

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

James O. Campbell, Chairman
Jim H. Branson, Executive Director

411 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99510



Mailing Address: P.O. Box 103136
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Telephone: (907) 274-4563
FTS 271-4064

Certified 
James O. Campbell, Chairman

Date 5/22/87

76th Plenary Session
NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
March 18-20, 1987
Hilton Hotel
Anchorage, Alaska

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council met March 18-20, 1987, at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska. The Scientific and Statistical Committee and Advisory Panel began Monday, March 16, and the Bycatch Committee met on Thursday, March 19.

Members of the Council, Scientific and Statistical Committee, Advisory Panel and general public in attendance are listed below.

Council

James O. Campbell, Chairman
Rudy Petersen, Vice Chairman
Don Collinsworth
Mark Pedersen for
Joseph Blum
RADM Edward Nelson
Oscar Dyson
Elizabeth Montagne for Robt. Ford

Robert U. Mace for
Randy Fisher
Robert McVey
Henry Mitchell
John Harville
John Peterson
John Winther
Larry Cotter

NPFMC Staff

Jim H. Branson, Executive Director
Clarence Pautzke
Judy Willoughby
Steve Davis
Denby Lloyd

Ron Miller
Ron Rogness
Terry Smith
Helen Allen
Peggy Kircher

Support Staff

Jim Balsiger, NMFS-NWAFRC
Jay Ginter, NMFS
Craig Hammond, NMFS
John Pedrick, NOAA-GC
Jim Brooks, NMFS

Fred Gaffney, ADF&G
Loh-Lee Low, NMFS-NWAFRC
Jon Pollard, NOAA-GC
Bill Robinson, NMFS
Ron Berg, NMFS

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Scientific and Statistical Committee

Phil Mundy, Chairman
Bill Aron
Gordon Kruse for Douglas Eggers
Larry Hreha
Bill Clark
Robert Burgner

Richard Marasco, Vice-Chairman
Terry Quinn
Don Bevan
John Burns
Don Rosenberg

Advisory Panel

Nancy Munro, Chairman
Bob Alverson, Vice Chairman
Rupe Andrews
Al Burch
Ron Hegge
Rick Lauber
John Woodruff
Joseph Chimegalrea
Terry Baker

Pete Isleib
Thorn Smith
Cameron Jensen
Ron Peterson
Lamar Cotten
Daniel O'Hara
Ed Fuglvog
Oliver Holm
Dave Woodruff

General Public

It was estimated that over 100 people attended the Council meeting during its session, including the following:

Fred Kirkes, American President Lines
Woody Knebel, Columbia Wards Fisheries
Hugh Reilly, American High Seas Fisheries Assn
Stan Crothers, M.A.F., New Zealand
Stephen Johnson, American High Seas Fisheries
Harold Jones, Kodiak
Bob Miller, Seattle
Ben Muse, CFEC
Y. Biao, China Nat'l Marine Fisheries
Mary Truitt, Alamar
Bill Orr, AFTA
Steve Hughes, NRC
Phil Werdal, Jubilee Fisheries
Gary Westman
Steve Grabacki, Graystar
Dean Paddock, Bristol Bay Driftnetters
Earl Kari, Anchorage
Chuck Meacham, ADF&G
Phil Chitwood, MRCI
George Gardner, Ketchikan
Arni Thomson, ACC
John Dooley, California
Peter Block, NorFish
Kenneth M. Allread, Kodiak
Yuuji Niimi, Nippon Suisan (USA) Inc.

Rod Moore, Rep. Don Young
Bill Woolf, Sen. Murkowski
Joe Plesha, Seattle
Peter Moore, AFDF
Walter Eichner, USGAO
Vic Horgan, OBSI
Kurt Schelle, CFEC
Li Shanxun, CNMFC
Bill Dowd, Mrs. Paul's
Mick Stevens, ProFish
Barry Collier, PSPA
Rodger Davies, DSFU
David Fraser
Ed Zeasor, Mrs. Paul's
Robt. Morgan, Oceantrawl
Stuart Lutton, Kodiak
Norm Stadem, Anchorage
Ted Evans, AFTA
Arne Aadland, NPFVOA
Chris Blackburn, Kodiak
Fred Yeck, Oregon
Larry Garrison, Washington
Jerome Selby, Kodiak
Emory Washington, Florida
David Harville, Kodiak

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

O. Rae Elde/Almar
Chris Jones, CNMFS
M. Morimoto, Japan Fisheries Agency
T. Yamamoto, Japan Fisheries Agency
Paul Peyton, DGED
James Crutchfield, NRC
Jacqueline Lindauer, Anchorage
Cindy Lowry, Greenpeace
Mat Oahert, Kodiak
Chip Threinen, Kodiak
Eric Maisonpierre, AJVF
James Major, Kodiak
Lynn Gabriel, Anchorage
Lee Daneker, Fishing Co. of Alaska
Bryan Strelisk, Sea-Land

Vern Hall, Kodiak
K. Nagao, Japan Consulate
Noni Burno, Kodiak
Jeff Stephan, UFMA
Jay Hastings, Seattle
K. Kobayashi, JDSTA
Rich Listowski, Juneau
Bill Dalton, Kodiak
J. Spicciani, Kodiak
Steve Smith, Kemp Fish
John Levy, Chignik
Charles Yates, Seattle
Sam Hjelle, Glacier Fish
J. Cleveland, Sea-Land

A. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chairman Jim Campbell.

Mr. Campbell introduced John Pedrick, NOAA General Counsel in Juneau, and Elizabeth Montagne attending as the State Department representative. Also in attendance was Mr. Walter Eichner of the U.S. General Accounting Office in Seattle.

Mr. Branson asked that Mr. Eichner be added to the agenda to report on the seafood safety study GAO is preparing for Congress.

The agenda was approved as submitted, with the addition of Mr. Eichner's presentation.

Bob Mace moved to approve the minutes of the December 1986 meeting. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried with no objection. The minutes of the January 1987 meeting were not yet available for approval.

B. SPECIAL REPORTS

B-1 Executive Director's Report

Jim Branson presented the Executive Director's report as provided in Council notebooks. Subjects covered were the recent Chairmen's meeting in Puerto Rico, 1988 Council meeting schedule, progress on sablefish limited entry and the groundfish management alternative survey.

Mr. Branson suggested to Council members that the Policy and Planning Committee should meet prior to selecting 1988 meeting dates to discuss the need for changes in the current amendment cycle and review the composition of plan teams. The Council concurred with this suggestion and the Committee will meet prior to the May meeting to develop recommendations for Council consideration. The meeting for the Policy & Planning Committee was set for April 22-23 in Anchorage.

Wm. Hall, Kodiak
F. Nagano, Japan Consulate
Karl Burns, Kodiak
John Steiner, UFA
J. Heston, Seattle
M. Kobayashi, JNPA
Rich Lisowski, Lunenburg
Bill Linton, Kodiak
J. Spindler, Kodiak
Steve Smith, Kingfish
John Levy, Chignik
Charles Yates, Seattle
Tom Hall, Glacier View
D. Cleveland, Sealaska

O. Lee, Vancouver
John... GMIT
M. ... Japan Fisheries Agency
T. Yamamoto, Japan Fisheries Agency
Tom Devito, UFA
James Goodrich, MFC
James... Lunenburg, Anchorage
Garry Lowry, Anchorage
M. ... Kodiak
Rich... Kodiak
Rich... Kodiak
James... Kodiak
Lynn Gabriel, Anchorage
Lee... Fishing Co. of Alaska
Evan... Sealaska

A. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Jim Campbell.

Mr. Campbell introduced John... 300A General Counsel in Lunenburg, and...
... as the State Department representative. Also in...
... was Mr. Walter... U.S. General Accounting Office in...
Seattle.

Mr. Branson asked that Mr. ... be added to the agenda to report on the...
... study ... is preparing for Congress.

The agenda was approved as submitted, with the addition of Mr. ...'s...
presentation.

... moved to approve the minutes of the December 1986 meeting. The...
... was recorded by John ... and carried with no objection. The...
... of the January 1987 meeting were not yet available for approval.

B. SPECIAL REPORTS

B-1 Executive Director's Report

Jim Branson presented the Executive Director's report as provided in Council...
... . Subjects covered were the recent Chairman's meeting in Puerto...
... 1986 Council meeting schedule, progress on submitted limited entry and...
... the groundfish management alternative survey.

Mr. Branson suggested to Council members that the Policy and Planning...
... should meet prior to scheduling 1988 meeting dates to discuss the...
... need for changes in the current management cycle and review the composition of...
... plan team. The Council concurred with this suggestion and the Committee will...
... meet prior to the May meeting to develop recommendations for Council...
... consideration. The meeting for the Policy & Planning Committee was set for...
April 22-23 in Anchorage.

Seafood Safety Study

Mr. Eichner reported that the General Accounting Office (GAO), an information-gathering office for the United States Congress, is doing a study on the safety of seafoods and labelling of seafood products. He is in Alaska to gather information which will help in their assessment. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the National Fisheries Institute also are studying the possibility of a federal inspection system similar to the USDA inspection of meat products. These two studies will be used by Congress in considering the feasibility of a seafood inspection program.

B-1(a) Report on Alaska Region NMFS & Northwest Center Budgets

Bob McVey, Director, Alaska Region, NMFS reported on the Region's FY 1987 funding. The total operational budget is about \$3.7 million, which represents a reduction of 7.5% to cover shortfalls elsewhere in NMFS. The budget covers 47 full time, permanent employees, most of them in Juneau. They are also recruiting for six additional employees at this time. The \$3.7 million budget is broken down as follows:

Fisheries Management Division	- 23%
Habitat Conservation	- 15%
Industry Services	- 3%
Marine Mammals & Endangered Species	- 4%
Enforcement	- 35%
Other Regional Activities	- 20%

Regarding the FY 1988 budget which has been presented to Congress, the total amount proposed for NMFS is \$99.5 million for operations, research and facilities, down from \$162 million in FY 1987. Under that budget, however, the Alaska Region would receive a relatively minor cut of approximately \$200,000 and three people from the Habitat Conservation staff. Even that cut is in the funding which might be restored if the proposed licensing fees are approved. NMFS is asking comments and suggestions from the Regional Councils with regard to the FY 1989 budget.

