

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council, SSC, and AP members

FROM: Jim H. Branson  
Executive Director

DATE: December 3, 1986

SUBJECT: Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

ACTION REQUIRED

1. Identify fully U.S. utilized groundfish species.
2. Provide bycatch amounts of fully utilized species from ABC if necessary.

BACKGROUND

Last December the Council was faced for the first time with several groundfish species that were fully utilized by domestic fishermen and processors. The three species, sablefish, Pacific ocean perch, and other rockfish, were subsequently designated as DAP fisheries (DAP=OY) and JVP and TALFF fisheries for them were set at zero. The DAP designation was a management decision since by regulation any joint venture or foreign fishery that would take any of these species would be prohibited.

To allow those fisheries to continue the Council established a policy that provides small bycatch amounts of fully utilized species to joint ventures and foreign fisheries. The bycatch amounts were subtracted from the acceptable biological catch (ABC) estimate, since a "buffer" existed between the ABCs for these species and their OYs. The OYs had been set below the ABCs to promote rebuilding or for economic considerations. The 1985 and 1986 bycatch apportionments (PSCs) were implemented by emergency rule or in permit conditions. A recap is provided as item D-2(d)(1).

The bycatch of fully utilized species will undoubtedly continue to be an issue before the Council so as part of Amendment 15 you approved a PSC framework procedure so the Council can set groundfish PSC limits annually for joint venture and foreign fisheries without plan amendment or emergency rule. The joint venture and foreign bycatch rates for these species are from the NMFS Foreign Observer Program, as they were in 1986. These rates are applied during the meeting to the initial 1987 JVP and TALFF apportionments to estimate 1987 bycatch requirements. The plan team has reviewed foreign observer data and recommends using the bycatch rates provided as item D-2(d)(2). Their rationale is described in the RAD. The team also recommends that you set aside a minimum of 10 mt of each species to accommodate an inadvertent bycatch of fully utilized species should the calculated requirements fall below this amount, and that the sum of the TQ and PSC not exceed the ABC.

1985 and 1986 fully utilized species bycatch limits in the Gulf of Alaska.

1985

<u>Species</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>JV PSC</u>	<u>TALFF PSC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sablefish	W	245	140	385
	C	545	31	576
Pacific Ocean Perch	W	53	30	83
	C	98	16	114
Rockfish	GW	-	25	25

1986

Sablefish	W/C	201	40	241
Pacific Ocean Perch	W/C	31	20	51
Rockfish	W/C	45	10	55

1987 GOA bycatch rates for fully utilized species.

		Bottom Trawl - All Areas			Midwater Trawl - All Areas		
		-----			-----		
		Sablefish	P.O.P.	O. Rockfish	Sablefish	P.O.P.	O. Rockfish
JVP		1.99%	4.57%	0.79%	0.04%	0.09%	0.02%
TALFF		1.99%	4.57%	0.79%	0.04%	0.09%	0.02%
		-----			-----		
		W. Gulf Pacific Cod Longline			C. Gulf Pacific Cod Longline		
		-----			-----		
		Sablefish	P.O.P.	O. Rockfish	Sablefish	P.O.P.	O. Rockfish
JVP		6.91%	0.14%	0.21%	8.41%	0.11%	0.12%
TALFF		0.05%	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	0.00%	0.02%

Transcription of testimony re: GOA pollock DAP, December 1986 Council Mtg

Jerome Selby, Mayor of Kodiak Island Borough: Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, I appreciate squeezing in here today. I'm Jerome Selby, mayor of the Kodiak Island Borough here today speaking on behalf of the Kodiak Island Borough. I have some good news to share with the Council and then we have a couple of requests that are actually a result of the good news.

The good news basically is the fact that the pollock processing plant capacity in Kodiak is mushrooming in a way that I think many of us had hoped it would for a long time and it's actually becoming a reality now. Because of that expansion, the first action that we're requesting is that priority access provision of the MFCMA be used to allocate at least 82,100 mt of the 95,000 mt OY pollock quota for 1987 for the Shelikof Strait for American domestic catch and processing. This data does not include domestic floating processors which I understand there was at least one on the grounds last year.

Similarly, the second action request is that the priority access provision also be used to allocate at least 120,000 mt of the 1988 OY for the Shelikof Strait for American domestic catch and processing. And we're trying to keep a close eye on the plant capacity and if the capability is there sufficient to process more than that, we'll undoubtedly be back next year to ask you for an additional increase to that allocation.

Let me talk just a little bit more about the good news. There's been a dramatic increase, as I indicated, in plant capacity in Kodiak since just last year. Kodiak now has six or seven plants capable of processing in 1987, three more which may be processing before the end of 1987. In the written material that I've provided you copies of we went through and listed in some detail the number of actual fillet machines that have been added to Kodiak in the last year. It comes to a total of 12 machines and represents an investment of approximately \$12 million in equipment by the industry in Kodiak. I listed it in detail in the material we've given you because we'd like to emphasize the fact that the industry is in fact making investment in the development of the plant capacity and we would hope that the Council would continue to recognize the effort being made by the industry there and recognize the increase in the capacity means the capability is definitely there to process additional fish. Kodiak therefore will soon have the capacity to process about 1.5 million pounds per day as a result of the increase in the machinery and equipment. Of course, the \$2 million isn't all that's been invested by the industry, that's just in the fillet machines. Additional support equipment such as ice making machines, freezers, and the other necessary equipment have also been purchased. If you added that all up and assumed a 250-day processing year you'd be looking at somewhere around 180,000 mt a year of processing capacity in those plants. We went through with the plant managers and for those who didn't want to reveal what they considered proprietary information, made an estimate of what the realistic plant capacity for 1987 is, and we've come up with the figure of about 82,100 that I requested at the start of this presentation. In addition, at least two additional plants are basically under construction or have ordered equipment, hence the 122,000 mt figure that we've requested for 1988. Hence, the plant capacity more than supports the request that we've made here today for the allocation. In 1988 as you all know there will be a bigger and better quality pollock harvest in 1987 because of the

large 3-year-old age class in the pollock for 1987. Total catch should be greater, hopefully the fillet recovery will be improved and the roe recovery should be higher because of the older age of the fish. This improvement should continue until 1988 and it's my understanding that the target is to end up with an optimum sustained yield of 800,000 mt out of the Shelikof Strait in the early 1990s. Quite frankly, from our perspective, we would like to see all 800,000 mt processed on Kodiak Island but we realize that the floating processors are probably are going to get involved and we think that's healthy, too.

The key thing is we think now is the opportunity to give the U.S., Alaska, Kodiak and the Alaska fishing industry and economic boost at the same time we forward in the Americanization of the industry and I know you folks understand the economic significance of the information I've given you probably better than I do, but bear with me for a minute and I'll just run through a few numbers to indicate what it means to Kodiak. If we're awarded 120,000 to 150,000 tons of pollock in 1988, fishermen alone would earn an additional \$13.5 to \$18 million assuming the dockside price remains at the current 6¢ per pound. If each surimi line required 960 man hours per day at just \$5.50 per hour for 250 days per year, processing people would earn \$3.9 to \$5.25 million. If each of the smaller plants would employ 36 people per day at 18 people per 8-hour shift smacking pollock roe for 40 days, these people would earn between \$126,000 to 253,000. So, just between the fishermen and the processing people, Kodiak would see between \$17.5 to \$23.5 million in 1988 if we can persuade you folks on the Council and of course the Secretary of Commerce to reserve adequate Shelikof pollock for American processors. In reality, as you know, more funds than that would come into Kodiak because of the spin-off benefit of the economic impact of that kind of additional fishery product in Kodiak. That would include anyone from support industry, welder, electricians, diesel mechanics, hydraulics specialists, those folks who are in direct support of the fishing industry, down through the hardware salesmen, the real estate folks, the bar tenders and everyone else in town. All of these people, of course, broaden the tax base of Kodiak and the community would have a chance to replace of the dollars it's losing from state and federal resources and basically now you know why I'm here testifying to you. We see this as a real critical thing for the economics of Kodiak Island. It's obvious from that perspective, and I'm sure you would agree that what we're proposing is in the best interests of Kodiak as well as in the best interests of Alaska and the United States fishing industry. It's interesting to me, and it's my understanding that 1987 might very well be the year that the whitefish industry, including both domestic and joint venture, will exceed the value of the Alaska salmon industry for the first time. In terms of significance to Kodiak, it's even more significant when you consider that the dockside value of \$18 million represents close to 20 to 25% increase in just one year to the total across-the-dock value which is running at about \$80 million in the last couple of years, so you're talking about something that's very significant to the Kodiak economy in terms of the pollock industry.

I have some additional information that's in your material much of which comes from your studies and I won't bore you with those details, but in substance these studies indicate the largest biomass of pollock in the Gulf, of course, surrounds Kodiak which is no news to you. Our concern is that we feel there's a chance here to actually put some momentum behind the Americanization, and what we like to call the Alaskanization, of the fishing

industry and we would really like to have your support in making that come to be a fact.

A related topic that is of concern I'll just mention in passing, of course, is the issue of the reflagging of foreign processors and I know that the Council shares that concern, certainly you passed a resolution in September indicating that you share that concern with us. I think we really need to work with the Congressional delegation to try to get something done on stopping that reflagging of those vessels. It would be a real tragedy, and I think that's the right word, as far as Kodiak Island is concerned. Now that we've finally got investment by the industry in the shorebased plants, it would only take about 4 or 5 of these reflagged foreign processors to come into Shelikof Straits to basically take care of the entire allocation available out there and hence now you know why we're real concerned about it; it's because you could basically wipe out an industry that just now gotten its feet under it and looks like it might take off.

In summary, as you know, the Magnuson Act is now ten years old. I think when it was passed it was thought to be bringing prosperity to Alaskans but that prosperity has not really been fully developed or realized yet. It's a little bit ironic since you know that that bill was nicknamed the "Alaska fishing act" by legislators from other states and I think Senator Stevens and Congressman Young took a little ribbing from some of the other states in the process, but certainly it was a remarkable piece of legislation which did give an advantage to Alaska in a lot of ways to the fishing industry. There were great expectations in Alaskan fishing towns that prosperity that was just around the corner. That prosperity has been long delayed and is now what we consider overdue. Council support of this request could be a small but significant step toward realizing the potential promised for Alaska in the Magnuson Act. We hope you will agree with our position and give us your wholehearted support.

Council Questions:

John Harville: You're requesting 82,100 mt for essentially DAP, isn't it?

Selby: That's correct.

Harville: In the charts we've been given we're shown a request for 68,000 mt; does that 68,000 include part of yours, did your projections contribute to those data collected by NMFS? How do we equate those two numbers.

Selby: Well, I'm not real sure now. The 68,000 your quoting would be what?

Harville: DAP for Shelikof.

Selby: I know you've been recommended to drop that from 95,000 OY to an 85,000 and if you take the 20% reserve off that, that gets you to the 68,000.

Harville: No, I'm looking at the DAP. . . I may need help from staff; maybe Steve could help.

Steve Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The table that was passed out earlier. . .it was passed out early only because you were interested in the ABC and TO recommendations of the SSC and Advisory Panel. What you see there, Dr. Harville, under DAP is the DAP as surveyed and adjusted so that it will fit within the SSC and AP's recommendations.

Harville: Did that projection include consideration of the 82,100 mt that are . . .

Davis: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. The DAP that was specified for the Western and Central areas of the Gulf for pollock, my records show approximately 84,000 tons and the reason it shows 68,000 in your table is that we had to take into account the reserver hold back.

Harville: O.K., thank you. The point I want to be sure about is that those two figures are meshed together.

John Peterson: I had a question also. It has to do with your second request, which is priority access and I guess I didn't understand what you mean by priority access. The allocation of the quantities under DAP is one thing, but are you inferring access by area or by time in your second request?

Selby: Well, I think the concern that's addressed there and I know the Council's working on it from a couple of other angles, is the concern of not catching all of the fish by the end of April so that the shoreside plants have no fish to work with throughout the remaining eight months of the year. We are not advocating time and area closure but what we are asking is that a mechanism be established so there is adequate fish out there and with what was recommended by the Panel of holding back the reserve at least to make sure there are fish available after the season probably would take care of that.

John Peterson: Would it though? I forget what the recommendation was, but it didn't reserve that much fish for the balance of the year.

Selby: I think it will for this year, but I think next year it's a different type of problem. That's why . . . I think the recommendation of the Panel, I understand, is that you're going to be looking at a mechanism to spread some of that catch out over the year.

John Peterson: But, the way the recommendation is that we've seen satisfies your requirements?

Selby: For 1987 we don't feel it's a major concern because we don't feel like the boats that will be fishing for the onshore plants would take the 68,000 early in the year, early in April at the end of the roe season, so there undoubtedly would be some available later in the year.

John Harville: Are you looking also at perhaps looking into that 50,000 mt that's recommended for exploration outside of Shelikof? Is it possible that some of your needs could be satisfied from outside of Shelikof?

Selby: Well, that's possible, but we really haven't taken that into account in what we've presented here because my understanding is that no one's really

caught anything out of that allocation in the past and that would sort of betting on the come I think from our perspective.

Oscar Dyson: I'm not disputing your figures, but so far there's been a missing link in our ability to get fish ashore. We haven't been able to find the vessels to do it and that's my only concern, that down the line we'll find out we won't be able to harvest nearly as much.

Selby: I think we're aware of that concern. I think that basically what the Borough's saying is we would like to see the opportunity there. I guess what you're saying, Oscar, kind of fits along the line of what my grandmother used to tell me -- the proof is in the pudding.

Campbell: Plus, there's a responsibility on the part of the industry to request that which they're going to use.

Selby: Yes, and that's why we're saying the proof is in the pudding, because if the industry has the fish available then they need to get out there and get the boats to fish for them so they can handle the product.

. . . . .

John Sevier, Alaska Pacific Seafoods, Kodiak: My name is John Sevier. I'm the plant manager and general manager of Alaska Pacific Seafoods in Kodiak. We had the pilot surimi project in Kodiak through the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation. More than anything I'm here for you people to ask me questions. We've shown over the last few years that we've been able to both harvest and process the pollock that has come our way and you've got a letter in front of you now that shows that. If you have any questions at all, I'm here just for that reason.

Larry Cotter: Have you had difficulty locating catcher vessels to provide you with the amount that you desire?

Sevier: We have not had any problem at all at this point. Some of the boats that have been fishing joint ventures have moved over and have now started fishing shorebase so we have not had the problem that some of the other plants have had.

Cotter: Have you been able to pay a price which is competitive with that received by the joint venture fishermen?

Sevier: We feel that our price that we're paying the fishermen is an adequate amount of money for them to deliver shorebased. It has to be done, of course, on a quantity basis rather than quality although the quality has been there also. I know there's been a lot of talk about quality and the quality that we've seen with the fishermen that have been fishing for us, we haven't seen any problem at all.

Oscar Dyson: Do you have a contract with these boats, or how do you feel that you're going to keep that kind of effort that you have now? Do you have an agreement with them to . . .



Sevier: We have a general agreement with them that does deliver a certain amount of poundage to the plant, that's pretty much set up in advance. We do not have one for the upcoming Shelikof Strait fishery but I'm sure that we'll probably be able to get one.

. . . . .

Oliver Holm/Kathy Kinnear, Kodiak Longliners Assn. Holm: I'd like to speak to Gulf pollock first. We recommend a TQ of 70,000 mt. This is the low end of the plan team's exploitation range. The future of the resource is highly dependent on only one year class. At 95,000 mt Gulf pollock would be exploited at a rate higher than in the Bering Sea and obviously the Gulf stock is not nearly in as good a shape. A conservative management regime is necessary for shoreside plants to justify their investment. If the resource collapses the plant can't move easily to another area. . . (remaining testimony on other species)

No Council questions on DAP pollock.

. . . . .

Mick Stevens, ProFish Int'l: I'm speaking as Vice President and Director of Fishing Operations for ProFish Int'l. I'd like to briefly discuss the Gulf of Alaska pollock in the Western and Central areas, specifically the DAP and the JVP, noting the plan team and I believe the SSC commented that up to 120,000 mt could be established as a TQ and still provide for what they believe is an increasing biomass over the next several years. They took a midpoint of 95,000 mt and proposed that as a TQ, taking a conservative number. I'd like to specifically request a minimum of a 10,000 mt JVP on pollock in the Western and Central Gulf of Alaska for 1987 and I would justify that 10,000 mt as follows. We have two small Japanese companies as partners for 1987 with ProFish, Kato Kyogo and Anyo Suisan, who desire to conduct a joint venture fishing operation for roe pollock, specifically in the Shelikof Straits area. These are smaller companies with smaller processing vessels and we have been discussing with local Kodiak draggers to conduct this fishery. It certainly is in their preference to conduct a fishery in Shelikof Straits rather than be moved to the Bering Sea area where their ability to produce fish due to weather conditions and other factors would be perhaps negatively impacted by operating in that area. I'd like to note the DAP requests for 1987 in the Western and Central Gulf is substantially increased over 1986 requests and 1986 performance. Is that increase and the exclusion of any opportunity for JVP operations when the value to the fishermen is highest during the roe season, would that exclusion be justifiable? I believe that you will have to assess DAP to answer that question. I know some of you may believe that the numbers for DAP in the Gulf of Alaska are somewhat inflated. Again, there's a very significant increase and I believe that the requests in 1986 for DAP in that area was approximately 60,000 mt and the catch to date has been approximately 21,000 mt. I'd also like to note that I believe a year ago at this Council session the Council did reduce the DAP request from some number that was higher than 60,000 mt and established the DAP at 60,000 mt for

1986. Again, the DAP performance to date is approximately 21,000 mt. Additionally, Mr. Chairman, with the establishment of a small JVP in the Gulf of Alaska for pollock, we would recommend a change in the opening date for joint venture operations from February 15 to February 25. Historically, the highest CPUEs in the Shelikof joint venture fishery have been during the month of March, the first two weeks of March. Weather conditions are more favorable toward the end of the fishery during the month of March, the very late part of February, and additionally, the history of that fishery has shown a significant decrease in the amount of small size pollock that have been taken in the later weeks of the fishery. I noted earlier during the team's presentation that there was particular concern by certain Council members on the possible harvest of 3-year-old fish during the Shelikof season this next year. With that regard, and the DAP opening date of January 1, a specific JVP fishery that did not open until February 25, would have less potential impact on the young fish than a DAP operation would. I again would ask you to consider very carefully the DAP requests and see if it's possible for you to find a minimum of 10,000 mt for a JVP operation in the Shelikof Straits next year. Thank you.

John Winther: If there was a 10,000 JV in the Gulf, with the pool concept, how do you think that would operate.

Stevens: Well, I think our particular operation would have a chance to be successful. In your table of JVP requests, some of the larger joint venture operations, both Japanese and I believe even some Korean, have indicated some interest in conducting a JVP operation in Shelikof. However, they are larger scale operations, their interest is in a larger tonnage amount and I believe with a very small JVP they would not risk moving to Shelikof from the Bering Sea where they would likely be operating at the beginning of the season and this would allow us to plan for a specific Shelikof fishery and I think be able to prosecute it.

John Peterson: Mick, you said that is a very valuable fishery and it is certainly. What was the exvessel price for roe pollock in the Shelikof; what's the difference between that exvessel price and the exvessel price for ordinary pollock?

Stevens: During 1986, in one instance the differential between the roe pollock price and the non-roe pollock price was approximately \$15 to \$20 a metric ton.

Peterson: So, that would be a 15 to 20% increase in value over non-roe pollock.

Stevens: Roughly so, Mr. Peterson, and of course negotiations are under way for 1987 and I would not be surprised if that differential was increased for 1987.

Oscar Dyson: When you're looking at February 15 you're just looking for the JVP season, you're not looking at everybody's season, right?

Stevens: No sir, I don't think there's any interest or reason to restrict the opening date for a DAP operation. There's certainly been no proposals to that effect. I was speaking just to the permit condition on the joint venture

processors. That's the 25th. I specifically discussed this issue with our fishermen who might be involved in the operation and the buyers and they feel that that date is reasonable.

. . . . .

Jeff Stephan, United Fishermen's Marketing Assn: . . .(comments on cod). . .  
With regard to pollock, we support allocating the entire TO to DAP.

(No Council questions regarding pollock DAP)

. . . . .

Vic Horgan, Ocean Beauty Seafoods and King Crab, Inc. (Kodiak): . . .We at King Crab are embarking on a project on bottomfish. We're currently doing about 200 mt per month for the headed and gutted market, it's in the start-up phase so we expect to do much more than that, God willing. We are also expanding and remodelling the plant so as to have three mechanized lines capable of filleting not only cod but pollock and having the ability to handle incidental catch. We would expect that the combined operation for headed and gutted and fillet would be well over 10 ton per day on theoretical capacity, that's an 8-hour shift basis. We have an additional holding capacity for another 20 ton a day. Anticipating a question or two from Oscar, no, we don't expect to do this day in and day; attracting boats is going to be a problem; we're not projecting miracles, nor do we need them to survive; yes, our numbers are in the Borough figure, but more importantly, realistic cod numbers are in the NMFS figures as well. Those numbers were about 2,000 mt of cod and a lesser amount of pollock. Again, the potential's much greater but the realism is there that you start small and you don't try and con somebody. Our program starts out based around longliners that need an extension of their fishing season; we need an extension of our processing season. We also want to augment that and have some commitments to augment that with draggers during specific times of the year. Gentlemen, this is a significant investment in capital, time, and effort. It's not the first attempt, however, for us to be in this business, it's the third. Three years ago, on the second attempt, we spent a considerable amount of time and effort to prove that we could do a number of things. We could get the fish, we could process it to a marketable form and in fact we were successful except for one minor problem. The market wasn't there. In the course of proving the market wasn't there we lost enough money to buy a boat equivalent to one of Barry Fisher's midwater boats. So what. We lost some money, we waited; time's right, momentum's there and the market's there. Now, that's the non-confrontational version. . .

(No Council questions on pollock)

Dave Harville, Kodiak Western Trawlers Group:

Transcription of Council discussion and actions, December 1986, re: pollock DAP in the Gulf:

Thursday, December 11:

Don Collinsworth - general comments for setting ABCs, TQs, DAP, etc:

Mr. Chairman, if you'd permit me I'd like to take just a minute before we go to lunch to make a couple of comments. In the course of doing our business the rest of the day and tomorrow, I'd like to talk about how we're going to approach that because I think it's important that we start to get our mindset in the direction we want to go. If we take each category species-by-species, region-by-region, ABC, TQ to TALFF, and look at this incrementally and make some judgment about the goodness of the estimate of processing capacity and everything, we have literally dozens and dozens of incremental decisions to make and unless we approach them in some more holistic way we may end up making a camel instead of something that we really want. I'm going to suggest that although the Gulf and Bering Sea are clearly separate management plans, there are linkages in terms of the impact on the fishing fleets and the industry-to-industry agreement and so on and so forth. So I think that it may be useful once we return from lunch to have some general discussion about where we would like to end up. And, if we can do that then I think we can go back and incrementally build the record to explain how we got there. We've listened to many, many hours of testimony both from our advisory committees, our SSC, the informed public, and from vested interests across the state and I think we have a lot of information available to us and we have all be processing this as it comes in. That's not to say that we've come to any particular conclusion at this point that I'm sure we can be persuaded by the arguments of our colleagues as we debate these issues. But, I would be bold enough, I guess, to suggest maybe where I'm coming from, at least at this point, and have my colleagues think about it over lunch and then come back and discuss it again, or start the discussion there. . . .Clearly this is a holistic approach that's going to satisfy everybody; no one will be unhappy with this at all. I guess at this point I would be generally inclined to want to pursue the idea of setting the Gulf TQ equivalent to the DAP and I won't explain all of the reasons for that at this point, but one of them does deal with the concept of processor preference. Then, moving to the Bering Sea, I would generally support putting the processor-preference issue on our agenda for amendment next cycle, establishing a committee to look at that and start moving there. . . [remainder deals with Bering Sea]

The Council then broke for lunch and came back at approximately 2:10 p.m.

Don Collinsworth: I would be willing to make a motion and then we could subject it to the amendment process to deal with any specific issues in regard to the whole of the complex of the matrix we have on the board, dealing with the species, areas, ABCs, TOs, DAPs, JVs and TALFF. My general suggestion before lunch, at least the proposition I guess I'd like to have explored, would be to set the TOs equivalent to DAP (referring to Gulf of Alaska) and within that context, there's one issue that requires some consideration and that is the distribution of the sablefish TQ in Eastern and Central Gulf and it would be the intent of my motion to adopt the recommendation of the Advisory Panel on that. If making a collective motion like that is what you had in mind, I'd be happy to so move.

Chairman Campbell: I think it might be better if we just go ahead and approve the ABCs, then the target quota and the other will shake out and . . . I don't know.

Steve Davis: That's one way of going, Mr. Chairman. Last year the Council first adopted the ABCs as recommended by the Plan Team and SSC. Then the next step was to set your initial target quotas, remember that you will probably want to tentatively set all the numbers in the Gulf and then go through the same kind of process for the Bering Sea, given that there may be some give and take from both areas. You will not be giving your final approval to all the numbers until we've completely met all the questions . . .so you'd be asked at this point to make your initial recommendations or decisions with regards to the various quotas and apportionments. But I would recommend that you first start with ABC.

Chairman Campbell: Right, if we could have a motion to accept the ABC figures, that's a scientific figure; we've never really . . .

Don Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman, I so move. (Henry Mitchell: Second)

Chairman Campbell: You have a motion in front of you then to accept the ABC figures as outlined. Are there any comments or questions?

Mark Pedersen: Are we bound to put in numbers under the ABCs for the "not available"? (Steve Davis answered No)

Chairman Campbell: Are you ready for the question?

John Winther: On the sablefish under S/E Outside, I don't see any numbers; how does that line up down there.

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer that question. The East Yakutat/Southeast Outside have been managed together as two subdistricts and in the past you have broken the number out between the two districts but since they are managed as one fishery, the number you see on the East Yakutat row represents both districts.

Winther: Do both those columns represent what you might call the traditional allocation to each area of the ABC?

Davis: The ABC as apportioned here is based on the biomass distribution between the 400 & 1,000 m depth contour. This was the recommendation of the SSC to the Council as a starting point. You're not necessary locked into that distribution, though.

Chairman Campbell: Any further questions? Are there any objections?

Mark Pedersen: Mr. Chairman, I object to the motion because of the sablefish distribution.

Chairman Campbell: Are there any other? Hearing none then, the motion carries.

Chairman Campbell: The Chair will then entertain a motion to set the . . .

Don Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman? I would move to set the . . .

Chairman Campbell: Don, I like to take it by species -- that's what we did last year and then talk to each one. It won't take long but I think we ought to. I'll entertain a motion to accept the TQ for pollock and go right on from there.

Collinsworth: Whatever your preference is . . . the other way to do it is to make a general motion and then anyone can amend the motion on a species basis.

Chairman Campbell: O.K., that's fine.

Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman, I would move to set the TQ in the Gulf equivalent to the DAP. [Second by John Winther]

Cotter: A point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. I assume then that Dr. Collinsworth's motion is to accept the TQ as outlined on this sheet.

Collinsworth: No, I set the TQ equivalent to DAP. In other words, the result of so doing will be that we have no JVP and no TALFF in the Gulf in 1987.

Branson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of Mr. Davis? Steve, how are we going to sort out the DAP requests on these in those cases where some of it is held in reserve but not all of it? Are there some instances of that?

Steve Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You have in your table, you'll notice that in some cases there no reserves held back. This is the case for Pacific ocean perch, sablefish, and other rockfish. The last two years these three species have been categorized as fully U.S.-utilized species and with that recognition there's no reason to hold back 20% in reserve. If I understand Dr. Collinsworth's motion, what he is attempting to do is zero out the JVP and TALFF numbers that you see in the far right columns. You can do that in one of two ways, but I think probably the easiest way would be to reduce the target quota by the sum of the JVP and TALFF should there be any. That then will lower the target quota, an automatic 20% reserve would be held back, and the remainder would be taken by DAP.

Branson: In the case, then, Steve, of let's say Pacific cod in the Western Gulf, we would reduce the 29,951 ton TQ by 5,177 plus 10,224 to arrive at a new TQ of approximately 14,000 tons.

Davis: That's correct. Of course, by lowering the TQ the reserve will also be reduced to a certain extent. We may have to do some fine tuning to the numbers, but that's one approach.

Branson: Seems to be it's an awfully awkward way of doing it because the reserve is complicating the procedure enormously. Mr. Chairman, if I may, ask the maker of the motion, might it not be easier to work from the recommended TQs of the AP and adjust them as necessary on an individual basis?

Collinsworth: Well, Mr. Chairman, I tried to make my motion relatively clean in saying that we ought to set TQs equivalent to DAPs and if we do that, that

would then put us in a category that because of our adjustment of the TO we're saying that's this is a fully-utilized domestic species and we would not be required to have a reserve. I think in almost every case the DAPs that have been offered by the industry are probably optimistic and probably we would not find ourselves in any instance constrained by the DAP number so my idea was that essentially that reserve category would be zeroed out as well.

Chairman Campbell: I think just procedurally, in order to get that reserve figure done we . . .

Branson: Let me ask another question then if I may, Mr. Chairman. In that same example that I used before, Steve, why can't we just simply in the case of Pacific cod in the Western Gulf, on the basis of the motion that's on the floor, say DAP equal 8,560 and reserve and JVP and TALFF are zero and TO is 8,560?

Steve Davis: You could do that, Mr. Chairman. The only question I would ask would be if there were a reserve release to JVP or TALFF during the year, if you're zeroing out reserves from the outset there can be no reserve releases.

Council comments, not identified: "Absolutely"; "Right"; "I think that's what (...we mean...).

Branson: The motion essentially makes all species in here fully utilized. So we'd be in the same categories we are with perch and sablefish, there is no reserve.

Davis: If that's your intention we can do it that way.

Branson: That's what I understand the motion as including.

Chairman Campbell: Don, that's the way I understand your motion.

Collinsworth: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mace: I'm not quite swift enough to handle that -- it would be simpler for me, we've only got three or four species in there that we've got some concern for, and it would be simpler for me to start with the TOs and work from that end. Compare those to the SSC's recommendations and see where we want to go from there in the case of pollock and two or three of those or species, I think those are the only ones we're going to have a concern over. But, it looks like we have to build this from the bottom up and that would be from my standpoint the simplest way to do it.

Rudy Petersen: Mr. Chairman, I concur.

Chairman Campbell: Yeah, Don, I think we could be done with this a lot faster than it'll take us to discuss. . .

Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman, before I concur I would ask the Chairman's permission to promote a little bit of discussion before I withdraw my motion and we go incrementally. I'd like to get just a little bit of discussion on the record whether or not the proposition that I've put forward, that is to essentially zero out reserve and setting the TO equivalent to DAP. Now what

that means, of course, is that there will be no JVP, there would be no reserve that would be released sometime during the year to JVP or to TALFF and this makes the Gulf of Alaska a wholly-domestic fishery to be harvested and processed by U.S. processors and U.S. harvesters. I think that in many cases in the area around Sand Point and around Kodiak this in essence does provide some kind of a very direct processor preference for access to resources in the Gulf. We had zeroed out TALFF two years ago and then subsequent to an industry-to-industry meeting came back and changed that and issued some TALFF. I feel we're at a point where the JVP and the TALFF in the Gulf are relatively small amounts of product and we can take the initial step and make the Gulf a wholly processed and harvested domestic zone. If there is concurrence in that, then I think the motions are clear. We do precisely what I have suggested in my motion. If there is disagreement, then I think we need to go back through and make the decision whether we're going to allow JVP and/or TALFF, but I'd really appreciate some discussion, Mr. Chairman, before I withdraw my motion and go incrementally through it because I guess I'd like to know where we're going to end up or have some sense of where we're going to end up as we deal with these incrementally.

Chairman Campbell: Fair request. Rudy?

Rudy Petersen: Mr. Chairman, I would concur except in the case of the pollock. I feel that no matter how you cut the numbers, to me there is a certain amount of fish there that could be allocated to JVP and I think that the amount of vessels in the area and the economic needs are very definitely pointed to the fact that this fish could be used and not wasted in that sense. I think there's no economic reasons necessarily that would prohibit this. I think the DAP is well covered and so I don't think there's a problem in that sense.

Oscar Dyson: Mr. Chairman, I also agree with that approach. I think that what Don is trying to do will come. However, I think there's a little bit of fish left for JVP, a small amount because there's some small boats there and small processors that might be able to work in there, so I would look for a little bit for that purpose.

Larry Cotter: I have some grave concerns regarding the pollock reserve in Shelikof Straits anyway from a biological standpoint. The report that we received yesterday said that "there has been a rapid and significant decline" to the resource. We're talking about a roe fishery that will take an estimated . . . 10% of the biomass will be the 3-year-old fish that we're relying upon for our future fishery in Shelikof Strait. Out of that 3-year-old stock, only 5% to 15% is sexually mature, it does not make any sense at all to me to run the risk of the future in order to accommodate some joint venture operations. Further, there was some testimony yesterday noted in the U.S.-Korean agreement that referred to discards and the desire to decrease discards in the future. The discards referred to are presumably male pollock that do not have roe or other female pollock that are not yet sexually mature, presumably they are discarded and nothing is done with that resource. I did some calculations yesterday and if all of the non-roe producing pollock are discarded, that would provide wastage of approximately 47,000 mt out of the 85,000 mt that we're looking. That, of course, is the outside figure, but even if we're talking about wasting 25,000 mt given the fact again that we're focusing on 3-year-old fish and that is what we're relying upon for the



future, I don't think that there is any sound reason to allow anything other than a DAP fishery in Shelikof Straits. Thank you.

Chairman Campbell: I think Mr. Branson pointed out . . . Jim, did you want to comment?

Jim Branson: Just to complicate the debate a little further, TQ has to fall between a range of 200,000 and 800,000 tons and at the moment DAP, by the numbers we're using, is considerably under that.

Mace: What was that again?

Chairman Campbell: The DAP is now at 153,945 and has to be between the range of 200 & 800,000.

John Winther: If we had the reserve added in, wouldn't it be above that?

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification. I said earlier that the OY range in Amendment 15 is 200,000 to 800,000 mt. It's actually 116,000 at the lower end of that OY range.

John Peterson: Mr. Chairman, I would also point out I believe the DAP total must be increased by the amount of reserves.

Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman, thank you for the discussion; I think it gives me a little indication of what the mix of interests may be and I'll withdraw my motion.

Henry Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion. In the Gulf of Alaska with pollock I would move that the TQ be set at 68,000, which is the DAP. That's for the area in the Western and Central, and in addition as part of that motion, that outside of Shelikof that the amount be set at 50,000. And in the Eastern it be set at 1,930.

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, if I read the Council accurately, I think what you would like to do is to set the quotas at the DAP and as I mentioned earlier, the DAP as reflected in your table is after I've removed the 20% reserve. If you want to use the DAP figures, then under your C-5 tab in your notebooks you have a table that Clarence presented to you that has the actual surveyed DAP. The survey for pollock in the Western and Central Gulf is approximately 86,000 tons, so it's not 68,000 tons; it's actually 86,000 tons. Those are the surveyed DAPs.

Mace: Mr. Chairman. I think this is some of our problem. We're a little uncomfortable with the DAP estimates on the basis of past performance and suddenly we're going to increase that substantially and making pollock, which is the one I'm concerned with now, a DAP harvest in the Gulf and I am confident that there could be some JV harvest there and I would move to set the TQ, if it's appropriate, [Campbell: Henry's motion died for lack of a second]. I think that the way to really cut this in a hurry is to move to set the TQ at 95,000 and then we're going to find out rather quickly whose board ate the cabbage and go on from there. [Rudy Petersen seconded the motion]

Mitchell: Could the motion be restated?

Chairman Campbell: As I understand it, it's to set the TO . . .

Mace: Equal to ABC, 95,000 mt.

Winther: That's just for the Western & Central for the whole Gulf?

Mace: That's for the Western and Central.

Chairman Campbell: And, what about the others?

Mace: 50,000 for outside Shelikof and 17,000 for Eastern. The only change would be on the Western and Central over what the AP's recommendation is.

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Advisory Panel, I was in error, 50,000 was the quota Council approved last year; the Advisory Panel is actually recommending a 20,000 ton exploratory fishery, so that should be changed to 20,000.

Chairman Campbell: You want to change that, Bob, to 20,000 mt?

Mace: No, I think we'll leave it at 50,000.

Larry Cotter: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer an amendment to assist in the process of determining where everyone is at. My amendment would be to the Western & Central, to change it to 68,000. . .

Chairman Campbell: That would be a substitute motion if you're going to change each one of these, which I can't accept. Are you going to do that?

Cotter: I wasn't going to . . . well, I'll hold, Mr. Chairman.

Collinsworth: I call for the question.

Chairman Campbell: Question's been called for.

Mark Pedersen: Point of Order, we weren't able to have discussion on that motion.

Chairman Campbell: Yeah, if you want to have; the question's been called for, go ahead.

Pedersen: I think this resource that the roe fishery is operated on has moved out of Shelikof into Dyer Straits and I can't support a 95,000 mt TO.

Chairman Campbell: Well, I can't accept it without the recommendation of the AP, either. Are you ready for the question?

Roll call vote: Cotter-No; Dyson-No; Mace-Yes; McVey-No; Mitchell-No; Mark Pedersen-No; R. Petersen-Yes; J. Peterson-No; Winther-No; Collinsworth-No; Campbell-No. Motion failed, 9-2.

Collinsworth: Before I offer another motion I want to make sure we're all reading from the same sheet of music. The DAPs that are reflected on the screen are not the DAPs that . . . they are discounted, are they not,

equivalent to the amount of reserve? They're not the reported figures that came from industry? [Answer: that's right] And, we do have a table that shows, for example, in the Gulf of Alaska, on pollock, that we have 85,912, close to 86,000 DAP, so what we should have some asterisk by DAP up there to show that that is discounted by an amount equivalent to the reserve. I guess my original motion was to set the TQ equivalent to the DAP and what I really had intended was, of course, not a discounted DAP but the DAP that had been reported and in this case it's right at 85,000, so maybe we could just get the Western and Central out of the way and I'll offer the motion that we do set the TQ equivalent to 85. . . whatever the DAP actually is. [83,982; rounded off to 84,000]. [Branson: would that be satisfactory, Mr. Collinsworth? Collinsworth: That would be wonderful.] [Motion seconded by Henry Mitchell]

Chairman Campbell: The motion, then, addressing pollock in the Western & Central Gulf is 84,000. Any further comments? Ready for the Question? Is there any objection? Mark Pedersen objected. Motion carried.

Henry Mitchell: I would move that on pollock in the Outer Shelikof that the TQ be set at 50,000. [Larry Cotter seconded]

John Winther: Mr. Chairman, would that be for the same dates as last year -- January 15-April 10?

Mitchell: Possibly; I'd like to set the dates later, though.

Branson: Could I have the number again, please? (50,000). . . and the time period?

Mitchell: Same dates then.

Branson: Same ones - January 15 to April 10? - Yes.

Collinsworth: Mr. Chairman, did we not have the AP recommend that that be 20,000 instead of 50,000?

Larry Cotter: Mr. Chairman, in my calculations, following along with Dr. Collinsworth's initial motion that never made it to the table, if the TQ in this area is 50,000 and I think we'd then end up at just over the 200,000 figure which would bring us within the range.

Chairman Campbell: No, we're within the range [range just got lowered-Branson]. We don't have to do that.

Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the second I would withdraw my motion and make another motion. [Cotter agreed] I move that on pollock in Outer Shelikof that the TQ be set at 20,000 mt (including the dates). [seconded by Mark Pedersen]

Mace: Could staff tell us what the catch was last year in that area?

Steve Davis: I understand, Mr. Chairman, it was several hundred tons in that exploratory fishery. After the Shelikof roe fishery had ended the vessels in joint ventures that participated moved to the Bering Sea and fished on the known quantities there.

Bob McVey: Steve, isn't this just to indicate that there is this opportunity outside, whether the number's 20 or 50,000 probably doesn't make much difference.

Davis: That's correct, the number isn't based on any survey information at all; it's just a carrot at the end of a stick to encourage some exploring for pollock.

Chairman Campbell: Ready for the Question? Are there any objections? Hearing none, then the motion carries. Eastern?

Mitchell: I would set that for the Eastern at 1,930 mt...rounded off to 2,000 mt. [Seconded by John Peterson]

Chairman Campbell: Steve, are we O.K. on that?

Davis: Yes, we're O.K.

Chairman Campbell: I don't understand why we had one that didn't have the reserve on it (not sure this is what he said, tape faded out)

Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, in the Eastern Gulf the numbers that are reflected there are actual survey numbers. The reason those numbers were there as opposed to balancing out the tables with everything equal to the AP's original TQ, is that later when we try to predict bycatch we would artificially inflate bycatch just because we were attempting to round out on these tables. So, what we wanted to do was put in what we believed to be the most accurate DAP harvest in that area.

Bob McVey: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we reduce the TO down to 1,930 tons, that if our DAP fishery uses that up it will be closed even though that's a small fraction of the ARC. If I'm not mistaken, we have no option but to shut the fishery down if we adopt a TQ that low and we might very easily have that fishery go beyond that and would certainly want it to continue. There is a hazard in making the TQs down at the level of our survey results for DAP.

Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the second I would withdraw that motion. [Second concurred] Mr. Chairman, I would make another motion - in the Eastern Gulf on pollock, I would move that the TQ be set at 4,000 mt. [Seconded by Larry Cotter]

John Winther: Mr. Chairman, does anyone have a number that would work - I don't hear too much excitement about that motion.

Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would have to hear from Mr. McVey about whether or not he feels that's an appropriate number. Do you think they'll reach 4,000 if they fish in the area?

McVey: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the number we should use is the one recommended by the AP where we had a lot of discussion and debate and input on what was an appropriate TQ figure for the Eastern Gulf. There may be other thoughts here, but that would be my idea of it.

Collinsworth: Might I ask Mr. McVey if we have experienced, say, in the last three years any time that we have exceeded the DAP figures submitted by industry for any species of fish in the Gulf or the Bering Sea.

McVey: We have not, Robinson says.

Collinsworth: I don't believe we have and in fact there's been a very, very considerable margin . . . Henry Mitchell pointed out that sablefish was one species. Collinsworth: We didn't exceed it. Mitchell: We did exceed it. Collinsworth: We exceeded the quota.

Mitchell: But in this case, using TOs, you have to shut the fishery. It's different. Is that correct, that you would have to shut the fishery under the TO concept which is different than under the OY concept. Is that correct?

Several people answered "correct."

Mitchell: So, under TOs you would have to shut it down.

Collinsworth: Part of my question is that I think we have considerable margin for error already built in to the DAP.

Winther: Mr. Chairman, what's been harvested in that area in the last three years? Two years, one year, whatever.

Davis: Mr. Chairman, last year a little over 70 tons.

Oscar Dyson: Mr. Chairman, could we get the AP's recommendation on that again?

Bob Alverson: As it applies to this Eastern area? [Yes]. We recommended the 17,000 number primarily because there was no data available within the last three years for the plan team or SSC to make any intelligent guess of what should be out there and there has been virtually no industry activity in that area to judge what is available. There was some concern that generally that area has a smaller juvenile stock in it, but other than that concern, the AP chose to go with the number that was before it that has historically been there.

Winther: Mr. Chairman, when we get down to figuring the bycatches of halibut would this number affect that in any way?

Steve Davis: It does, Mr. Chairman, in that we do attempt to estimate the halibut bycatch in the Eastern Gulf.

Winther: So the higher this number is, we're going to have to attach a halibut bycatch to whatever figure we approve here.

Davis: If you insert here a very high TO it would tend to overestimate the halibut bycatch.

Winther: That's what I was getting at, so maybe we better be pretty conservative on this number here.

Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that there hasn't been a lot of activity there and also the pollock are of a more juvenile size, I think 4,000 figure, though below the AP recommendation, is appropriate.

Mark Pedersen: Mr. Chairman, Maybe the AP could advise us. Is there any JV opportunity for that area? I mean, setting at 4,000 mt are we precluding legitimate JV opportunity?

Alverson: I'd have to defer to Al Burch. He knows that area better than most in terms of JV on pollock. [Al Burch wasn't there]

Mark Pedersen: Evidently there was no request for JVP there, so I guess we could withdraw that comment.

Chairman Campbell: O.K., so you have the question in front of you at 4,000; are you ready for the Question? Are there any objections? Don Collinsworth objected. Motion carried.

[Discussions and motions on other Gulf species]

4:25 p.m., Thursday, 12/11:

Chairman Campbell: Now, Steve, we've set the ABC, TQ, do we have anything to do on DAP? Seems to me that Henry had one thing we had to do under . . .

Steve Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you have a couple of shortfalls and we could scan the table to locate those. The first one, I believe, is in the Western Gulf with Pacific cod . . . discussion and motions on Pacific cod . . .

Davis: . . . We have a 68,000 DAP in the Western & Central Gulf; the TO was set at 84,000, so an adjustment needs to be made there.

Chairman Campbell: The Chair will entertain a motion to set the DAP at 84,0000.

