

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

News and Notes



Stephanie Madsen, Chair
Chris Oliver, Executive Director

605 West 4th Avenue, Ste 306
Anchorage, AK 99501-2252
Phone (907) 271-2809
Fax (907) 271-2817

Volume 3-04

Visit our webpage at www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc

June 2004

Aleutian Islands Pollock

The 2004 Consolidated Appropriations Act requires the Council to allocate pollock TAC to the Aleut Corporation for a directed pollock fishery in the Aleutian Islands. The pollock allocation would be for economic development in Adak. Only vessels less than 60 feet in length or AFA vessels can fish in this fishery, and only with permission from the Aleut Corporation. During its June 2004 meeting, the Council reviewed a revised draft EA/RIR for proposed FMP and regulatory amendments to provide for this AI pollock fishery. After hearing comments from the AP, SSC, and the public, the Council approved a management program for the AI pollock fishery starting in 2005. The Council's motion provides the details on allocation size, apportionment split, and other features of this fishery; the final Council motion is available on the website. Staff contact is Bill Wilson.

Groundfish FMP Revisions

Housekeeping revisions to the groundfish FMPs have been proposed in Amendments 83/75. The groundfish FMPs have been reorganized and revised to reflect current information and recent amendments. The Council released the revised FMPs for public review conditional on incorporation of SSC recommendations. The SSC formed a subcommittee to review the definitions and descriptions of MSY and OY in the FMPs, and will provide comments to Council staff in July. The FMP documents will be distributed to the Council and available to the public in August, either by request from the Council office, or by download from the Council website. Staff contact is Diana Evans.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

2	Programmatic Policy Plan, Fishery Interaction study, CDQ Program
3	HAPC and EFH, