

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council, SSC and AP Members

FROM: Chris Oliver *Choy*  
Executive Director

DATE: May 20, 2002

SUBJECT: Single Geographic Location Change

ESTIMATED TIME  
8 HOURS  
(For all C-7 items)

**ACTION REQUIRED**

Final action on single geographic location amendment and proposed inshore/offshore language changes.

**BACKGROUND**

In April, 2002, staff presented, for initial review, the EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendment 62/62. The Council approved the document for public review with final action scheduled for June, 2002. The document addresses the single geographic location restriction for AFA-qualified inshore floating processors, and AFA inshore/offshore-related amendment changes. The document was sent out for public review on May 13, 2002. The Executive Summary is attached as Item C-7(a)(1).

Single Geographic Location

The purpose of this action is to provide greater flexibility for AFA-qualified inshore floating processors by allowing them to process targeted BSAI pollock in more than one geographic location during a single fishing year. There are two alternatives under consideration in this action item. The first alternative is to leave intact the language that restricts AFA-qualified inshore floating processors to a single geographic location during a single fishing year while processing BSAI targeted pollock. The second alternative would require AFA-qualified floating processors to operate in a single geographic location in state waters for the duration of each reporting week but would allow changes in locations between weeks. In addition, AFA inshore processors would be required to process all GOA pollock and GOA Pacific cod in the same location they processed these species in 2002.

Inshore/Offshore Language Proposals

The purpose of this action is to revise obsolete or inconsistent inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs caused by the passage of the AFA in 1998. In this action item, there are five alternatives under consideration. These alternatives are exclusive from one another, so any combination of alternatives can be selected. The first alternative is no action. The second alternative is to remove obsolete inshore/offshore language from the BSAI Groundfish FMP. The third alternative is to update the CVOA to accommodate AFA-related changes. The fourth alternative is to remove references to BSAI inshore/offshore from the GOA Groundfish FMP. The final alternative is remove the December 31, 2004, sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocations.

## DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

### Executive Summary

This proposed amendment would redefine the single geographic location for AFA-qualified inshore floating processors by allowing them to relocate to a different location in the BSAI between reporting weeks rather than between fishing years. The document also includes options for revising obsolete inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs in order to be consistent with AFA and existing regulations and removing the sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocation to be consistent with the removal of the sunset date for the AFA program in the BSAI.

### Problem Statement:

The problem statement developed and formally adopted by the Council in April 2002 to address the proposed changes to the single geographic location is presented below:

*Existing regulations require AFA inshore floating processors to operate in a single geographic location when processing BSAI targeted pollock. The result is a lack of flexibility and inefficient use of these facilities. The problem for the Council is to develop an FMP amendment to remove this restriction in the BSAI while providing continued protection for GOA groundfish processors. The Amendment should increase flexibility for these facilities to provide opportunities for reduced delivery costs and enhanced product quality while avoiding negative environmental impacts.*

A problem statement for revising inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs is presented below:

*The American Fisheries Act (AFA) was passed by Congress in the fall of 1998. Because of the implementation of the AFA, much of the inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs is obsolete or inconsistent with current fishery management regulations. In addition, since Congress recently eliminated the AFA sunset date, the GOA inshore/offshore allocation sunset date of December 31, 2004 is no longer necessary. The problem before the Council is to revise outdated and inconsistent inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA FMPs and remove the sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocation to achieve intended consistency between the BSAI and GOA regulations.*

### Alternatives Under Consideration

There are two action items in this amendment. The first item deals with single geographic location for AFA-qualified inshore floating processors. The second item is revising inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA FMPs and removing the sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocation.

#### Single Geographic Location

The first alternative for this action item is to leave intact the language that restricts AFA-qualified inshore floating processors to a single geographic location during a single fishing year while processing targeted BSAI pollock. The second alternative would require AFA-qualified inshore floating processors to a single geographic location during the duration of a reporting week while processing targeted BSAI pollock. Between reporting weeks, inshore floaters are able to change locations. In addition, these inshore floaters

## DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

would be restricted to their 2002 pollock processing location when they process GOA pollock and Pacific cod.

Alternative 1: (status quo/no action) Retain the current single geographic location language, which limits AFA-qualified floating processors to operating in the same location throughout the fishing year while processing targeted BSAI pollock. These floaters are able to relocate to another location only between fishing years for the purpose of processing targeted BSAI pollock.

