter Pan Seafoods, and APA indicated an immediate processing capability and market for all cod and sablefish that could be taken. For example, Mr. C. Jensen told the Panel that Pacific Pearl will utilize two longline vessels between Dutch Harbor and Sand Point for cod and sablefish year round. Additionally, Captain Edward "Buster" Shaishnikoff (Sand Point) spoke of a developing trawl fishery principally for bait. In two months he caught 500,000 pounds 60% of which was cod. Captain Shaishnikoff indicated that the fishery began with no boats last year and has expanded into four fulltime draggers. Also, there were indications that New England Fish Co. was negotiating with a local group in Dutch Harbor to establish a bottomfish plant for cod in that area.

To quote the most compelling argument, Specking said the Advisory Panel believed Captain Shaishnikoff when he said that "the Davidson Bank area presented the richest fishing ground available to U.S. fishermen in that area, and that given a change in processing characteristics beyond what is present now, the fishery would explode."

The Advisory Panel, based on testimony and their original feeling that the area should be protected to afford U.S. fisherman an opportunity to develop in an area of rich mixed fisheries, unanimously rejected the proposal.

The Council considered the amendment and the issue of creating a U.S. sanctuary for a developing fishery. They also considered options presented by attorneys for the North Pacific Longline and Gillnet Association restricting the number of vessels and/or the amount of time foreign vessels would fish the Davidson Banks.

The Council adopted the Advisory Panel recommendation to maintain Davidson Bank as a closed area to foreign fishing. This decision by the Council was based on the indications from the industry that an American fishery has just begun in the area and that large amounts of effort and capital were preparing to enter the area to both catch and process bottomfish.

AGENDA #12, Alaska Board of Fisheries Actions that Affect Council FMPs

In a letter from Greg Cook, Executive Director of the Alaska Board of Fisheries, the Council was asked to incorporate a herrings-savings, time-and-area closure into the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands FMP. The proposed area--57° N. to 59° 30' N. latitude between 171° W. and 175° W.

Bank agreement was to process an area which should appear to be an issue.

Regarding this proposal, the Advisory Panel explored the possibility for developing U.S. fisheries in the area. Supporting the proposal that there was an area of high potential for the U.S. catching and processing fishery representatives of the North Pacific Fishery Council, Inc., (NPFCC), Alaska and AFA indicated an immediate processing capability and market for all fish and shellfish that could be taken. For example, the U.S. market could be served by the two fishing vessels between the Port of Seattle and the Port of Seattle. Additional support for the proposal was provided by the U.S. Fishery Council, Inc. (U.S. F.C.), which indicated that the U.S. market could be served by the two vessels in about 100,000 pounds per year and has expressed hope for further expansion. Also, there were indications that the U.S. Fishery Council, Inc. was negotiating with a local group in the Port of Seattle to establish a processing plant for cod in that area.

To prove the most compelling arguments, the Advisory Panel believed Captain Galtsoff when he said that the Davidson Bank area produced the richest fishing ground available to U.S. fishermen in that area, and that given a change in processing characteristics, it would be present now, the fishery would expand.

The Advisory Panel, based on testimony and their original feeling that the area should be protected to afford U.S. fishermen an opportunity to develop in an area of rich wild fisheries, unanimously rejected the proposal.

The Council considered the agreement and the issue of whether a U.S. agreement for a developing fishery. They also considered other proposals by agreement for the North Pacific Fishery Council and U.S. Fishery Council. The number of vessels and/or the amount of the fishing vessels would then be the Davidson Bank.

The Council advised the Advisory Panel recommendations to maintain Davidson Bank as a closed area for foreign fishing. This location for the U.S. fishery was based on the indications from the industry that an American fishery had just begun in the area and that large amounts of effort and capital were preparing to enter the area to both catch and process fishery.

AGREEMENT WITH ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES ACTIONS THAT AFFECT COUNCIL

In a letter from Governor... Director of the Alaska Board of Fisheries, the Council was asked to cooperate in a fisheries-agreement. The Council also agreed with the Alaska Board of Fisheries that the proposed area—U.S. to 100 miles between 140° W. and 145° W.

longitude--would be closed to all foreign trawling from November through March. Additionally the letter asked the Council to consider an offshore closure to all domestic trawling north of 56° N. longitude and to proscribe any directed harvest of Bering Sea herring by the foreign fleet in the future.