Larry Cotter: I will so move, Mr. Chairman. Seconded by John Peterson.

Chairman Campbell: That will set DAP then at 84,000, or equal to TO. Are there any objections? Rudy Petersen objected.

Mitchell: I would make a motion on pollock in the Outer Shelikof that the DAP be set at 20,000 tons. Seconded by John Peterson.

Cotter: The reason for creating this experimental opportunity off of Shelikof was to attempt to encourage some exploratory operations which might yield additional fisheries. I don't think anything really happened last year of consequence and I wonder whether if we make it all DAP if anything of consequence is likely to happen this year. I'm not really speaking against the motion, I'm just throwing out the question of whether or not it might be wise to provide for some of that to be JVP in the event that they do want to go explore. That might be the only way that we ever find anything.

Chairman Campbell: Did we have any requests to do that?

Cotter: I guess we don't. Anyway, it's not big deal to me, I just thought I'd . . .

Chairman Campbell: No, it's a good point, but I think we should hear if there were any requests.

Nancy Munro: Mr. Chairman, the AP did provide for an exploratory fishery with that intent in mind, outside Shelikof, even though they had heard from the plan team that the actual catch outside the area was minimal last year. They thought they would still provide the incentive.

Jim Branson: Nancy, did they intend the incentive to be extended to joint ventures as well as DAP fishermen? Was that discussed?

Munro: I think that was implied.

Unidentified: Mr. Chairman, our notes indicate that Barry Fisher suggested that 20,000 mt would be sufficient to stimulate exploration out there.

Branson: The question is whether it should be DAP or JVP, it seems like.

Larry Cotter: Well, to be brutally frank, Mr. Chairman, you know if somebody went exploring out there, let's assume it's JVP, cause I don't think DAP's going to go exploring. JVP goes exploring and they find something real nice, that is obviously going to benefit DAP next year. Whether it's worth it to them to go exploring for one year is up to them, but it certainly isn't going to hurt us.

Henry Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, the dates that were set on that would still hold, am I correct?

Steve Davis: That was part of your TQ recommendation.

Mitchell: Right, and it's the intention of the individual that may change this that those same dates would apply even though that 20,000 would be available for JVP.

Cotter: That's correct, it would be outside of that area and the only . . . yes, that's right.

Chairman Campbell: Oscar, you're familiar with this fishery. Why . . . there was very little effort out there, nothing occurred . . .

Oscar Dyson: No, there was very little effort because I guess everybody was doing something else, but now we've closed down the effort of any joint ventures in Shelikof Strait it may change the picture and you could get some effort out there looking. So, I see no reason why that shouldn't be available to joint venture fishing to searching along with the DAP.

Clarence Pautzke: Mr. Chairman, in the Gulf we had requests for pollock for JVP of about 154,000 mt and without a JVP fishery in the Gulf you could assume that that demand will move over into the Bering Sea which will put the total demand in the Bering Sea for pollock at 1.57 million mt, way over the 1.2 or

1.3 that's available up there and possibly this may create a incentive for an exploratory fishery out there this year that you did not have last year.

Chairman Campbell: And, Barry Fisher had a figure of what, 20,000 tons? Well, the argument made some sense.

Mark Pedersen: Mr. Chairman, is there a motion on the floor?

Branson: Yes, there is. Henry Mitchell moved to set the Outer Shelikof DAP at 20,000 tons and it was seconded by John Peterson.

Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I'll withdraw that motion. [second concurred]

Larry Cotter: Mr. Chairman, before I make a substitute motion, is there reason to expect any DAP exploratory efforts towards that 20,000 and the reason I ask is fairly obvious; if there's no reason to expect that, then the motion could provide 20,000 to JVP; on the other hand, if there is reason to expect exploration, then some portion would have to be provided for DAP.

Branson: Mr. Chairman, if you set 20,000 JVP that would not preclude a DAP fishery, does it? How does the rule run on that?

[The answer from the floor was not audible]

Branson: No, it would be included in the regular TQ.

Chairman Campbell: So, we'd be O.K. in that case, then just to allocate 20,000 to JVP outside Shelikof.

Larry Cotter: Mr. Chairman, I'll so move. [Second by John Peterson]

Steve Davis: In the past several years you've emphasized that the joint ventures that would be operating on pollock during this period of time would be using midwater trawls and if you anticipate that the joint ventures might participate in this exploratory fishery will continue to use midwater trawl gear then there will be very little bycatch of anything else. If they use bottom trawl equipment in their exploratory fishing, then the Council may need to provide other species for bycatch purposes. So the bottom line is that if you intend to have this joint venture explore using midwater gear, then you don't need to provide any bycatch.

Chairman Campbell: Did we have any restriction on it last year?

Davis: I believe it was midwater trawl gear only.

Cotter: Mr. Chairman, my motion would include that - be restricted to midwater trawl.

Branson: [restates the motion] to set the Outside Shelikof pollock fishery at 20,000 tons for JVP to be taken by midwater trawl between January 15 and April 10.

Oscar Dyson: What does that do to the joint venture thing -- does . . .



Chairman Campbell: That goes all to JV.

Mark Pedersen: Does that preclude any DAP operation.

Chairman Campbell: No, we just went through that discussion here. Whatever they would catch would go to the general TO.

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, for the record, I believe that the starting time last year was January 15 through April 10.

Bob Mace: Mr. Chairman, sometime in the next few hours we might out if there's any interest in the JV groups to explore out there. I question it. I think this is just an exercise in futility.

Chairman Campbell: I think Barry Fishery suggested the 20,000, Bob.

Mace: Well, yes, but at the time I think they were looking at some other JV fisheries out there in the Gulf.

Chairman Campbell: I guess that the intent of the motion is that there will be no DAP quota.

Branson: The DAP figure is set at 84,000 and any fishery out there would come out of that. There is a DAP figure but there's no special DAP figure for outside Shelikof.

Chairman Campbell: O.K. Ready for the Question? Any objections? Hearing none, the motion carries.

Henry Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would move that on pollock in the Eastern Gulf that the DAP be set at 4,000 tons. [Didn't hear who seconded]

Chairman Campbell: O.K., any other comments or questions. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the motion carries.

Steve Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the DAPs now have been set equal to the target quotas for all species in the Gulf.

Chairman Campbell: O.K., and we have ABC figures set for everything and you'll have these figures back . . .

Davis: And we'll review them and bring back any problem areas and at the same time we'll discuss bycatch. I think I can safely say that at this point, given the target quotas and the apportionments to DAP, that you will not have a halibut problem in 1987 assuming that the 2,000 ton mortality limit that you've put out for public review in September is indeed selected again as your goal in 1987.

. . . . .