Alternative 2: In the BSAI directed pollock fishery, AFA inshore floating processors would be required to operate in a single geographic location in state waters for the duration of each reporting week but would be allowed to change locations from week to week. In addition, AFA inshore processors would be required to process all GOA pollock and GOA Pacific cod in the same location they processed these species in 2002.

### BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs Proposed Inshore/Offshore Language

The alternatives in this action item are exclusive from one another, so any combination of alternatives can be selected. The first alternative is no action. The second alternative is remove obsolete inshore/offshore language from the BSAI Groundfish FMP. The third alternative is update the CVOA to accommodate AFA-related changes. The fourth alternative is remove references to BSAI inshore/offshore from the GOA Groundfish FMP. The final alternative is remove the December 31, 2004, sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocations.

The following alternatives are not exclusive, so any combination of alternatives can be selected including no action.

Alternative 1: No Action

Alternative 2: Remove obsolete inshore/offshore language from the BSAI Groundfish FMP

Alternative 3: Update the CVOA to accommodate AFA-related changes.

Alternative 4: Remove reference to BSAI inshore/offshore from the GOA Groundfish FMP

Alternative 5: Remove the December 31, 2004, sunset date for GOA inshore/offshore allocations.

### **Environmental Impacts:**

None of the alternatives under consideration would affect the prosecution of the BSAI or GOA pollock or Pacific cod fisheries significantly. The proposed alternatives are designed to allow AFA-qualified inshore processors to process targeted BSAI pollock (as well as other groundfish) in more than one location during a fishing year, eliminate obsolete inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs, and eliminate the sunset date for the GOA inshore/offshore allocation. Since the proposed inshore/offshore language revisions are simply updating the BSAI and GOA FMPs to reflect current regulations, there is no impact to the environment from these alternatives. The single geographic location alternatives are not

**DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

expected to affect takes of species listed under the Endangered Species Act. In addition, none of the alternatives are expected to substantially alter the takes of BSAI or GOA pollock, Pacific cod, or bycatch rates of other fish and crab. A summary of environmental impacts from single geographic location alternatives are included in Table E1.

**E1. Summary of Environmental Impacts**

<b>Area of Consideration</b>	<b>Alternative 1 Retain SGL Restriction to One Year (Status Quo)</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Redefine SGL Restriction to One Week</b>
<b>Impacts on pollock and Pacific Cod Stocks</b>	Alternative 1 is expected to result in no change to the pollock and Pacific cod stock. In retaining the current SGL definition, effort would likely continue to be directed toward BSAI pollock along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season.	Alternative 2 is expected to result in no change to the pollock or Pacific cod stock. There is the potential for some minor shifts in spatial concentration of fisheries along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season to a more dispersed area south of the Pribilof Islands or to Adak Island area.
<b>Direct Impacts of Trawl Gear on Habitat</b>	Alternative 1 is expected to result in no change in the intensity, spatial, or temporal trawling for targeted pollock or Pacific cod. Effort would likely continue fishing along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island.	Alternative 2 is expected to result in the same level of trawling. However, there is some potential for shifting of trawling from the area along the 50 fathom line just north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season to a more dispersed area south of the Pribilof Islands or to the Adak Island area.
<b>Impacts on Essential Fish Habitat</b>	Alternative 1 is not expected to impact the essential fish habitat. Effort would likely continue along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season.	Alternative 2 is not expected to impact the essential fish habitat other than redirecting fishing effort from the current fishing grounds along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season to a more dispersed area south of the Pribilof Islands or to the Adak Island area.
<b>Effluent Discharge Impacts</b>	Alternative 1 is expected to result in continued effluent discharge buildup in Beaver Inlet and Akutan. Due to poor water circulation in these protected waters, water column and ocean floor sediment flushes slowly allowing for buildup of effluent.	Alternative 2 could be expected to result in a small net benefit to water quality. Water column and sea floor sediment circulation is greater in the Pribilof Islands and Adak Island than current locations of Beaver Inlet and Akutan. The result would be less buildup of effluent in current location if allowed to relocate.
<b>Bycatch and Discard Impacts</b>	Alternative 1 is not expected to adversely impact the bycatch rate from status quo level.	Alternative 2 is not expected to adversely impact the bycatch rate. The action does not alter the amount of Pacific cod or pollock harvested. With the potential for shifting of effort to the Pribilof Islands or Adak Island during the pollock B season, the bycatch rates for these areas are similar or lower than those near Unimak Island.
<b>Endangered or Threatened Species</b>	Alternative 1 is not expected to adversely impact endangered or threatened species. Effort would likely continue along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season.	Alternative 2 is not expected to adversely impact endangered or threatened species. There is some potential for reduction in competitive prey conflicts caused by relocation of harvesting from fishing grounds along the 50 fathom line north of Unimak Island during the pollock B season to a more dispersed area south of the Pribilof Islands or to the Adak Island area.
<b>Marine Mammal Protection Act</b>	same as Endangered or Threatened Species	same as Endangered or Threatened Species
<b>Significance of Fishery Management Actions</b>	Alternative 1 is not expected to result in adverse impacts to the environment that would result in a significance determination.	Alternative 2 is not expected to result in adverse impacts to the environment that would result in a significance determination.

## DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

### **Economic Impacts:**

#### Single Geographic Location Alternatives

**Alternative 1** is the status quo/no action alternative. This alternative would retain the current single geographic location language. Currently, processors are able to change locations only between fishing years with regard to targeted BSAI pollock. They are also able to move to different locations during the same fishing year to processes other targeted BSAI groundfish. In selecting this alternative, the floaters would likely remain in their current location. In selecting this alternative, there would be no change in the competitive situation in the AFA shorebased processing sector and no change in the efficiency in operations for the two shorebased floating processors.

**Alternative 2** would limit AFA-qualified inshore floating processors to a single geographic location in state waters for the duration of each reporting week. Inshore floaters would be able move to a different location between reporting weeks. The benefits of choosing this alternative would be possible increased efficiency of the inshore floating processor sector by reducing delivery costs and possible improved product quality for pollock. The floaters would be able to locate closer to some of the pollock grounds during the B season which would reduce delivery times and costs for catcher vessels. Other possible benefits include increased tax revenue from fishery resource landing tax and increased commerce including purchases of retail goods and services for certain coastal communities. However, any increase in commerce or tax revenue in one community would be particularly offset by a reciprocal decline in tax revenue and commerce in another community.

There is some potential for preemption, although it is speculative. Under Alternative 2, AFA-qualified floaters could potentially leverage their mobility advantage and target other groundfish like Pacific cod. As a result, there is the potential for some preemption of shoreside deliveries of other groundfish. It is not clear if this would actually take place since no regulations currently prevent inshore floaters from moving to different locations to processes other groundfish. In addition, non-AFA processors are able to operate in the areas that floaters could relocate to. The floaters mobility could also create a competitive advantage over AFA-qualified shoreside plants in a potential Aleutian Island pollock fishery. By positioning itself closer to these pollock fishing grounds, and thereby reducing delivery costs, there is potential economic incentive for catcher vessels to delivery a portion of their 10 percent non-specified cooperative allocation to the two inshore floaters.

However, in discussions with other AFA-qualified inshore processors and other potential parties involved, there is little or no opposition to this proposal. Most felt the AFA cooperative agreements (by assigning permanent allocations to each sector and participating cooperatives) have addressed the preemption. Originally, the single geographic location restriction was placed in the inshore/offshore regulations to prevent floating processors who operated in the inshore sector from having an economic advantage over shoreside processors and to prevent offshore catcher/processors and motherships, who have greater mobility, from entering the inshore sector. With the passage of AFA and cooperative agreements, these concerns are less an issue in the targeted pollock fishery today.

## DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

### BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMPs Proposed Inshore/Offshore Language

Under all of the alternatives considered, there are no economic impacts to updating and eliminating inshore/offshore language in the BSAI and GOA Groundfish FMP's. These changes, technical or editorial in nature, are intended to remove inconsistencies in the FMPs with the AFA and current regulations. This in turn will help reduce confusion by the industry participants and managers.

Removing the December 31, 2004, sunset date from the GOA inshore/offshore allocation regime would continue the current inshore/offshore allocation into the foreseeable future. Economic benefits of removing the sunset date for the allocation were explored in the EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendments 51/51, which contained specific options in the analysis for the GOA allocations to 'rollover' without a sunset date. The analysis emphasized that while the Council is proceeding toward a fully rationalized program, a stable environment in the fisheries is critical to success of a rationalization regime. Maintaining the existing allocation provides a reasonable assurance to each industry sector involved regarding the future of the fishery. The analysis also recognized the acceptance and lack of controversy within the Council, fishing industry, environmentalists, and general public on the appropriateness of these allocations in the GOA. While voluminous public testimony was received on the BSAI allocations, none was received in opposition to the GOA allocations.

The potential benefits and costs that are likely to result from Amendment 2 are shown in Table E2 below.

DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

E2. Qualitative Summary of Benefits and Costs

Benefit or Cost Category	Alternative 1 Retain SGL Restriction to One Year (Status Quo)	Alternative 2 Redefine SGL Restriction to One Week
catcher vessel operating costs	Alternative 1 would result in no change in vessel operating costs.	There is a potential for reduced operating costs for the cooperative fleets delivering to the two shorebased processing ships, should they operate in areas closer to concentrations of pollock than their current locations in Beaver Inlet and Akutan. This situation, should it occur, would be most likely be for the pollock B season and involve operations in Adak or St. Paul in the Pribilofs. The magnitude of these potential reduced operating costs cannot be estimated for unknown situations, but the differences in actual running times between these harbors is shown in Table 3.3.
shorebased floating processing ship operations	Alternative 1 would result in no change in operations for the two shorebased processing ships	There is a potential for increased product value, increased product quality or both if future operations of one or the other of the shorebased processing ships were to operate nearer to concentrations of pollock during part of the year. The magnitude of the potential gain from efficiency or product value is unknown or speculative at this point.
shorebased floating processing ship operations	Alternative 1 would result in no change in vessel operations	Allowing the F/V ARCTIC ENTERPRISE and the F/V NORTHERN VICTOR to relocate during the fishing season may add greater flexibility for their respective companies to deal with regulation changes from measures to protect Steller sea lion or other time/area closures that may occur in future.
regional economic benefits	Alternative 1 would result in no change in regional economic benefits	There could be a regional shift in beneficial economic effects from expenditures by the two shorebased processing ships from their current location of Beaver Inlet and Akutan to other locations where they operated part of the year under Alternative 2. This transfer of economic activity and benefit would likely be a regional shift with no net gain to the nation. However, the communities of Akutan and Unalaska/Dutch Harbor would lose a portion of the economic benefits associated with operation of these companies. In addition, the community of Akutan and the Aleutians East Borough would potentially lose a portion of the fish tax revenues they currently receive.
competitive situation among the AFA shorebased plants	Alternative 1 would result in no change in the competitive situation within the group of eight AFA shorebased processing plants.	There could be a relatively small shift in competitive advantage to benefit the owners of the F/V ARCTIC ENTERPRISE and the F/V NORTHERN VICTOR and their respective cooperative fleets. This change in competitive advantage within the AFA shorebased sector is mitigated by several factors. The first factor is that the owners of the other shorebased plants apparently have no objections to Alternative 2. Another factor is that Trident Seafoods Corporation owns the F/V ARCTIC ENTERPRISE. With two other shorebased plants, Trident Seafoods Corporation would be affected by any competitive change less than the remaining four shorebased processors not owning a shorebased processing ship.

**Issue 6: Extent of Government oversight:**

Alternative 4: (From HR 553) Revise NMFS regulations to clarify that government oversight extends only to the activities of the CDQ group that are funded by royalties from the CDQ allocations. *Motion passed 9/8.*

*The minority is supportive of making adjustments to the maturing CDQ program where it is now appropriate. We believe that due in large part to conservative management and accountability to the communities, the success of the program can continue. However, Alternative 4 erodes that accountability and offers large opportunity for CDQ management changes that could bring the future of the program into question.*

*Signed: Jeff Steele, Ragnar Alstrom, Dave Boisseau, Hazel Nelson, Lance Farr, Al Burch, John Bruce, Michelle Ridgway.*

**Issue 7: Allowable investments by CDQ groups - fisheries related projects:**

Alternative 3, with the following amended option 2, suboption 1 for limits on non-fisheries related projects, and suboption A to make goals and purposes primarily fisheries related: Allow investments in non-fisheries related economic development in-region projects up to 20% of the previous years' pollock royalties.

**Issue 8: Other CDQ Administrative Issues:**

Alternative 2: Simplify quota transfer and Alternative fish plan process.

*Motion passed unanimously.*

**C-6 SSL Trailing Amendment**

The AP recommends Alternative 1 - no action. The analysis states "Alternative 1 would not jeopardize the continued existence of the SSL or adversely modify critical habitat." The AP believes that if there are concerns with the status of the pollock stocks, those should be dealt with under the annual TAC setting process, as has been done in the past. *Motion passed 13/1*

Additionally, the AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 5, Exempt pot fishing vessels from sea lion closures from 0-3 nm around Canton Island and Cape Barnabas. *Motion passed 14/0*

**C-7 (a) Single Geographic Location Change**

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 2, allowing AFA inshore floating processors to move to a different location between reporting weeks. It is the understanding of the AP that Steller sea lion requirements apply, and that pollock processed is harvested under AFA regulations. Further, the intent is not to create an additional burden on the 2 floating inshore processors that is different than for other AFA participants. Additionally, the AP recommends the Council adopt Alternatives 2-5 regarding the inshore/offshore language proposals. *Motion passed 17/0*

**C-7 (b) IR/IU**

The AP recommends the problem statement for IR/IU be revised to reflect the conclusions of the analysis that 100% retention of rocksole and yellowfin sole is not practicable as it would result in severe economic losses while less than 100% retention is not enforceable; and that the document be released for initial review with the following changes to the alternatives:

1. Incorporate a qualitative description of the following trailing amendments into alternative 3 as trailing amendments,

A. A bycatch reduction coop (BRC) structured as follows:



ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES  
June 3-8,2002  
Unisea Central, Dutch Harbor, Alaska

Advisory Panel members in attendance:

Alstrom, Ragnar  
Benson, Dave  
Boisseau, Dave  
Bruce, John (Chair)  
Burch, Alvin  
Cross, Craig  
Ellis, Ben  
Enlow, Tom  
Falvey, Dan

Fraser, Dave  
Kandianis, Teresa  
Mayhew, Tracey  
Nelson, Hazel  
Norosz, Kris  
Preston, Jim  
Ridgway, Michelle  
Steele, Jeff  
Stephan, Jeff

**C-4 CDQ**

The AP recommends that the Council adopt the following alternatives and options for the eight issues contained in the analysis:

Issue 1: Determine the process through which CDQ allocations are made.

Alternative 2: Define the process in regulation, an expanded state hearing and comment process, but with no formal NMFS appeals process.

Issue 2: Periodic or long term CDQ allocations:

Alternative 2, Option 2, suboption 1: Set fixed 3 year allocations with possible mid-cycle adjustment for extraordinary circumstances.

Additionally, the AP recommends the regulations must be revised to reflect that suspension or termination of CDQ allocations would be an administrative determination by NMFS and that the CDQ groups involved would be allowed an opportunity to appeal NMFS's initial administrative determination on any changes in CDQ allocations. The AP also recommends removing the requirement to publish a notice in the Federal Register about suspension or termination of a CDQ allocation.

Issue 3: Role of Government Oversight:

Alternative 2: Amend the BSAI FMP to specify government oversight purposes as described in the analysis.

Issue 4: CDQ allocation process - Types of quotas:

Alternative 1: No action

Issue 5: CDQ allocation process - the evaluation criteria:

Alternative 2: Publish allocation criteria in the NMFS regulations with the following changes to the criteria:

7. In areas of fisheries harvesting and processing, past performance of the CDQ group, to the extent practicable, in promoting conservation-based fisheries by taking actions that will minimize bycatch, provide for full retention and increased utilization of the fishery resource, and minimize impact to essential fish habitats.
8. Apply proximity to the resource only to these species: halibut, Norton Sound red king crab, Pribilof red king crab, St. Matthew blue king crab.

**D-1 (c) BSAI Amendment 68: Pacific Cod Pot Gear Split**

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 1: No action. *Motion passed 10/5.*

*A motion was made to adopt Alternative 2, Option 5: Apportion the BSAI Pacific cod pot gear TAC between pot CVs and pot CPs based on catch histories from 1995-1999. Suboption a: unused quota from either pot sector would be reallocated to the other pot sector before it is rolled over to other fixed gear sectors. If the quota remained unharvested, it would be reallocated to the longline CV sector (0.3 %). Additionally, the (5%) cod quota that is reallocated to the pot sector annually from the trawl and jig sectors would be reallocated to the pot sector as a whole. Motion failed 6/9.*

1. PSC caps for halibut and crab in the BSAI are subdivided into two pools. One pool is for vessels that wish to participate in a bycatch reduction program. The other pool is for vessels remaining in open access. The subdivision of PSC is calculated by summing the groundfish catch by target for each group, applying an appropriate bycatch rate to each target and assigning that amount of PSC bycatch to the BRC and the open access fishery.