Dr. Aron, Director of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, briefed the Council on the Center's FY 1987 funding. Dr. Aron pointed out that, according to 1985 catch statistics, about half the total tonnage of fish landed from the United States' EEZ comes from Northwest and Alaska waters. When catch statistics for 1986 are available, that share should escalate. Catches from the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, under the direct jurisdiction of this Council, account for most of the share.

Even though the Council, Alaska Region and the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center deal with fisheries contributing at least 35% of the nation's value in fisheries, the Center's ability to spend money has been substantially reduced, even with limited inflation. Increased costs of pay raises and employee benefits have been borne by the agency without Congressional supplementals. Even at level funding, the amount of work the dollar will buy will continue to decline.

Regional Salary Study

Mr. Johnson reported that the General Accounting Office (GAO) in information gathering office for the United States Congress, is doing a study on the safety of methods and labeling of seafood products. He has in Alaska to gather information which will help in their management. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the National Fisheries Institute also are studying the possibility of a federal inspection system similar to the USDA inspection of meat products. There are estimates will be used by Congress in considering the possibility of a seafood inspection program.

Report on Alaska of the NMFS & Wildlife & Marine Fisheries (b-1)(a)

Bob Meyer, Director, Alaska Region, NMFS reported on the Region's FY 1987 funding. The total operational budget is about \$3.7 million, which represents a reduction of 2.5% to cover administrative changes in 1987. The budget covers 47 full time permanent employees, most of them in Juneau. They are also reassigning on the additional employees at this time. The \$3.7 million budget is broken down as follows:

- 1.1M - Fisheries Management Division
- 1.1M - Fisheries Conservation
- .3M - Industry Services
- .2M - Administration & Endangered
- .4M - Special
- .3M - Information
- .3M - Other Regional Activities

Regarding the FY 1988 budget which has been prepared to Congress, the total amount proposed for NMFS is \$99.5 million for operations, research and facilities, down from \$182 million in FY 1987. Under that budget, however, the Alaska Region would receive a relatively minor cut or approximately \$100,000 and three people from the Habitat Conservation staff. Even that cut is in the funding which might be received if the proposed legislation are approved. NMFS is asking comments and suggestions from the Regional Councils with regard to the FY 1988 budget.

Dr. Aron, Director of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, pitched the Council on the current FY 1987 funding. He mentioned that the accounting to 1987 catch statistics, about half the total amount of fish landed from the United States, 33% comes from Northwest and Alaska waters. When catch statistics for 1988 are available, that share should increase. Catch from the fishing gear and half of Alaska, under the direct jurisdiction of this Council, account for most of the share.

Even though the Council, Alaska Region and the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center deal with fisheries contributing at least 35% of the nation's value to fisheries, the Council's ability to spend money has been substantially reduced, even with limited inflation. Increased costs of pay raise and employee benefits have been borne by the agency without Congressional supplemental. Even at local funding, the amount of work the dollar will buy will continue to decline.

In terms of the FY 1988 budget, the cuts in the NMFS budget would have fairly substantial impacts on the Center. For example, both the COBB & MURRE research vessels have been eliminated from the NOS budget which will affect the Center even though it's not in their budget. Other major reductions include \$8 million for U.S.-Canada salmon programs which will have an impact on Center programs at Auke Bay and in their Coastal Zone Division. The Marine Mammal Laboratory will lose \$1.2 million of its base and there would be cuts in the Center's REFM program. Cuts to the Center would essentially reduce their program by about 40%; some of that would be restored in the contingency program, tied to the passage of the fishing license bill. Dr. Aron also pointed out that their computer is obsolete and that parts are no longer being made for it.

B-2 Domestic Fisheries Report

Southeast Troll Fishery. Since the October 1 opening of the Southeast winter troll fishery, approximately 22,000 chinook salmon have been landed. The winter fishery will close April 14 and is projected to take 30,000-35,000 chinooks. Last year's harvest was 22,000. The average price paid to fishermen is currently \$3.50-\$4.00 per pound.

Tanner crab. In the Bering Sea, 26.9 million pounds of C. opilio have been harvested since January 15. Another 12 million pounds of C. bairdi were harvested in the Gulf of Alaska and the Aleutians. Most areas opened in January. The Western Aleutians opened November 1.

B-3 NMFS Management Report

Bill Robinson reported that the GOA FMP Amendment 15 final rule was filed with the Federal Register on March 9 and will be effective after the 30-day cooling off period expires on April 8. The emergency rule currently implementing the single OY-target quota framework procedures, the crab closures around Kodiak, and the improved reporting requirements for catcher-processors will need to be extended until the final rule takes effect.

A notice of availability of a Secretarial amendment repealing the Tanner Crab FMP and its implementing regulations was published in the Federal Register on March 2. Comments will be accepted until April 22.

The final rule for BSAI Amendment 10 is currently being reviewed by OMB and is expected to be filed with the Federal Register on March 16. All of the amendment except for the field order authority will take effect immediately upon filing because the 30-day cooling off period has been waived.

The Alaska Region has also submitted a regulatory amendment for both the BSAI and GOA plans bringing the federal sponsorship of the State of Alaska fish ticket system for catch data collection into greater conformity in the implementing regulations of the two FMPs and making it clear that landings of fish from the EEZ, even if landed to a floating processor in the territorial sea or internal waters of the state, require a fish ticket.

NMFS also announced the impending closure of the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf to directed fishing for sablefish with trawl gear, effective at noon, Saturday, March 21, in order to reserve the remaining uncaught portion of the

in terms of the FY 1988 budget. The FY 1988 budget would have jointly
substantially impacted on the Center. For example, both the OY and HERR
research vessels have been eliminated from the 1988 budget which will affect
the Center's research efforts. Other major reductions
include \$2 million for U.S.-Canada salmon programs which will have an impact
on Center programs as well as \$1.5 million in their Coastal Zone Division. The Marine
Mammal Laboratory will lose \$1.5 million of its base and there would be cuts
in the Center's BERTH program. Cuts in the Center would essentially reduce
their program by about 50%; some of that would be passed in the community
program, tied to the passage of the fishing license bill. Dr. Aron also
pointed out that the computer is obsolete and that parts are no longer being
made for it.

4-2 Insecticide Fisheries Report

Southern Fishery. Since the October 1 opening of the business winter
fishery, approximately 22,000 chinook salmon have been landed. The
winter fishery will close April 15 and is expected to take 30,000-35,000
chinooks. Last year's harvest was 22,000. The average price paid to
fishermen is currently \$3.50-\$4.00 per pound.

Tanner Crab. In the Bering Sea, 18.9 million pounds of C. opilio have been
harvested since January 15. Another 12 million pounds of C. opilio were
harvested in the Gulf of Alaska and the Aleutians. Boat crews opened in
January. The Western Aleutians opened November 1.

4-3 Fish Management Report

Bill Robinson reported that the GOA Fish Management Plan will be filed with
the Federal Register on March 9 and will be effective after the 30-day waiting
period expires on April 8. The emergency rule currently in place during the
single 90-day quota program procedure, the rule clearing around October
and the improved reporting requirements for catcher-processors will need to be
extended until the final rule takes effect.

A notice of availability of a Secretarial Amendment report of the Tanner Crab
Plan and its implementing regulations was published in the Federal Register on
March 1. Comments will be accepted until April 22.

The final rule for 82A1 Amendment 0 is currently being reviewed by OMB and is
expected to be filed with the Federal Register on March 16. All of the
amendment except for the 30-day waiting period will take effect immediately
upon filing because the 30-day cooling off period has been waived.

The Alaska Region has also submitted a regulatory amendment for both the 82A1
and 80A plans bringing the Federal ownership of the State of Alaska fish
ticket system for catch data collection into greater consistency in the
implementing regulations of the two plans and asking for clear language of
fish from the B.C. even if landed to a floating processor in the territorial
sea or inland waters of the state, require a fish ticket.

IFB also announced the impending closure of the Western Regulatory Area
and will be directed fishing for sablefish with trawl gear, effective at noon,
Monday, March 11, in order to receive the remaining unquota portion of the

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

trawl quota for bycatch. This will delay prohibiting retention of sablefish by trawlers and the accompanying waste. NMFS is monitoring fishing in the Central Regulatory Area and expects to take similar action there well before the trawl quota is reached.

Mr. Robinson told the Council that NMFS will require all sablefish longline fishermen who intend to participate in the fishery in the Gulf of Alaska beginning April 1 to register for the area in which they intend to fish. They will also be required to register for new areas if they move from an area that is being closed to one that remains open.

The Council was also informed that the Region has obtained \$350,000 to replace funding lost by ADF&G for administering the State fish ticket program for groundfish. A contract has been negotiated with ADF&G to begin collecting fish tickets in various ports where groundfish are landed and enter them into a data base system at NMFS in Juneau. A data base administrator will be hired to routinely manage the system. The Region also will have two new staff members in the near future, both to work with catch and effort data.

Groundfish Fisheries. The total U.S. processed catch through late February was 53,425 mt with about 45,000 mt coming from the Bering Sea and Aleutians area. Catch composition was 28,632 mt pollock, 1,110 mt sablefish, 14,331 mt Pacific cod, 8,208 mt rock sole, and 1,144 mt various other species.

Joint ventures harvested 377,322 mt, all from the Bering Sea and Aleutians. Catch composition was 358,985 mt pollock, 16,208 mt Pacific cod and 2,129 mt various other species.

Foreign fisheries harvested only 15,293 mt by late February, mostly Pacific cod in the Bering Sea. There was concern expressed by the Council over foreign directed fisheries on pollock in the international waters of the Bering Sea (i.e., the "donut hole"). Little information is available on this fishery. The Council is strongly encouraging all nations to provide accurate, timely catch information on their operations in the "donut."

Foreign Transshipment. Craig Hammond told the Council that he has received several inquiries recently in regard to regulations concerning the transshipment of product from the U.S. catcher/processor fleet to foreign flag transport vessels. As a result, NMFS has reviewed their established enforcement policy and in early March mailed a letter to the Council and all the permitted catcher/processor vessels. The Magnuson Act clearly prohibits foreign fishing within the territorial sea. That definition of fishing includes such activities as the transfer of fish and fish products and supplying of fuel, provisions, fishing gear and supplies. The definition does not allow the transfer of fish products from a U.S. flag catcher/processor to a foreign flag transport vessel or a foreign flag vessel to provide support to a U.S. flag vessel within the territorial sea. NOAA's interpretation of the Act does not, however, prohibit such transfers if they occur within the confines of a port or an established roadstead. Such transfers can occur beyond the territorial sea, more than three miles offshore, but in that situation it is viewed as a joint venture operation and the foreign flag vessel must have a joint venture permit and comply with the area's reporting requirements.

drawn points for by which. This will be a prohibiting retention of supplies by hunters and the accompanying waste. WMS to monitoring fishing in the Central Regulatory Area and expected to take similar action there will before the travel starts in October.

Mr. Robinson said the Council that WMT will require all supplies fishing fishermen who intend to participate in the fishery in the Gulf of Alaska. They will also be required to register for the year in which they intend to fish. It is being closed to one that remains open.

The Council also informed that the Region has obtained 350,000 to replace landing loss by ADG for administering the State fish stock program for groundfish. A contract has been negotiated with ADG to begin collecting fish tickets in various ports where groundfish are landed and enter the fish base system at WMS in January. A data base administrator will be hired to routinely manage the system. The Region also will have two new staff members in the near future, both to work with catch and effort data.

Groundfish Fisheries. The total U.S. processed catch through late February was 53,425 mt with about 45,000 mt coming from the Bering Sea and Aleutian area. Catch composition was 38,832 mt pollock, 1,110 mt sablefish, 1,331 mt flat cod, 8,108 mt rock sole, and 1,144 mt various other species.

Joint ventures harvested 377,322 mt of fish from the Bering Sea and Aleutian. Catch composition was 321,962 mt pollock, 16,303 mt haddock and 3,157 mt various other species.

Russian fisheries harvested only 15,023 mt by late February, mostly Pacific cod in the Bering Sea. There was concern expressed by the Council over foreign directed fisheries on haddock in the International waters of the Bering Sea (i.e., the "donut hole"). The information is available on this fishery. The Council is strongly encouraging all nations to provide accurate, timely catch information on their operations in the "donut hole."

Foreign Transshipment. Craig Hammond told the Council that he has received several inquiries recently in regard to regulations concerning the transshipment of product from the U.S. catcher/processor fleet to foreign flag transport vessels. As a result, WFS has reviewed their established enforcement policy and in early March mailed a letter to the Council and all the permitted catcher/processor vessels. The Magnuson Act clearly prohibits foreign fishing within the territorial sea. That definition of fishing includes such activities as the transfer of fish and fish products and supplying of fuel, provisions, fishing gear and supplies. The definition does not allow the transfer of fish products from a U.S. flag catcher/processor to a foreign flag transport vessel or a foreign flag vessel to provide support to a U.S. flag vessel within the territorial sea. WFA's interpretation of the Act does not, however, prohibit such transfers if they occur within the confines of a port or an established coastwise trade transfer area. Such transfers can occur beyond the territorial sea, more than three miles offshore, and in that situation it is viewed as a joint venture effort and the vessel flag vessel must have a joint venture permit and comply with the area's reporting requirements.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council concurred with NMFS' plans to extend the emergency rule implementing sections of Amendment 15 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan until the plan goes into effect.

The Council also discussed foreign vessels, particularly those from Poland, fishing in the "donut" area while waiting joint ventures to begin. Council members expressed their continuing concern with the lack of information on the fish harvested in this zone. It was suggested that the Council may base future privileges to operate in the U.S. EEZ on the foreign country providing this harvest information.

B-4 Coast Guard Reports on Activities

U.S. Coast Guard enforcement efforts off Alaska through February 28 totaled 113 cutter days and 224 aircraft hours. Nineteen notices of violation and written warnings have been issued to foreign vessels and 4 to those from the U.S. vessels. The infractions were mainly for failure to maintain required logs and reports. A Japanese longliner was issued a notice of violation for failure to provide assistance to an NMFS observer as required, and a Chinese processor was cited for conducting fisheries support activities without a NMFS observer on board as well as logbook violations and not keeping its International Radio Call Sign legible.

The Coast Guard reported recent problems with Polish fishing vessels entering U.S. territorial waters without first obtaining Coast Guard approval and stressed the importance of vessels from the Soviet Union, Poland, and China complying with the appropriate regulations regarding entry into U.S. territorial waters or ports.

The Coast Guard also warned that they will be citing vessels running with their high intensity work lights on because of the hazard to navigation, particularly in congested or restricted waters. The lights may obscure navigational lights, deteriorate night vision, and blind other vessels.

B-5 Joint Venture Operations

Joint ventures with five countries reported catching about 430,000 mt by early March. U.S. trawlers delivered 235,407 mt to the Japanese, 170,516 mt to the Koreans, 20,000 to the Soviets, 200 mt to the Poles and 5,500 mt to the Chinese. The harvest stands at about 22 percent of the total requested at the December Council meeting. Fifty-two U.S. trawlers made deliveries in January and 92 in February, a considerable expansion over the first two months of 1984-86.

B-6 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pat Livingston of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center gave a presentation on predator-prey interactions among fish species.

CONCISE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council, consisting with 12' plans to extend the emergency fishery management section of Amendment 12 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan until the plan goes into effect.

The Council also discussed foreign vessels, particularly those from Iceland, fishing in the "dorm" area while waiting for their quotas to begin. Council members expressed their continuing concern with the lack of information on the fish harvested in this area. It was suggested that the Council may have future privileges to operate in the U.S. EEZ on the foreign country providing this has not information.

B-4 Coast Guard Reports on Activities

U.S. Coast Guard enforcement efforts off Alaska during February 28 included 113 boardings and 140 separate hours. Nineteen notices of violation and 40 written warnings have been issued to foreign vessels and 4 to those from the U.S. vessels. The infractions were mainly for failure to maintain required log books. A Japanese longliner was issued a notice of violation for failure to provide assistance to an HRS observer as required, and a Chinese processor was cited for conducting fisheries support activities without a HRS observer on board as well as logbook violations and not keeping the International Radio Call Light signals.

The Coast Guard reports recent problems with Polish fishing vessels entering U.S. territorial waters without first obtaining Coast Guard approval and discussed the importance of vessels from the Soviet Union, Iceland, and other countries complying with the appropriate regulations regarding entry into U.S. territorial waters or ports.

The Coast Guard also warned that they will be citing vessels running with their high intensity work lights on because of the hazard to navigation, particularly in congested or restricted waters. The lights may obscure navigational lights, deteriorate night vision, and blind other vessels.

B-5 Joint Venture Operations

Joint ventures with five countries reported catching about 430,000 mt by early March. U.S. catches delivered 225,407 mt to the Japanese, 170,216 mt to the Koreans, 20,000 mt to the Soviets, 100 mt to the Poles and 2,500 mt to the Chinese. The harvest stands at about 75 percent of the total requested at the December Council meeting. Fifty-two U.S. processors have delivered in January and 22 in February, a considerable expansion over the first two months of 1984-86.

B-6 Predator-Prey Interactions

The Director of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center gave a presentation on predator-prey interactions among fish species.

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

C-1 Legislative Update

The Council received a briefing on several bills that have been introduced since the beginning of the 100th Congress. There appears to be considerable interest in Washington, DC, in addressing the problem of plastics pollution of the marine environment. H.R. 474, H.R. 940, S. 62, S. 559, S. 560, and S. 633 all focus on various aspects of plastics pollution. The Senate is expected to ratify Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships in the near future.

The issue of the reflagging of foreign vessels is also being considered by Congress. Representative Young introduced a bill, H.R. 438, on January 7, 1987, that prohibits the reflagging of foreign built fishing, fish processing, and tender vessels as U.S. vessels after October 31, 1986. The Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Merchant Marine, and Coast Guard Subcommittees of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will hold a joint hearing on H.R. 438 in Washington, DC, on April 29, 1987, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 1334 of the Longworth Office Building. Senators Stevens and Murkowski have introduced S. 377 that would impose a ten-year moratorium on the ability of foreign built vessels to engage in fish processing under the U.S. flag.

The Council was also briefed on the latest move by the Reagan Administration to implement user fees on commercial and recreational marine fisheries as well as Coast Guard user fees. The current proposal is to levy the fees as part of a Marine Fisheries Conservation Assurance Program. The fee schedule would require a \$6 federal permit to fish in marine waters for commercial and recreational fishermen, a \$25 stamp for buyers or sellers of certain marine fish, a landing tax of 1% of exvessel value of certain fish landed for commercial purposes and a \$25 federal game fish stamp for certain species. Most of the fees would double in two years under this proposal. The Administration is also discussing Coast Guard user fees that could raise \$355 million in FY88 and \$466 million annually thereafter. No draft legislation on either marine fisheries or Coast Guard user fees has, as yet, been circulated.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members agreed that they should urge the immediate ratification of Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

Rod Moore, fisheries aide to Representative Don Young, told the Council that the appropriate action would be to convey their concern to the State Department and urge that the ratification documents be transmitted to the Senate as soon as possible. Letters to the appropriate Congressional committees would also be appropriate.

Bob Mace moved to take the actions suggested by Mr. Moore. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and carried unanimously.

C-2 Halibut Management

Ron Miller gave a status report on 1987 regulations for the halibut fishery adopted by the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) in January.

4-1 Legislative Update

The Council received a briefing on several bills that have been introduced since the beginning of the 100th Congress. The House passed a bill, H.R. 477, on January 7, 1987, that prohibits the reflagging of foreign built fishing, fish processing and tender vessels as U.S. vessels after October 31, 1988. The Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Merchant Marine, and Coast Guard Subcommittees of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will hold a joint hearing on H.R. 477 in Washington, DC, on April 22, 1987, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 122A of the Longworth Office Building. Senators Stevens and Mikulski have introduced S. 237 which would impose a two-year moratorium on the ability of foreign built vessels to engage in fish processing under the U.S. flag.