Specking told the Council that the Advisory Panel had discussed these recommendations, but felt that the data presented supporting the proposed herring-savings, time-and-area closure was inconclusive. The Panel requested an explanation of the data to be presented at their March meeting. The Panel also discussed the proposed domestic herring offshore trawl closure and concluded there were other factors that should be considered by the Board of Fisheries. First there is a favorable world market for herring as a food fish. Second there is a need to allow exploratory U.S. trawlers for certain research purposes. Third why should U.S. trawlers be excluded from a trawl herring fishery given the possibility of a weather-related zero harvest of herring near shore and a subsequent expanded foreign trawl fishery for herring offshore? Finally what are the actual ramifications of a mixed stock herring fishery on the eastern Bering Sea? Specking closed by saying the Panel would continue a review of the proposals and will consider additional information at the next Council meeting.

After discussing the proposed herring-savings, time-and-area closure the Council agreed to recommend to the MPDT for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island Groundfish Fishery Plan the inclusion of a time and area closure. The Council also agreed to recommend an admendment to the Trawl and Herring Gillnet Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands PMP establishing a herring savings time and area closure.

The Council did not agree with the Board recommendation to close to domestic herring trawling the offshore waters (3-200miles) north of 56° N. longitude and intends to explore this subject further with the Board of Fisheries, possibly at the next meeting. If conditions nearshore prevented an adequate harvest of the prescribed Herring OY and an allocation were given to the foreign trawl fisheries, the Council expressed some concern that this would discriminate against the U.S. fishermen.

AGENDA #13 Status of Halibut Legislation and Negotiations

Mr. Lokken reported on the status of the U.S./Canadian negotiations on Halibut and other west coast fishery matters. The Treaty, Lokken said, if successfully concluded would supersede the Council's proposed fishery management plan for Halibut Off Alaska. The IPHC at its meeting in Vancouver, B.C., established the following quotas and seasons. The quotas in Areas 2 and 3 would remain the same as for 1978. Proposed

longitude would be closed to all foreign traffic from Vancouver through
March. Additionally the Government would consider an offshore
closure to all foreign traffic north of 50° N. longitude and to provide
any direct network of traffic can be handled by the foreign fleet in the
future.



Speaking to the Council that the Advisory Panel had discussed these
recommendations, but felt that the data presented and the proposed
closure were not sufficient. The Panel
requested an examination of the data to be presented at their March
meeting. The Panel also discussed the proposed closure and the
Panel closure and concluded that there were other factors that would be
considered by the Board of Fisheries. It was noted that a possible world
market for herring as a food fish. Second there is a need to allow
exploratory U.S. trawling for certain research purposes. Third why
should U.S. trawling be included from a treaty fishing liability given the
possibility of a well-stocked zero harvest of herring stocks and
a subsequent expanded liability for herring off-shore. Finally
what are the actual responsibilities of a third stock herring liability on the
eastern Pacific coast? Speaking closed by saying the Panel would continue
review of the proposals and will consider additional information at the
next Council meeting.

After discussing the proposed herring savings, the Board area closure and
Council agreed to respond to the TWC for the Pacific Salmon (Alaska)
Committee. The Board will the inclusion of a time and area closure. The
Council also agreed to recommend an amendment to the Treaty and Herring
Committee for the Alaska Pacific Fishery Commission a herring savings
time and area closure.

The Council did not agree with the Board recommendation to close to
domestic herring trawling the offshore waters (50-60 miles) north of 50° N.
longitude and intends to explore this subject further with the Board of
Fisheries, possibly at the next meeting. If conditions permit
presented an alternative network of the proposed Treaty TWC and an allocation
was given to the foreign fleet. The Council expressed
concern that this would discriminate against the U.S. fleet.