2. Companies in the BRC will be required to limit each vessel to its share of the calculated amount of halibut and crab allowance. Evidence of binding private contracts and remedies for violations of contractual agreements must be provided to NMFS for the BRC to be approved. Participants in the BRC must demonstrate an adequate system for the estimation, monitoring, reporting and overall accounting of the PSC available to the BRC.

3. Bycatch reduction will be accomplished by:

- a. Bycatch rate reduction that results in a more efficient use of the PSC available to the BRC
- b. PSC available to the BRC will be reduced by 5% beginning in year two of the program
- c. A periodic review of PSC use and PSC available to the cooperative to allow consideration of further reductions of PSC allocated to the BRC. Further PSC reductions should be based on achieving a balance between the optimum yield objectives and the bycatch reduction objectives contained in the MSA.

4. THE BRC is for the non-pollock catcher processor sector.

5. The BRC will be as inclusive as possible for all non-pollock CP's in the BSAI (i.e. both AFA and non-AFA , TAC controlled fisheries and PSC controlled fisheries.)

6. Subdivision of current PSC caps between sectors (CV's CP's and/or AFA CP's and non AFA CP's may be necessary)

7. Allocation within the BRC such as qualifying years or amounts of PSC available to individual vessels will be decided by members of the BRC.

8. Monitoring requirements and costs will be distributed equitably among BRC members.

9. Monitoring requirements will be developed with one objective being minimizing these costs to BRC members

10. Protections for non-cooperative fisheries, if necessary, will be specified.

*Motion passed 14/1*

B. An alternative to create discard caps for the flatfish fisheries upon triggering a cap, 100% retention would be required.

2. Add a suboption to Alternative 4 which would allow separate exemptions by region, gear, CV-CP, AFA/non-AFA, and by an average of bycatch rates over a period of years.

*Motion passed 14/1*

#### D-1 (a) TAC Setting Process

The AP recommends the council release the draft TAC setting EA/RIR/IRFA with the following changes:

1. Expand discussion of current public process such as plan team meetings, Council meetings, etc., in the context of meeting public process and APA requirements.
2. Expand the analysis of Alternative 3 to include an option to establish a separate time line for sablefish fisheries to maintain consistency with the halibut fishery.

The AP concurs with the SSC problem statement as stated in their February 2001 minutes and requests the analysis be clarified to reflect this problem statement. *Motion passed 10/3*

DATE 6/11

TIME 8:35A

AGENDA ITEM C-7a

**\*\*\*BALSIGER VOTES LAST ON  
EMERGENCY RULES**

**ROLL CALL TALLY**

	YES	NO
ANDERSON	✓	
AUSTIN	✓	
DR. BALSIGER (or Salveson) <b>EMERGENCY RULE?</b>	✓	
BUNDY	✓	
DUFFY (or Krygier)		✓
DR. FLUHARTY	✓	
HYDER	✓	
MADSEN		✓
PENNEY <i>absent</i>		
<b>SAMUELSEN</b>		✓
BENTON		✓

MOTION 8:35A DF: passed 6-4  
move to table this til later.

DATE 6-11

TIME 9:48A

AGENDA ITEM C-7a

**\*\*\*BALSIGER VOTES LAST ON EMERGENCY RULES**

**ROLL CALL TALLY**

	YES	NO
ANDERSON	✓	
AUSTIN	✓	
DR. BALSIGER (or Salveson) <b>EMERGENCY RULE?</b>	✓	
BUNDY	✓	
DUFFY (or Krygier)	✓	
DR. FLUHARTY	✓	
HYDER	✓	
MADSEN		✓
PENNEY		
SAMUELSEN	✓	
BENTON	✓	

MOTION JB: motion to table til Oct.  
passes 9-1

# PUBLIC TESTIMONY SIGN-UP SHEET FOR

AGENDA ITEM C-7(a) Single Geographic Location

PLEASE SIGN ON THE NEXT BLANK LINE.  
LINES LEFT BLANK WILL BE DELETED.

	NAME	AFFILIATION
1.	RALPH HOARD	ICICLE SEAFOODS
2.	Paul MacGoyers	AT-Sea Reviews
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		
25.		