The Council was also briefed on the latest move by the Reagan Administration to implement user fees on commercial and recreational marine fisheries as well as Great Guard user fees. The current proposal is to levy the fees as part of a Marine Fisheries Conservation Assurance Program. The fee schedule would require a \$5 federal permit to fish in marine waters for commercial and recreational fishermen, a \$25 stamp for buyers or sellers of certain marine fish, a landing tax of 1% of assessed value of certain fish landed for commercial purposes and a \$25 federal game fish stamp for certain species. Most of the fees would double in two years under this proposal. The Administration is also discussing Great Guard user fees that could raise \$355 million in FY88 and \$400 million annually thereafter. No direct legislation on either marine fisheries or Great Guard user fees has, as yet, been developed.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members agreed that they should urge the immediate ratification of Annex V to the International Convention for the Conservation of Fisheries from Ships (ICLRF).

Bob Moore, fisheries aide to Representative Don Young, told the Council that the appropriate action would be to convey their concern to the State Department and urge that the ratification documents be transmitted to the Senate as soon as possible. Letters to the appropriate congressional committees would also be appropriate.

Bob Moore moved to take the action suggested by Mr. Moore. The motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson and carried unanimously.

4-2 Habitat Management

Bob Moore gave a status report on 1987 legislation for the habitat study requested by the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IHP) in January.

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

The Council, in response to testimony at the January Council meeting, recommended several actions to the IPHC: (1) that the halibut stocks in Areas 4A and 4B be managed as discrete stocks to aid the fishermen of Atka in achieving reasonable access to the halibut resource; (2) that they consider adopting an opening scheme for Area 4B similar to those in effect in Areas 4C and 4E (one day on/one day off, or two days on/one day off); and (3) that the IPHC explore all methods to minimize unlawful fishing, including preseason hold inspections.

In January the Council was also asked to support a proposal to create Areas 4F around Atka with a quota of 400,000 lbs, and Area 4G within Bristol Bay with a quota of 500,000 lbs. The Council determined that since the main aspect of the proposed opening in the nursery area was biological, the matter properly fell within the jurisdiction of the IPHC.

The Commission did not adopt an opening scheme for Area 4B similar to those in effect in Areas 4C and 4E. Also, the Commission decided that the stocks in Areas 4A and 4B should be managed as a unit rather than as discrete stocks. Because of a lack of necessary funding, the Commission decided against mandatory preseason hold inspections.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

There was some discussion on the actions taken by IPHC. Bob McVey explained to the Council the reasoning behind the Commission's actions. He pointed out that although proposals by the Pribilovians for special measures to assure them a larger share of the quota were not adopted by the Commission, they did institute a special trip limit of 10,000 lbs. per vessel until 40% of the quota has been taken; after that time, trip limits would be off and there would be open fishing for residents and non-residents alike though still on a 1 day on, 1 day off routine.

C-3 Non-profit Fishery Research Foundation

Ron Miller reported that since the January 1987 meeting in Anchorage to discuss the creation of a private, non-profit fishery research foundation the steering committee has been reviewing a resolution to be distributed to the industry. Another meeting will be held in the near future in Anchorage to allow representatives from the industry to discuss and act on the resolution.

Rod Moore of Representative Don Young's office has refined draft legislation that would allow industry organizations created to fund fisheries research to require mandatory assessments on members. The legislation is to be introduced in the near future.

C-4 APPRISE

Ole Mathisen, University of Alaska-Juneau, reported on the progress of the Association of Primary Production and Recruitment in Subarctic Ecosystems (APPRISE) project being conducted by School of Fisheries & Science (University of Alaska-Juneau), the Institute of Marine Science at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, the Oceanic Institute in Hawaii, and the NMFS Auke Bay Laboratory. The goal of the project is to develop a predictive capability for

The Council, in response to testimony at the January Council meeting, recommended several actions to the ILMC: (1) that the habitat stock in Areas AA and AB be managed as discrete stocks to aid the fishermen of Alaska in achieving reasonable access to the habitat resource; (2) that they consider adopting an opening scheme for Area AB similar to those in effect in Areas 90 and 91 (one day on/one day off) or two days on/one day off; and (3) that the ILMC explore all methods of minimal bycatch fishing, including processor hold traps, etc.

In January the Council was also asked to support a proposal to create Area AF around Atka with a quota of 100,000 lbs. and Area AG within Bristol Bay with a quota of 500,000 lbs. The Council determined that since the main aspect of the proposal opening in the nursery area was biological, the matter properly fell within the jurisdiction of the ILMC.

The Commission did not adopt an opening scheme for Area AB similar to those in effect in Areas 90 and 91. Also, the Commission decided that the stock in Areas AA and AB should be managed as a unit rather than as discrete stocks. Because of a lack of necessary funding, the Commission decided against mandatory processor hold traps, etc.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

There was some discussion on the actions taken by ILMC. Bob Keyey explained to the Council the reasoning behind the Commission's actions. He pointed out that although proposals by the fishermen for special measures to assure them a larger share of the quota were not adopted by the Commission, they did institute a special trip limit of 10,000 lbs. per vessel until 1/1/87. If the quota has been taken after that time, trip limits would be 0 lbs. and there would be open fishing for residents and non-residents alike though still on a 1 day on, 1 day off routine.

C-1 Non-profit Fishery Research Foundation

Don Miller reported that since the January 1987 meeting in Anchorage to discuss the creation of a private, non-profit fishery research foundation the steering committee has been reviewing a resolution to be distributed to the industry. Another meeting will be held in the near future in Anchorage to allow representatives from the industry to discuss and act on the resolution.

Bob Young of Representative Young's office has refined draft legislation that would allow industry organizations created for fishery research to receive routine mandatory assessments of members. The legislation is to be introduced in the near future.

C-4 APRIS

Ole Mathisen, University of Alaska-Juneau, reported on the progress of the Association of Primary Producers and Recreators in Fisheries Ecosystems (APRIS) project being conducted by School of Fisheries & Science University of Alaska-Juneau, the Institute of Marine Science at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, the Oceanic Institute in Hawaii, and the ILMC and the Laboratory. The goal of the project is to develop a predictive capability for

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

larval recruitment which may be applicable to more extensive, less accessible fisheries areas.

C-5 Limited Entry

Bill Robinson, NMFS-Alaska Region, reported on his experience with limited access systems while working on an exchange program in Australia last year.

Stan Crothers of the New Zealand Fisheries Management Agency, working in Washington D.C. on an exchange from New Zealand, gave a presentation on their progress with limited access programs using individual trade quotas.

C-6 Other Business

(a) Sablefish Limited Entry

The Council received a status report from Bob Alverson on industry efforts to develop recommendations on limited access proposals for the sablefish fishery. The Fishing Vessel Owner's Association and North Pacific Longline Coalition (Sitka) sent out a questionnaire to all fishermen who landed sablefish in 1986. Responses are coming in but the results are too preliminary to analyze at this time. Mr. Alverson requested the Council establish the following schedule for sablefish limited entry: Between the March Council meeting and April, the Council solicit public comments for a long-term sablefish management program, to include traditional management schemes as well as limited entry options; review those proposals at the May meeting and choose those proposals to be further developed and instruct the plan team to redraft them for the September meeting; at the September meeting, Council would review the plan team's draft and send out the proposals for public comment with a final decision at the December Council meeting. Mr. Alverson said they feel that timing is important in this issue and that once they get into the 1988 season it will be almost impossible for the Council and industry to develop any coherent plan.

Mr. Alverson told the Council that they have obtained the services of a University of Washington law student, Bill Mounts, who would be willing to work as a liaison between industry and the Council and NMFS in drafting of regulations for any program devised. They have also secured commitments from industry for \$25,000 to be used as matching funds for this work.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The Advisory Panel recommended the Council adopt the schedule proposed by Bob Alverson.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council felt that they should stay with the original plan -- to wait for specific proposals from industry before developing a schedule of analysis, public review and implementation. If, at the May meeting, the industry comes forward with some proposals they can agree to, then the Council could ask the plan team to prepare them for Council and public review.

lawyer recruitment which may be applicable to more extensive, less accessible
financial resources.

4-5 Limited Entry

Bill Robinson, NMFS-Alaska Region, reported on his experience with limited
access systems while working on an exchange program in Australia last year.

Stan Grothman of the New Zealand Fisheries Management Agency, working in
Washington D.C. on an exchange from New Zealand, gave a presentation on their
program with limited access programs with individual trade quotas.

4-6 Other Business

(a) Subchapter S Limited Entry

The Council received a status report from Bob Alverson on industry efforts to
develop recommendations on limited access proposals for the subchapter S party.
The Fishing Vessel Owners Association and North Pacific Fishing Coalition
(NPFCA) sent out a questionnaire to all fishermen who landed salmon in
1986. Responses are coming in but the results are too preliminary to analyze
at this time. Mr. Alverson requested the Council establish the following
schedule for subchapter S limited entry: 1) on the March Council meeting and
April, the Council holds a public comment for a long-term subchapter
management program, to include traditional management schemes as well as
limited entry options; review those proposals at the May meeting and choose
those proposals to be further developed and include the plan to submit
them for the September meeting. At the September meeting, Council
would review the plan team's draft and send out the proposals for public
comment with a final decision at the November Council meeting. Mr. Alverson
said they feel that timing is important in this issue and that once they get
into the 1988 season it will be almost impossible for the Council and industry
to develop any coherent plan.

Mr. Alverson told the Council that they have obtained the resources of a
University of Washington law student, Bill Hunter, who would be willing to
work as a liaison between industry and the Council and NMFS in drafting of
regulation for any program. They have also secured comments from
industry for \$25,000 to be used as matching funds for this work.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The Advisory Panel recommended the Council adopt the schedule proposed by Bob
Alverson.

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council felt that they should stay with the original plan - to wait for
specific proposals from industry before developing a schedule of activities.
Public review and implementation. It is the law meeting, the industry can
forward with some proposals they can agree on then the Council could call the
plan team to prepare them for Council and public review.