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF FISHERIES AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Johnson reported on the status of the U.S. Canadian negotiations
on Herring and other west coast fishery matters. The Treaty, London
If successfully concluded would supersede the Council's proposed fishery
management plan for Herring off-shore. The TWC at the meeting in
Vancouver, B.C. established the following time and area. The
proposals in Areas 2 and 3 would remain the same as for 1977. Proposed



seasons are May 17 to June 2, June 26 to July 12, July 28 to August 13, and (if necessary) August 29 through September 14. The dividing line between Area 4W and Area 4E is now 173° W. longitude. Lokken said the agreement would be sent to the United States and Canadian governments for approval and that the Council had been asked to present their views on the proposed treaty.

The Council through Messrs: McKernan, Lokken, Tillion, and Jensen expressed general satisfaction and approval of the basic agreement praising the efforts of Ambassador Negroponte in the negotiations. The Council, however, took exception to the seasons recommended by the Halibut Commission, changed from those originally proposed by the NPFMC and by the Halibut Commission staff.

In consideration of the tentative agreement reached with Canada and with expressed opposition to the seasons recommended by IPHC the Council unanimously approved the agreement but urged that the IPHC reconsider the season dates passed at the meeting in Vancouver on February 22-23, 1979.

AGENDA #14, Joint Venture Permit Applications

The foreign permit application review committee, chaired by Keith Specking met in Room 608 of the Sheffield Hotel to consider applications for "joint venture" permits for two Soviet vessels, the KAZATIN and the KAMYSHIN. The two vessels intend to process fish caught by U.S. fishermen, fishing for Marine Resources Co. of Bellingham, Washington. In a letter to the Council explaining the JV operation the projected catch was estimated to be 6,000 metric tons as follows: 2,000 metric tons of pollock, 1,900 metric tons of Pacific cod, 1,400 metric tons of Pacific ocean perch, 400 metric tons of sablefish, 300 metric tons of miscellaneous species-- all from the Chirikof/Shumagin area.

On Thursday, the Advisory Panel met, Specking said, and considered the joint venture applications. He said the Panel recommended the following:

1. That as a part of all permits, there be the condition that NMFS must establish that an excess U.S. catching capacity does exist in the fishery and there is in fact a demonstrated intent to harvest the resource.
2. That the restrictions applied to joint venture operations not allow the foreign processor to operate landward of 12 miles under any circumstance.
3. The joint venture restrictions and conditions that applied to joint venture during 1978, i.e., the incidental by-catch percentage restrictions, (including the Council adopted .5% blackcod restriction) be attached to the KMIDC restrictions.

agrees and may be to June 2, June 28 to July 13, July 18 to August 13, and (if necessary) August 18 through September 13. The fishing days between Area A and Area B shall be determined by the Government of the United States and Canadian Government. Agreement would be made to the United States and Canadian Government for approval and that the Council had been asked to present their views on the proposed criteria.

The Council through various resolutions, recommendations and decisions expressed general satisfaction and approval of the main agreement regarding the criteria of management, especially in the respect that the Council, however, took exception to the manner proposed by the United States Government to change from a fixed quota system to a fixed effort system and by the United States Government.

In consideration of the fact that the agreement reached with regard to the increased participation in the season recommended by the Council, the Council unanimously approved the agreement but noted that the U.S. Government's season dates passed at the meeting in Vancouver on February 22-23, 1979.

AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The foreign vessels application number submitted by the United States met at Room 202 of the Shellfish House to consider applications for "joint venture" permits for two lobster vessels, the LAFAVE and the KATZMAN. The two vessels intend to process fish caught by U.S. fishermen fishing for Lobster Resources off of Washington, Washington. In a letter to the Council explaining the US operation the proposed catch was estimated to be 2,000 metric tons of lobster and 1,000 metric tons of fishery products. 400 metric tons of shellfish, 300 metric tons of miscellaneous products all from the Shelikotan area.

On Thursday, the 17th of June, the Council met and considered the joint venture applications. The Council recommended the following:

1. That as a part of all permits, there be the condition that the U.S. Government shall be responsible for the joint venture fishery and there be a responsibility to harvest the resource.
2. That the restrictions apply to joint venture operators not allow the foreign operator to operate beyond of US waters under any circumstances.
3. The joint venture restrictions and conditions that apply to joint venture fishing in U.S. waters, the International Fisheries Commission (IIFC) restrictions, (including the Council's decision on the IIFC restrictions) be applied to the joint venture.