(b) Next Allocation of TALFF

The Council discussed the next foreign allocation release, scheduled for April. Mr. Branson reported that there is approximately 32,000 mt of unallocated TALFF and that normally the April allocation is half of that total. The major species available are pollock, 3,700 mt; yellowfin sole, 3,404 mt; Arrowtooth flounder, 3,730 mt; other flounder, 9,958 mt; and Pacific cod, 8,760 mt. The Allocations Board meets April 1 in Washington and the Council agreed that Clarence Pautzke should attend along with a Council member of the Chairman's choosing. It was suggested that in order to expose Council members to this process, the assignment should be rotated among them.

As far as recommendations to the Board, it was pointed out that the main issue would be whether the foreign countries have been living up to their part of the industry agreements.

D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

D-1 King and Tanner Crab FMP

(a) Annual King and Tanner Crab Hearing in Seattle.

The Council held its annual king and Tanner crab hearing in Seattle on March 4. With membership of the Alaska Board of Fisheries changing, no one from the Board could attend. Approximately ten members of the public attended the hearing. A summary of public testimony was provided in Council notebooks.

(b) Crab Management Committee Update

The Crab Management Committee met with members of the Crab Plan Team to review the first working draft of a combined King and Tanner Crab FMP for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. A report of that meeting was provided to Council members. With the advice provided them, the plan team will work on a new draft and meet again with the committee prior to the next Council meeting. They hope that after the May meeting the plan team will have enough direction to further revise the fishery management plan and complete the associated economic and environmental impact studies during the summer. The revised plan and decision documents will be inserted into the 1988 crab management cycle which calls for the new plan to be implemented sometime in late 1988.

Public Testimony

Arne Aadland/Thorn Smith, NPFVOA, recommended the extension of the 1987 C. opilio fishery in the northwest portion of the Bering Sea since this area is not surveyed well. This year the opilio harvest guideline is lower and fishermen hope that if CPUE remains high the season will be extended by NMFS. NPFVOA is concerned that with budget cuts ADF&G may not be able to monitor CPUE rates as closely as in prior years and that this could affect the outcome of the season extension decision.

NPFVOA is developing a proposal for next year that will look at the possibility of lowering the minimum size limit for king crab. The current minimum size limit is 6½". The Association asked the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center to examine this question and preliminary results from the

(b) - Alaska Fisheries Council

The Council discussed the next foreign allocation review, scheduled for April. Mr. Wagon reported that there is approximately \$2,000,000 of unallocated TAFE and that normally the April allocation is half of that total. The major available are Pollock, 2,700 mt; walleye sole, 2,400 mt; Atkasoftoon, 2,730 mt; and a remainder, 2,950 mt; and Pacific cod, 8,700 mt. The Allocation Board meets April 1 in Washington and the Council agreed that Clarence Paivika should attend along with a Council member of the Chairman's choosing. It was suggested that in order to expose Council members to this process, the assignment should be rotated among them.

As far as recommendations to the Board, it was pointed out that the main issue would be whether the foreign countries have been living up to their part of the fishery agreements.

11. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN

11-1. King and Tanner Crab TFE

(a) Annual King and Tanner Crab Hearing in Seattle

The Council held its annual King and Tanner crab hearing in Seattle on March 1. With membership of the Alaska Board of Fisheries changing, no one from the board could attend. Approximately ten members of the public attended the hearing. A summary of public testimony was provided in Council minutes.

(b) Council Management Committee Update

The Crab Management Committee met with members of the Crab Plan team to review the latest working draft of a combined King and Tanner Crab TFE for the hearing. A report of that meeting was provided to Council. With the advice provided them, the plan team will work on a new draft and meet again with the committee prior to the next Council meeting. They hope that after the hearing the plan team will have enough information to further revise the fishery management plan and complete the associated economic and environmental impact studies during the summer. The next plan and decision documents will be issued into the 1988 crab management cycle which calls for the new plan to be implemented sometime in late 1987.

Public Testimony

Arne Aabim/Torn Smith, FFWA, recommended the extension of the 1987 CPUE to February in the northwest portion of the Lower Peninsula since this area is not surveyed well. This year the CPUE survey is scheduled for lower and higher than in previous years. If CPUE remains high the season will be extended by FFWA. FFWA is concerned that with budget cuts ADFG may not be able to monitor CPUE rates as closely as in prior years and that this could affect the outcome of the season extension decision.

FFWA is developing a proposal for next year that will look at the possibility of lowering the minimum size limit for King crab. The current minimum size limit is 6 1/2". The Association asked the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center to examine this question and preliminary results from the

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

analysis suggest that reduction of the size limit may not have an adverse effect on reproductive potential. Further analysis at the Center is planned.

Their Association favors leaving the current Tanner Crab FMP in place.

Arni Thomson, Alaska Crab Coalition. Mr. Thomson participated in the development of the new king and Tanner crab FMP and favors suspension of the current Tanner crab plan.

He also proposed that managers consider a split king crab season (fall/spring) in Bristol Bay to test the feasibility of eventually having a combined king and C. bairdi crab fishery immediately prior to the C. opilio fishery. One advantage of the proposal is that meat recovery or yield will be increased. The Coalition believes that harvesting half the guideline in the winter/early spring months will provide the same number of king crab to the fishery but at a higher average weight which could produce a higher exvessel value of the catch. Another advantage would be that by scheduling king and Tanner crab fisheries together, start-up costs and handling of crab will be reduced. The proposal will be developed further by the Coalition and submitted to the Board of Fisheries and Council in the future.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council approved the Committee's report and time schedule and expressed appreciation for the work done by the Committee, plan team, and industry groups.

D-2 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

(a) 1987 Pollock Apportionments

In December the Council apportioned the pollock quota of 84,000 mt in the Gulf for 1987 as follows: DAP-83,700 mt; JVP-300 mt; TALFF-0 mt. That decision was based primarily on the NMFS industry survey conducted in November and testimony at the December Council meeting. Subsequent reevaluation of DAP requirements by Regional staff indicated there was as much as 21,900 mt available for other than DAP use from the target quota of 84,000 mt. Regional Director Bob McVey recommended that amount be transferred from DAP to JVP (21,900 mt) with the reserve to be held for either category as needed (20% of TQ = 16,800 mt). Under Secretary Calio asked the Council to comment on this recommendation.

Jim Balsiger, Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, reported on preliminary pollock stock assessment from the ongoing hydroacoustic survey by the MILLER FREEMAN. He stressed that these data were collected on the first of three legs of the survey and are very preliminary. He gave the Council four basic pieces of information: (1) the geographic area of aggregation is smaller than last year; (2) the density of aggregation is less than last year; (3) the first layer, at 100 fathoms, was all three-year-old fish and the second layer, 5 fathoms from the bottom, contained all sizes; and (4) the gonad maturation is similar to past years. Based on these preliminary data, Mr. Balsiger said they have no reason to believe that there will be an increase in the abundance of pollock in the Gulf this year.

analysts suggest that reduction of the size limit may not have an adverse effect on reproductive potential. Further analysis of the data is planned.

Their Association favors leaving the current Tanner Crab TPE in place.

And Thomas, Alaska Crab Coalition, Mr. Thomas participated in the development of the new kind and Tanner Crab TPE and favors suspension of the current Tanner Crab TPE.

He also proposed that managers consider a split bag crab season (fall/winter) in Bristol Bay to test the feasibility of essentially having a combined bag and C. bagged crab fishery immediately prior to the C. fishing season. The advantage of the proposal is that most recovery or yield will be increased. The coalition believes that harvesting half the quota in the winter/spring months will provide the same number of crab to the fishery but at a higher average weight which could produce a higher ex-vessel value of the catch. Another advantage would be that by scheduling bag and Tanner crab fisheries together, sweep-up costs and handling of crab will be reduced. The proposal will be developed further by the coalition and submitted to the Board of Fisheries and Council in the future.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTION

The Council approved the Committee's report and the schedule and approved application for the work done by the committee, plan team, and industry groups.

D-2 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

(a) 1987 Pollock Apportionments

In December the Council apportioned the pollock quota of 84,000 mt in the Gulf for 1987 as follows: DAF-83,700 mt; AIF-000 mt. That decision was passed primarily on the 1988 industry survey conducted in November and December at the December Council meeting. Subsequent reevaluation of DAF requirements by Regional staff indicated there was a need for 21,000 mt available for other than DAF use from the larger quota of 84,000 mt. Regional Director Bob Meyer recommended that amount be transferred from DAF to 21,000 mt (21,000 mt) with the residue to be held for either category as needed (30% of 21,000 mt = 6,300 mt). Under Secretary Gallo asked the Council to comment on this recommendation.

Jim Bellinger, Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, reports on preliminary pollock stock assessment from the ongoing hydroacoustic survey by the M/V RICHMAN. He stressed that these data were collected on the basis of three layers of the survey and are very preliminary. He gave the Council four basic pieces of information: (1) the geographic area of aggregation is smaller than last year; (2) the density of aggregation is less than last year; (3) the 200 fathom, 100 fathom, was all three-year-old fish and the second layer contained all three; and (4) the ground water level is similar to past years based on these preliminary data. Mr. Bellinger said they have no reason to believe that there will be an increase in the abundance of pollock in the Gulf this year.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The AP recommended the Council request NMFS to provide updated information at the May meeting regarding TQs, DAP potential, and JVP plans. This would include: (1) any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydroacoustic surveys and age/length studies); (2) the results of a formal survey of DAP processors, including an estimate of DAP processing capacity ready but not able to get fish; and (3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shoreside delivery.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

The SSC declined to consider the matter of Gulf of Alaska pollock apportionments among DAP, JVP and TALFF, as the issues did not include matters of science.

Public Testimony for all groundfish items is found in Appendix I to these minutes.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members felt it was important to give the Regional Director direction to finalize the apportionments for 1987, but also felt that the final results of the acoustical survey would be helpful before making any recommendation.

There was also some concern whether the Council should go outside its established procedure and make changes at this point in time and with very preliminary information.