The Council approved the recommendation of the Foreign Permit Review Committee; i.e., "to approve the applications with the conditions made a part thereof that Permit Applicants be advised to keep the by-catch of sablefish to a minimum and that the expectation is that sablefish may be designated in the future plans as a longline fishery." The Council also recommended a condition on the Permit requesting a U.S. observer be aboard whenever the processors are receiving fish from American boats.

AGENDA #16, Report on Shrimp Workshop in Kodiak

Dr. Dayton L. Alverson, Center Director, Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center, Seattle, reviewed the Shrimp Workshop held February 15-17, 1979, in Kodiak, Alaska. The workshop he said was conceived to examine world wide activity in the Pandalid shrimp fisheries. Presentations were given by scientists from Iceland, Greenland, Japan, Norway, United States, and Canada. Pandalid shrimp fisheries have grown faster than other shrimp fisheries in the world, Alverson said, and reached a harvest of 140,000 metric tons last year; Alaska having been the dominant producer over the last five to six years. Alverson went on to discuss some of the topics of the Workshop, including fluctuations in the fishery world wide, different research and management methodologies, environmental considerations, and the U.S. management of shrimp in general. Alverson said the Workshop was an outstanding success and that the Proceedings would be available at a later date.

AGENDA #17. Presentation on Crab Population Trends and Management Strategies and Modelling Strategies and Their Use in Decision Making

Dr. Dayton L. Alverson, Director, Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, Seattle, gave an excellent illustrated presentation on king and tanner crab surveys and their limitations; the use of catch-per-unit-of-effort data; the correlation of historic crab catches with corresponding survey and CPUE data; yield per recruit models and general forecasting. A transcript of the presentation may be found in Appendix J.

Large increases in the U. S. tanner crab fleet combined with survey results which indicate a drastic decline through 1982 of harvestable male tanner crab (Chionoecetes bairdi) present a grim outlook for the industry and perhaps call for some reflection on crab management. Dr. Alverson told the Council that management of crab required an index of the distribution and abundance of crab, prevailing CPUE fishery information and reliable yield per recruit models. Crab surveys, he said, are subject to enormous errors associated with the chosen sampling patterns,

The Council approved the recommendations of the Working Party... to approve the application with the conditions made... of capital to a minimum and that the application be... may be deferred in the future plans as a... Commission also recommended a condition on the... however be approved the... and... from... member...

ANNEX 11 - Report of the Working Party on the...

Mr. Gordon H. Alverson, General Director... reviewed the... in... the... which... given by... and... during... in the... 1950... over the... the... which... considerations... and... would be available at a later date.

ANNEX 12 - Presentation of the Working Party on the... and... in... Working Party

Mr. Gordon H. Alverson, General Director... presented... and... correlation of... data... of the presentation may be found in...

Working Party... in the... results which... and... Alverson... the... and... subject to... with the...

availability of crab to the gear (assuming some avoidance and herding occurs), the massive clustering of crab, and environmental (temperature) related factors. Also, differences in survey vessels, gear rigging, and the experience of the captain effect the standardized procedures of the survey.

Emphasizing that crab surveys are one of two ways to grossly assess the status of the stock, Dr. Alverson went on to discuss the use of catch-per-unit-of-effort (CPUE) data of the actual fishing fleet in management decisions. The use of CPUE data assumes proper sampling of the total population, consistent operator experience level, no modifications in pot size or fishing efficiencies, no modifications in bait, soaking time, or amount of effort and standardized gear operation. Additionally, Dr. Alverson said that an underlying assumption of the value of CPUE data is the relationship to population size. Ideally, CPUE is thought of as a linear index of population size; if the population is declining there is a proportional decline in CPUE and the converse is true. Gear saturation problems with crab pots tend to mask some population declines or some population increases. The point made was that the CPUE data with survey data does provide an index of the gross distribution and abundance of the resource.

The history of the king and tanner crab fisheries in the Bering Sea Dr. Alverson said, bears out the relationship between CPUE and survey forecasting data and the actual catch. Their combined ability to index gross changes are a valuable tool for the Council in estimating future trends in management policies for crab.