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendation with regard to the apportionment of pollock to DAP and JVP in the Gulf, which is:

That the Council request NMFS to provide updated information at the May meeting regarding TQs, DAP potential, and JVP plans. This would include:

(1) any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydroacoustic surveys and age/length studies);

(2) the results of a formal survey of DAP processors, including an estimate of DAP processing capacity ready but not able to get fish; and

(3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shoreside delivery.

In the interim, the Council recommends that the Regional Director not release any pollock to JVP in the Gulf.

The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell and carried 9 to 1, with Rudy Petersen voting against and Bob McVey abstaining.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The AP recommended the Council request NITS to provide updated information as to the May meeting regarding the DAF potential, and VVP plans. This would include: (1) any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydroacoustic surveys and egg-length studies); (2) the results of a formal survey of DAF processors, including an estimate of DAF processing capacity ready but not able to see fish; and (3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shrimp delivery.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

The SSC declined to consider the matter of Gulf of Alaska pollock apportionments among DAF, VVP and TAFE, as the issues did not include matters of science.

Public testimony for all groundfish items is found in Appendix I to these minutes.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members felt it was important to give the Regional Director discretion to finalize the apportionment for 1967, but also felt that the final results on the scientific survey would be helpful before making any recommendation.

There was also some concern whether the Council should consider its established procedure and make changes at this point in time and with very preliminary information.

Don Collinsworth moved to effect the AP's recommendation with regard to the apportionment of pollock to DAF and VVP in the Gulf of Alaska.

That the Council request NITS to provide updated information to the May meeting regarding the DAF potential, and VVP plans. This would include:

(1) any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydroacoustic surveys and egg-length studies);

(2) the results of a formal survey of DAF processors, including an estimate of DAF processing capacity ready but not able to see fish; and

(3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shrimp delivery.

In the interim, the Council recommends that the Regional Director release any pollock to VVP in the Gulf.

The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell and carried 9 to 1, with Robertson voting against and Bob McVey abstaining.

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

(b) AMENDMENT 16

Amendment 16 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan addresses the following issues:

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).

Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all gear (include consideration of a 22-inch limit).

Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-longline and pots).

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish year-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider square approximation of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider January through June closures of the 100-mile zones and the entire Bering Sea.

Alternative 4: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all DAP vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from DAP catcher/processors and mothership/processors.

Fishing season framework.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., the setting of seasons will require a plan amendment).

Alternative 2: Establish a fishing season framework to allow the annual setting of seasons, using a more efficient notice procedure.

(b) AMENDMENT 11

Amendment 11 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan addresses the following issues:

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).

Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all gear (include consideration of a 32-inch limit).

Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-longline and pots).

Set priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish year-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider square configurations of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider closure through June closure of the 10-mile zone and the entire Bering Sea.

Alternative 4: Establish a license structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all TAP vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from TAP vessels/processors and motherhip/processors.

Establish season length.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., the setting of seasons will require a plan amendment).

Alternative 2: Establish a fishing season framework to allow the annual setting of seasons using a more efficient notice procedure.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no bycatch limit other than for halibut can be placed on the groundfish fishery; no authority to set PSC limits on foreign fisheries; when halibut PSC limit is reached, just bottom trawl fisheries close).

Alternative 2: Establish a framework measure to control bycatches of all prohibited species. Will provide authority to set PSC limits for all traditional prohibited species on all domestic and foreign groundfish fisheries.

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., existing plan would remain out of date and difficult to use).

Alternative 2: Update FMP, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. This alternative address includes several administrative changes, a description of rockfish management strategies, a revised list of target species, and clarification of legal gear.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

Complete comments of the SSC are found in their minutes, Appendix II.

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish. The SSC pointed out that the analysis provided in the draft amendment indicates that a size limit would not increase the total yield from the stock in view of the current low fishing mortality. While the analysis indicates that there is a possibility of some economic gain to be realized by applying a size limit to the catches of longliners, it must be understood that these gains will be rapidly dissipated if constraints are not placed on the level of effort deployed in the fishery. Given these conclusions, the SSC suggested that if the Council wishes to implement a size limit for the longline fishery, serious consideration must be given to simultaneous implementation of a program to limit effort. They questioned the advisability of continuing public review of the amendment without addressing limitation of effort.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island. The SSC concluded that the catch/effort equation used in the RIR did not provide the data needed to determine how this action would affect both DAP and non-DAP fishermen. They recommended that the analysis and conclusions based on this CPUE model be removed from the RIR. The SSC made specific recommendations to the plan teams for amending the RIR and recommended the proposal be sent out for public review after the modifications are made.

Revise the definition of prohibited species. The SSC recommended that this proposal be sent out for public review.

Report the status of the 280 framework as follows: all prohibited species (i.e., salmon, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).

Alternative 1: No fishing (i.e., no harvest) other than for salmon can be placed on the prohibited species, no output to the 280 limit on fishing; when fishing 280 limit is reached, that portion of the fishery class).

Alternative 2: Establish a framework measure to control bycatch of all prohibited species. Will provide authority to set 280 limit for all traditional prohibited species on all domestic and foreign commercial fisheries.

Update Gulf of Alaska WME descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

Alternative 3: Update WME descriptive chapters and incorporate Council policy as directed. This alternative includes several substantive changes a description of rockfish management strategies, a revised list of target species, and classification of legal gear.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

Complete comments of the SSC are found in their minutes. Appendix II.

Establish a minimum size limit for halibut. The SSC obtained our best estimate provided in the draft management framework that a size limit would not increase the total yield from the stock in view of the current low fishing mortality. While the analysis indicates that there is a possibility of some economic gain to be realized by applying a size limit to the range of fisheries, it must be understood that these gains will be rapidly dissipated if constraints are not placed on the level of effort deployed in the fishery. Given these conditions, the SSC suggested that if the Council wishes to implement a size limit for the longline fishery, further consideration must be given to simultaneous implementation of a program to limit effort. They questioned the sustainability of continuing possible review of the framework without decreasing limitation of effort.

BAR priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island. The SSC concluded that the catch/effort ratio used in the FIE did not provide the data needed to determine how this action would affect both BAR and non-BAR fisheries. They recommended that the analysis and conclusion based on the CME model be removed from the FIE. The SSC made specific recommendations to the plan teams for amending the FIE and recommended the proposal be sent out for public review along with the recommendations are made.

Revise the definition of prohibited species. The SSC recommended that this proposal be sent out for public review.

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Improve catch recording requirements. The SSC noted that the proposal goes beyond the original reason for the amendment, which was to allow the verification of the amount of groundfish being caught by catcher/processors and mothership/processors. They support the collection of information that is required for fisheries management and research, but feel that it is premature to use this amendment to initiate and define a DAP reporting system. The SSC found that the proposal as presented fails to provide the reader with sufficient information on the types of information to be collected and that the proposal also requires extensive editing. They recommended a fourth alternative be added to the package: "Apply the 'Cumulative Product Log' and the 'Transfer Logbook' recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels." With the additional alternative and clarification, the SSC recommended the proposal be sent out for public review.

Fishing season framework. The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review after minor editorial changes.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs). The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review after the plan team makes some minor changes for the sake of clarification.

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review but stressed the need for the revision to proceed with attention to the need for consistency with the BSAI groundfish fishery management plan.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. Although they recognized the model in the RIR/EA indicates little impact, the majority of the AP felt that it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. The AP also recommended that if the proposal goes out for public review the CPUE model should be translated into language more easily understood by the public.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island. The AP recommended an amended version of the alternatives for this proposal be sent out for public review:

Alternative 1: Do nothing (no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed only for those fishing for DAP operators.

Alternative 3: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed for those delivering to DAP operators or for those delivering to foreign processors laying outside the small square.

Alternative 4: Establish seasonal area closures within the small square.

Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

... The SSC noted that the proposal ...
... The SSC recommended the proposal be sent out for public review ...
... With the additional alternative and ...
... the SSC recommended the proposal be sent out for public review ...

Fishing gear review. The SSC recommended sending the proposal out for public review after minor editorial changes.

Expand the existing list of SSC members to include all traditional "subsistence species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs). The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review after the list is expanded for the sake of clarification.

Update GULF of Alaska WRF descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review but stressed the need for the revision to proceed with attention to the need for consistency with the WMA groundfish fishery management plan.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Establish a minimum state limit for subsistence. The SSC recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. Although they recognized the model in the WMA indicates little support, the majority of the AP felt that it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. The AP also recommended that the proposal be sent out for public review. The GDF model should be translated into a more easily understood by the public.

- Alternative 1: Do nothing (no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).
- Alternative 2: Establish a gear-bound area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 24°30' and 25°N latitude between 162° and 162°W longitude). Fishing within this area would be allowed only for those fishing for DAF operators.
- Alternative 3: Establish a gear-bound area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 24°30' and 25°N latitude between 162° and 162°W longitude). Fishing within this area would be allowed for those delivering to DAF operators or for those delivering to foreign processors (with certain exceptions).
- Alternative 4: Establish seasonal area closures within the small square.
- Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Alternative 6: Spread out JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year.

After extensive discussion and testimony about the RIR document the AP recommended numerous changes to the authors. One major cause of concern was uncertainty over what problem this proposal is trying to solve. For example:

- (a) In the RIR the plan team focused on getting fish to shore.
- (b) The proposer testified that the key problem is Americanization.
- (c) Much testimony centered on widespread fears about concentrating fishing effort on spawning stocks.

Revise the definition of prohibited species. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

Improve catch recording requirements. The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review, incorporating the SSC's recommendation for a fourth alternative.

Fishing Season Framework. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review with Alternative 2 amended to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation. That criteria would include an analysis of whether seasons would have an allocative impact.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs). The AP recommended a rewritten and amended proposal be sent out for public review which would:

- (1) Clearly outline examples of how this may impact a particular fishery.
- (2) Clearly outline how PSC limits will be determined, enforced, and appealed.
- (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis.

They also recommended a third alternative be added: "Defer the issue of bycatch of prohibited species to the Bycatch Subcommittee."

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Don Collinsworth moved to send the proposal out for public review, incorporating the AP's suggestions for clarification. The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell, and failed 8 to 3, with Collinsworth, Mitchell and Winther voting for the motion.

Several Council members felt that the analysis did not have compelling enough arguments to prove the benefits of a size limit on sablefish and that it would be a waste of time and effort to continue with this proposal for public

Alternative 6: spread out 17 allocations over a number of seasons within the year.

After extensive discussion and testimony about the RTR document the AP recommended numerous changes to the plan. The major cause of concern was uncertainty over what problem this proposal is trying to solve. For example: (a) In the RTR the plan team focused on getting fish to shore. (b) The proposal specified that the key problem is American salmon. (c) Much testimony centered on widespread fears about overfishing leading to a collapse of spawning stocks.

Under the definition of prohibited species. The AP recommended that the proposal be sent out for public review.

Improve catch recording requirements. The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review, incorporating the RTR's recommendations for catch alternatives.

Fixing Season Framework. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review with Alternative 2 amended to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation. That criteria would include an analysis of what seasons would have an allocative impact.

Expand the existing habitat RSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, lingcod and Tanner crab). The AP recommended a written and amended proposal be sent out for public review which would:

- (1) Clearly outline examples of how this proposal impacts a particular fishery.
- (2) Clearly outline how RSC limits will be determined, outlined, and applied.
- (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis.

They also recommended a third alternative be added: "Under the issue of expansion of prohibited species to the Bering Subcommence."

Update Gulf of Alaska RTR descriptive sections, regarding chapters, and incorporate Council being as directed. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Establish a minimum size limit for halibut.

Don Collinsworth moved to send the proposal out for public review incorporating the AP's suggestions for distribution. The motion was seconded by Harry Mitchell and failed 8 to 3 with Collinsworth, Mitchell and Wheeler voting for the motion.

Several Council members felt that the analysis did not have compelling enough arguments to prove the benefits of a size limit on halibut and that it would be a waste of time and effort to continue with this proposal for public

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

review. It was also pointed out that the SSC recommended that a size limit be considered only in connection with a limited entry proposal for the fishery.

Mr. Collinsworth said he made the motion because it is consistent with the AP's recommendation. He also commented that in conversations with fishermen the sablefish size limit has been discussed as a way of regulating the catch which would be an economic advantage.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendations, including the six alternatives:

Alternative 1: Do nothing (no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed only for those fishing for DAP operators.

Alternative 3: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed for those delivering to DAP operators or for those delivering to foreign processors laying outside the small square.

Alternative 4: Establish seasonal area closures within the small square.

Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Alternative 6: Spread out JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year,

and that the plan team address the concerns of the SSC regarding the CPUE model, before sending out for public review. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried, 7 to 4, with Dyson, Mace, M. Pedersen, and R. Petersen voting against.

There was considerable discussion and debate on this amendment proposal, particularly on whether there was sufficient time to develop the new alternative (6) and get the package out for the 30-day public review period. It was suggested that the plan team could obtain additional technical help from the Regional Office, the Center and the Auke Bay Lab. Many felt that if the proposal was approved for public review it should contain the maximum and most diverse alternatives possible.

Further discussion on the alternatives and, specifically Alternative 6, addressed whether the alternatives were appropriate to the objective of the proposal, priority for domestic processors. Some felt that Alternative 6, spreading JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year, was another issue and should not be addressed under this proposal. There was also some concern whether the plan team would be able to properly analyze the wide range of alternatives suggested. The Council also discussed whether this proposal would address only pollock or all species in the Bering Sea.

John Winther moved to restrict analysis of this proposal to pollock. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and carried, 8 to 3, with John Peterson, Mitchell, and Collinsworth voting against.

review. It was also pointed out that the SSC recommended that a size limit be considered only in connection with a limited entry proposal for the fishery.

Mr. Collinsworth said he made the motion because it is consistent with the AA's recommendation. He also commented that in conversations with fishermen the size limit has been discussed as a way of regulating the catch which would be an economic advantage.

100 mile limit of U.S. waters

Mr. Collinsworth moved to adopt the AA's recommendation, including the size limit.

Alternative 1: No zoning (no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fisheries).

Alternative 2: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 33°30' and 33°45' latitude between 122° and 122°15' longitude). Fishing within this area could be allowed only for those fishing for DWF operators.

Alternative 3: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 33°30' and 33°45' latitude between 122° and 122°15' longitude). Fishing within this area would be allowed for those delivering to HAF operators or for those delivering to foreign processors fishing outside the small square.

Alternative 4: Establish seasonal area closures within the small square.

Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Alternative 6: Spread out VWP allocations over a number of seasons within the year.

and that the clear beam address the concerns of the SSC regarding the CWP model, before sending out for public review. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried 7 to 0 with David, Noel, M. Behrman, and J. Peterson voting against.

There was considerable discussion and debate on this agenda item. Particularity of whether there was sufficient time to develop the new alternative (6) and get the package out for the 30-day public review period. It was suggested that the plan could obtain additional technical help from the Regional Office, the Council and the Alaska Dept. Many felt that if the proposal was approved for public review it should contain the text and most diverse alternative possible.

Further discussion of the alternatives and, specifically Alternative 6, addressed whether the alternatives were appropriate to the objective of the proposal, priority for domestic processors. Some felt that Alternative 6, spreading VWP allocations over a number of seasons within the year, was another issue and should not be addressed under this proposal. There was also some concern whether the plan team could be able to properly analyze the wide range of alternatives suggested. The Council also discussed whether this proposal would address only dock or all species in the Bering Sea.

John Peterson moved to restrict language of this proposal to public review. The motion was seconded by David Peterson and carried 8 to 0 with Noel, M. Behrman, and Collinsworth voting against.

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Mr. McVey suggested that between now and the May meeting the plan team and staff could work with industry to prepare a well-developed Alternative 6 along with supporting documents. The Council could approve it for public review at that time and make a final decision in September. If, by January 1, there were compelling conservation reasons for implementing the final decision, perhaps it could be done by emergency rule. Jon Pollard, NOAA-GC, told Council members that he could not predict whether an emergency rule could be used at that time.

Some Council members felt that there isn't a problem to be dealt with, that Americanization of the shoreside processing industry is taking place as quickly as possible now; others felt that the proposal should be developed and sent out for public review.

The Council instructed the plan team to proceed with the proposal for public review, completing as much analysis as possible.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Henry Mitchell moved to sent the proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by Mark Pedersen and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendations, which was to send the proposal out for public review including a fourth alternative (Apply the "Cumulative Product Log" and the "Transfer Logbook" recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels. The motion was seconded by Bob McVey and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

There was some concern about the broad scope of the data that would be required under such a program. John Harville pointed out that industry cooperation is a must for logbooks to be effective. He suggested that the development of the details of this proposal should include industry participation. Mr. McVey said that they will work with industry to clarify NMFS' specific needs and to find some common ground.

Fishing season framework.

Don Collinsworth moved to send out this proposal with the AP's recommendation to amend Alternative 2 to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation, including analysis of whether seasons would have an allocative impact. The motion was seconded by Bob Mace and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).

Mr. Moyer suggested that between now and the next meeting the plan team and staff could work with industry to prepare a well-developed Alternative 6 along with supporting documents. The Council could approve it for public review at that time and make a final decision in September. If, by January 1, there were compelling conservation reasons for implementing the final decision, perhaps it could be done by emergency rule. Don Pollock, NOAA-CC, said Council members should not predict whether an emergency rule could be used at that time.

Some Council members felt that there isn't a problem to be dealt with. The Americanization of the species processing industry is taking place as quickly as possible now; others felt that the proposal should be developed and sent out for public review.

The Council instructed the plan team to proceed with the proposal for public review, completing as much analysis as possible.

Review the definition of prohibited species.

Henry Mitchell asked to send the proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by Mark Johnson and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Improve such recording requirements.

Don Collinsworth moved to edit the AA's recommendations, which was to send the proposal out for public review including a fourth alternative (A4), the "General Product Log", and the "Incidental Bycatch" recording requirements to either processor and nonprocessor vessels. The motion was seconded by Bob Fovey and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

There was some concern about the broad scope of the data that would be required under such a program. John Raville pointed out that industry participation in a meat log should be encouraged. He suggested that the development of the details of this proposal should include industry participation. Mr. Moyer said that they will work with industry to clarify NRS' specific needs and to find some common ground.

Finalize season framework.

Don Collinsworth moved to send out this proposal with the AA's recommendation to amend Alternative 6 to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation, including analysis of whether seasons would have an allocative impact. The motion was seconded by Bob Fovey and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Expand the existing Baited TSC framework to include all prohibited species (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendation: to send out for public review a rewritten and amended proposal which would:

- (1) Clearly outline examples of how this may impact a particular fishery.
- (2) Clearly outline how PSC limits will be determined, enforced, and appealed.
- (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis, and

that a third alternative be added: "Defer the issue of bycatch of prohibited species to the Bycatch Subcommittee." The motion was seconded by John Winther and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

Don Collinsworth moved to send this proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by Larry Cotter and, there being no objection, it was so ordered. Oscar Dyson was not present for this vote.

There was some concern about the work going into a revision with the current objective of combining the two groundfish plans. However, Steve Davis told Council members that the chapters being updated will have to be done, even for a combined plan. Bob Mace asked that staff come back to the Council with a workable schedule for combining the two groundfish plans.

D-3 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands FMP.

Amendment 11.

Amendment 11 to the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP addressed the following issues (those marked with an asterisk are common to both the Gulf and Bering Sea FMPs):

*Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).

Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all gear (include consideration of a 22-inch limit).

Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-longline and pots).

*DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish year-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider square approximation of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Public review program and a related proposal which would:

- (1) Identify suitable examples of how this may impact a particular industry.
- (2) Clearly outline how BAC limits will be determined, enforced, and reported.
- (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis, and

that a third alternative be added: "Refer the issue of hydraulic dredging to the Alaska Subcommittees." The motion was seconded by John Linder and there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Update bill of Alaska for descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

The Committee moved to read this proposal and for public review. The motion was seconded by Larry Gutter and there being no objection, it was so ordered. (A copy of this proposal was not present for this vote.)