Regarding the yield-per-recruit models (or, in Dr. Alverson's terms, a strategy of harvesting a crop in relationship to the amount of material generated), they seek to allow fishing some time before the animal maximizes its biomass by adjusting the size limit of the fishing power or the amount of fishing rate and protecting some spawners. In selecting an optimal harvest size at about 127 mm the actual loss to the fishery if the size is maintained at 140 mm is about 20%. Generalizing, Dr. Alverson said that in years of high abundance a liberal management approach should be used and in years of low abundance a conservative management approach should be used.

Dr. Alverson indicated he had recommended the SSC reevaluate its crab management strategy in terms of size, in terms of the risks that are involved with reproductive males, with the increased availability of biomass to the fishermen along with the status of the total crab population and ultimately consider those in terms of new management proposals or modifications they may wish to make to the Council. In closing, he reiterated the forecast decline of tanner crab in the Bering Sea and stressed the need to understand the data gathering and analysis techniques and methodology that comprise the equation leading to management policies and predictions.

availability of time for the... (transcription of mirrored text)

highly likely that... (transcription of mirrored text)

The history of... (transcription of mirrored text)

... (transcription of mirrored text)

... (transcription of mirrored text)

AGENDA #18, Contract 78-4, The Development and Enhancement of a Computerized Fishery Information System, ADF&G.

The Council and the Finance Committee considered a report on the progress of this contract. The report came from a meeting of the Contract Monitoring Committee, on February 12 and 13, where substantial changes to the contract were discussed. The report to the Council (Appendix K) recommended the use of a consultant to assist the Council in an analysis of the design and feasibility of a major amendment to the contract.

The contract originally contained two phases: each equally funded, each of one year duration. The first phase was to edit, clean up and document the historic fish ticket data file. The second phase was to provide a data retrieval system. The amendment proposed by the contractor and tentatively approved by the Contract Monitoring Committee would reprogram all of the money and time designed for the second phase into the first phase.

Professor McKernan, chairman of the Council's Finance Committee, told the Council they had met Friday morning and discussed the report of the Contract Monitoring Committee and the contract in some detail. He said the Finance Committee felt that a review by the consultant of the proposed changes was in order and that after the review the consultant's recommendations should be used as the basis to amend the contract. McKernan noted that Don Collinsworth, Deputy Commissioner of ADF&G, abstained from participation in the Finance Committee decision.

The Council approved the Finance Committee recommendation to hire a consultant as recommended by the Contract Monitoring Committee and report on the proposed changes and new amendment by the contractor.

AGENDA #19 Council Review of Foreign Fishing Permit Application Procedures and the Development of Review Criteria

The Executive Director discussed the background for this proposed review of the procedures used to review Foreign Permit Applications but suggested the matter be deferred to the March meeting.

AGENDA #20, Future Agenda Items

A list of agenda items were identified as follows for the March meeting:

1. Proposals before the Alaska Board of Fisheries
2. Bering Sea & Aleutian Island Groundfish FMP--final approval by the Council for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.

ALASKA AIR COUNCIL REVIEW OF FOREIGN MARINE TANKER APPLICATION PROGRAMS AND THE REVISION OF REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Council and the Finance Committee considered a report on the progress of this contract. The report came from a meeting of the Contract Monitoring Committee, on January 12 and 13, where substantial changes to the contract were discussed. The report to the Council (Appendix B) recommended the use of a consultant to make the Council in an analysis of the matter and feasibility of a major amendment to the contract.

The contract originally contained two phases: each equally funded, each of one year duration. The first phase was to edit, clean up and document the historical data files. The second phase was to provide a data retrieval system. The amendment proposed by the contractor and tentatively approved by the Contract Monitoring Committee would reprogram all of the money and time budgeted for the second phase into the first phase.

Professor William, Chairman of the Council's Finance Committee, told the Council that he had met with the contractor and discussed the report of the Contract Monitoring Committee and the contract in some detail. He said that the Finance Committee felt that a review by the consultant of the proposed changes was in order and that after the review the consultant's recommendations should be used as the basis to amend the contract. Williams noted that Don Collinsworth, Deputy Commissioner of AD&G, had abstained from participation in the Finance Committee decision.

The Council approved the Finance Committee recommendation to hire a consultant as recommended by the Contract Monitoring Committee and report on the proposed changes and any amendments by the contractor.

ALASKA AIR COUNCIL REVIEW OF FOREIGN MARINE TANKER APPLICATION PROGRAMS AND THE REVISION OF REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Executive Director discussed the background for this proposed review of the procedures used to review foreign tanker applications but suggested the matter be deferred to the March meeting.

ALASKA AIR COUNCIL REVIEW OF FOREIGN MARINE TANKER APPLICATION PROGRAMS AND THE REVISION OF REVIEW PROCEDURES

A list of agenda items were identified as follows for the March meeting:

1. Proposals before the Alaska Board of Fisheries
2. Review of Alaska Inland Groundfish Management Plan approved by the Council for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.

3. Proposed interim regulations on P. L. 95-354.
4. U.S. Catcher/Processor Information Presentation
5. Permit Application Review Procedures

GENERAL

During the meeting, Chairman Tillion recognized Mr. Tyler Jones of Senator Mike Gravel's office and welcomed him to the meeting.

Chairman Tillion announced that Henry O. Wendler from the Washington Department of Fisheries will retire on March 30. Mr. Wendler expressed appreciation for the privilege of working with the North Pacific Council. The Council thanked Mr. Wendler for his service over the past two years and wished him good fortune in his retirement.

James O. Campbell was asked to attend, with Mr. Branson, the 200-mile Impact Conference to be held in Seattle February 27-28, 1979.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55am, Friday, February 23, 1979.

- 1. Proposed further regulations on L. I. 95-33A.
- 2. U.S. District Court Proceedings
- 3. Further Application for Review Proceedings

GENERAL

During the meeting, Chairman William W. Taylor reported to the members of the Council and welcomed them to the meeting. Chairman Taylor announced that Henry O. Wadsworth from the Washington Department of Fisheries will continue to serve as the representative for the province of working with the Council. The Council thanked Mr. Wadsworth for his service over the past two years and wished him good fortune in his retirement.

James O. Campbell was asked to attend with Mr. Wadsworth, the 1978-79 Forest Conference to be held in Seattle February 27-28, 1978.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50pm, Friday, February 23, 1978.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

The public testimony was held February 22, 1979, at 3:30pm. Those offering comments to the Council were:

1. Mr. Shinji Endo - Hokuten Trawlers Association APPENDIX L

Mr. Endo requested the Council postpone any decision on the closure of the FCZ adjacent to the Aleutian Islands to foreign fishermen to allow discussion among the trawling and longline associations in Japan. They will present their options at a later date.

2. Mr. H. Nakamura, North Pacific Longline Gillnet Association APPENDIX M

Requested the Council to establish a directed longline fishery for Pacific cod east of 157° W. longitude and also requested release of the March 2nd reserve. Mr. Nakamura expressed objection to the closure of a fishery when a nation's allocation has been reached.

3. Mr. Shoji Ono - Japanese Tanner Crab Association APPENDIX N

Requested the Council revise the restriction of foreign fishing below 58° N. for tanner crab to allow the Japanese to catch their allocation.

4. Mr. Toru Fukui - Japan Deep Sea Trawlers Association APPENDIX O

Mr. Fukui presented the Council with a working paper, "Regulation of the Foreign Fishery Within the Fishery Conservation Zone Along the Aleutian Islands," and also offered comments on the Bering Sea & Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery FMP. In answer to Council members questions on what efforts the Japanese industry is making to prevent violations in the FCZ, interpreter Jay Hastings promised to bring an industry-combined list of proposals from the Japanese to the March Council meeting.

5. Mr. Ken Sheppard - Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association and the International Longline Association

Mr. Sheppard requested the Council prohibit trawling in the 3-12 mile area adjacent to Unimak Pass.

6. Joe Demantle and Jesse Foster APPENDIX P

Presented a paper to the Council which expresses their concern for incidental catch of salmon in the Bering Sea by the foreign trawl fleets.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The public testimony was held February 22, 1978, at 3:30pm. Those attending consisted of the Council members.