There was some concern about the work going into a revision with the current objective of combining the two groundfish plans. However, Steve Davis told Council members that the chapters being reported will have to be done even if a combined plan. Bob Pace asked that staff come back to the Council with a workable schedule for combining the two groundfish plans.

Bill: Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands TMT.

Amendment II.

Amendment II to the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish TMT addressed the following issues (those marked with an asterisk are common to both the GOM and Bering Sea TMT):

Establish a minimum size limit for eschschsch.

- Alternative 1: No nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).
- Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all years (include consideration of a 32-inch limit).
- Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-line and pots).

BDP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

- Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restriction on processor receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).
- Alternative 2: Establish gear-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives considered: a) approximation of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider January through June closures of the 100-mile zones and the entire Bering Sea.

Alternative 4: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

*Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

*Improve catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all DAP vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from DAP catcher/processors and mothership/processors.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Amend definition to conform with that used by Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Increase Upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (upper value remains 2.0 million mt).

Alternative 2: Raise upper value of OY range to 2.4 million mt.

Alternative 3: Equate upper value of OY range to annual sum of EY/ABCs.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Prohibit JVP roe-stripping.

Alternative 3: Prohibit JVP and DAP roe-stripping.

Alternative 4: Establish semi-annual JVP pollock allocation.

Public testimony for this agenda item is found in Appendix I.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two set-aside areas
consider January through June closure of the 100-mile zone and the
entire fishing zone.

Alternative 4: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors and
restrict joint venture fish.

Review the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

Require catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all DAB
vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from DAB catcher/processors and
processor/processors.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Amend definition to conform with that used by Pacific
Fishery Management Council.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (upper value remains 2.0 million mt).

Alternative 2: Raise upper value of OY range to 2.4 million mt.

Alternative 3: Update upper value of OY range to annual sum of EY/ABC.

Prohibit pollock re-shipment.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Prohibit VWF re-shipment.

Alternative 3: Prohibit VWF and VWF re-shipment.

Alternative 4: Establish semi-annual VWF pollock allocation.

Public testimony for this agenda item is found in Appendix I.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

Complete comments of the SSC are found in their minutes, Appendix II. Please refer to the Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2, for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

The SSC recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. In addition, they recommended that the plan team add the following definition of threshold to the proposal:

The threshold is defined as the minimum size of a stock that allows sufficient recruitment so that the stock can eventually reach a level that produces MSY.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

The SSC suggested to the team a number of editorial changes to the proposal and recommended it be sent out for public comment after those changes are made.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

The SSC recommended this proposal be sent out for public comment.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Please refer to the Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2, for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise the definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review, with two changes:

- (1) Deletion of all editorial comments. An example of editorial comments is on page 73 which describes Alternative 3 as the most "conservative and protective."
- 2) Amend Alternative 3 to read: "Annually set the upper end of the OY range equal to annual estimates of EY/ABC but not to exceed 2.0 million metric tons."

Prohibit pollock roe stripping.

The AP recommended the proposal be sent out for public review.

Report of the Soc and Statistical Committee

Complete contents of the SOC are found in their minutes, Appendix T. Please refer to the bill of Alaska agency item 1-2 for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC)

The SOC recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. In addition they recommended that the plan team add the following definition of ABC:

The ABC should be defined as the minimum size of a stock that allows sufficient recruitment so that the stock can eventually reach a level that produces MSY.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range

The SOC suggested to the team a number of editorial changes to the proposal and recommended it be sent out for public comment after those changes are made.

Prohibit pickup for striping

The SOC recommended this proposal be sent out for public comment.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Please refer to the bill of Alaska agency item 1-2 for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise the definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC)

The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range

The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review, with two changes:

(1) Revision of all editorial comments. An example of editorial comments is on page 18 which describes Alternative 2 as the most "conservative and protective."

(2) Amend Alternative 3 to read: "Annually see the upper end of the OY range equal to annual estimates of BYAPG but not to exceed 3.0 million metric tons."

Prohibit pickup for striping

The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ACTION

Council discussion and action on the following proposals is found under the Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2:

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.
DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.
Revise the definition of prohibited species.
Improve catch recording requirements.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP recommendation to send the proposal out for public review after incorporating the definition of threshold suggested by the SSC. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and, there being objection, it was so ordered.

Increase the upper value of optimum yield (OY) range:

Mark Pedersen moved to send the proposal out for public comment after making the editorial changes proposed by the SSC and incorporating the AP's suggestion for Alternative 3 into a new, fourth alternative: "Annually set the upper end of the OY range equal to annual estimates of EY/ABC but not to exceed 2.0 million metric tons. The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell and carried with John Winther objecting. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

Bob Mace moved to drop this proposal from the package. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and failed, 6 to 4, with Mace, McVey, M. Pedersen, and R. Petersen voting in favor. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

The reason for this motion was previous testimony by the original proposers of the amendment indicating they wished to withdraw it.

Henry Mitchell moved to send this proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried, 6 to 4, with Mace, McVey, M. Pedersen and R. Petersen voting against. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that public testimony indicated some people still feel there is a need for this proposal to be analyzed and public testimony solicited.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bob McVey reported on the GATT negotiations with Japan. Negotiators have been successful in gaining IQ considerations on pollock and herring. It won't be a formal agreement, but an exchange of letters. Under pollock there will be a new quota category for which the initial allocation will be 100,000 tons round weight and will be available for any willing buyer and seller with no qualification other than a legitimate contract. There is also a mechanism for increasing the amount if needed. This should be functional by the first of April. On herring, the Japanese IQ will be broken into two parts, with one for Pacific herring at 50,000 tons round weight; quota shares will be divided

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ACTION

General discussion and action on the following proposals is found under the
List of Alaska agenda items, D-2:

Establish a minimum size limit for fish in
All portions within 100 miles of Alaska Islands.
Revise the definition of prohibited species.
Improve monitoring and enforcement.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

On 2/11/87, a motion was made to adopt the ABC recommendation to send the proposal out
for public review after incorporating the definition of ABC as presented by
the SSC. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and there being objection,
it was so ordered.

Increase the upper value of optimum yield (Y) range.

Mark Peterson moved to send the proposal out for public comment after making
the editorial changes proposed by the SSC and incorporating the ABC
suggestion. A motion was made to send a new fourth alternative. A majority of the
upper end of the Y range equal to annual catch limits of 100,000 and not to
exceed 1.0 million metric tons. The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell and
carried with John Wacker dissenting. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

Inhibit public e-stocking.

Mr. Mace moved to drop this proposal from the package. The motion was
seconded by John Peterson and failed 6 to 4 with John Mace, M. Peterson,
and R. Peterson voting in favor. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

The reason for this motion was previous testimony by the original proposer of
the amendment indicating they wished to withdraw it.

Henry Mitchell moved to send this proposal out for public review. The motion
was seconded by John Peterson and carried 6 to 4 with Mace, Mace, M.,
Peterson and R. Peterson voting against. Mr. Dyson was not present for the
vote. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that public testimony indicated some people
still feel there is a need for this proposal to be analyzed and public
testimony solicited.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Mace reported on the CAAI negotiations with Japan. Negotiations have been
successful in reaching an agreement on political and fishing. It won't be a
formal agreement, but an exchange of letters. Under point of there will be a
new quota category for which the initial allocation will be 100,000 tons round
weight and will be available for any willing buyer and seller with no
qualification other than a legitimate contract. There is also a requirement for
increasing the amount if needed. This should be functional by the first of
April. On fishing, the Japanese will be broken into two parts, with one
for Pacific landing at 20,000 tons round weight; quota shares will be divided

MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

equally among traders and users. A more detailed report will be prepared upon completion of the negotiations.

Paul Fuhs, Mayor of Unalaska, commented on the video he had shown during public testimony. He apologized for the controversy caused, but said that it was shown in good faith. The film was recorded about five weeks ago and there was no deliberate intent to misrepresent the facts. The point was to stress the importance of managing stocks conservatively.

Council member Larry Cotter asked to have a report at the May Council meeting on the issue of "dumping" excess fish so that the Council can have more information in order to discuss the problem. Al Burch was asked by the Council to prepare a report for the May meeting.

Paul MacGregor. Mr. MacGregor expressed concern over the Council's discussion on the impending TALFF releases. He reported on the progress of various projects provided for in the 1987 Japanese-U.S. industry agreements: (1) a Japanese research cruise has been scheduled; (2) a delegation is on the way to Nelson Island to implement a program to try to develop a groundfish fishery with Nelson Island residents; (3) they have agreed to put more money into a pink salmon project in Unalakleet; (4) have pursued negotiations with KEG fishermen for a project in Norton Sound later this summer; (5) they have contacted every U.S. processor they can about the availability of import quotas in Japan; and (6) have been active participants and supporters of negotiations between the United States and Japan on herring and pollock IQs.

F. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Campbell adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, March 20.

equally strong arguments and needs. A more detailed report will be prepared upon completion of the negotiations.

Paul Smith, Mayor of Unalakleet, commented on the video he had shown during public testimony. He apologized for the controversy caused, but said that the video was shown in good faith. The film was recorded about five weeks ago in Unalakleet and no deliberate intent to misrepresent the facts. The point was to stress the importance of managing a salmon conservatively.

Council member Larry Goggin said he had a report at the May Council meeting on the issue of "dumping" excess fish so that the Council can have more information in order to discuss the problem. Al Burch was asked by the Council to prepare a report for the May meeting.

Paul MacGregor, Mr. MacGregor expressed concern over the Council's discussion on the impending TATP release. He reported on the progress of various projects provided for in the 1967 Japanese-U.S. industry agreement: (1) a Japanese research cruise has been scheduled; (2) a delegation is on the way to Unalakleet to implement a program to try to develop a groundfish fishery with Unalakleet residents; (3) they have agreed to put more money into a pink salmon project in Unalakleet; (4) have pursued negotiations with TATP fishermen for a project in Norton Sound later this summer; (5) they have contacted every U.S. processor they can about the availability of support funds in Japan; and (6) have been active participants and supporters of negotiations between the United States and Japan on fishing and port of call.

1. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Campbell adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, March 30.