APPENDIX A - Testimony of the Fisheries Association

The Fisheries Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters to fishing vessels and to allow fishing vessels to travel and landing operations in Alaskan waters. They will present their evidence at a later date.

APPENDIX B - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to establish a fisheries management plan for the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and also requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters. The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

APPENDIX C - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and to allow the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

APPENDIX D - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and to allow the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

APPENDIX E - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and to allow the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

APPENDIX F - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and to allow the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

APPENDIX G - Testimony of the Alaska Fishermen's Association

The Alaska Fishermen's Association requested the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters and to allow the Council members to consider the closure of the HCR adjacent to the Alaskan waters.

7. Mr. Paul Frost - commercial fisherman from Togiak

Mr. Frost requested the Council close the area from 3-12 miles to trawlers to allow an increase in the quota for subsistence fishermen. Rear Admiral Duin asked Mr. Frost's definition of 'subsistence.' "Catch all you need, and if you catch any extra, sell it." was Mr. Frost's reply. Chairman Tillion pointed out the foreign herring fishery would soon be at an end as the fishery would soon be expanded by domestic fishermen from Seattle, Homer, and Kodiak.

8. Robert A. Davenny - American Fisheries Corporation

Mr. Davenny spoke on the closure to foreigners in the 3-12 mile zone. He believes domestic processors should have first choice at a fishery if they are going to harvest any of it.

9. Mr. Scott Stafne - representing Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association

Mr. Stafne told the Council his clients were not in favor of granting Permit Applications to the Marine Resources Co., Inc. He said the Pacific Pearl Seafood Company is ready to purchase all available blackcod at favorable prices, and that U.S. blackcod fishermen would be fishing the same grounds as the Marine Resources Co. vessels. Mr. Stafne requested copies of the following letters be made a part of the February minutes:

Date	To:	From:
		Alaska Longline Fisheries Association
		Fishing Vessel Owners Association
		Halibut Producers Cooperative
		Pelican Cold Storage
		Northern Producers
		International Longline Association

10. Ed Furia, James Seely, Lawrence Brodie, and John Harris of the
New England Fish Company APPENDIX Q

Mr. Furia stated his company wants the processor preference consideration given to all joint venture Permit Applications. He also requested that no foreign factoryship be allowed inside the 12-mile zone. He requested the Council to state its intent to enforce the processor preference amendment to the FCMA. The lawyers also presented a number of proposals for amendments to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery FMP.

7. Mr. Paul Frost - Commercial Fishermen from Alaska

Mr. Frost requested the Council close the case (see page 8-13) unless a decision to allow an increase in the quota for subsistence fishermen. Mr. Frost asked Mr. Frost's definition of "subsistence" and if you could give him and the other parties and the fishing industry would soon be at an end as the industry would soon be expanded by commercial fishermen from Seattle, Homer, and Kodiak.

8. Robert M. Gaverly - American Fisheries Corporation

Mr. Gaverly spoke on the closure of fisheries in the 3-13 with some of the fisheries. He believes the fisheries should have been closed as a primary fishery and they are going to be closed by the 3-13.

9. Mr. Scott Starnes - representing Alaska Fisheries Fishermen's Association

Mr. Starnes told the Council that Alaska is not in favor of expanding the fishing industry to the extent of the Alaska Fisheries Association. He said the fishing industry is ready to purchase all available fish as long as the U.S. closed fisheries would be fishing the same grounds as the Alaska Fisheries Association. Mr. Starnes requested the Council of the following items be made a part of the primary fisheries:

From: To: Date:

- Alaska Fisheries Fishermen's Association
- Fishing Vessel Owners Association
- Alaska Fisheries Cooperative
- Alaska Fish Storage
- Alaska Fish Processors
- International Fisheries Association

10. Mr. James Paul, James Paul, James Paul, and John Paul of the New England Fish Company

Mr. Paul stated his company was the processor of salmon and considered them to all joint venture with the fishermen. He also stated that no fishing industry would be allowed under the license system. He requested the Council to state the date to enforce the processor provisions of the license system. The license system also provided a number of provisions for amendments to the Alaska Fisheries Fishermen's Association.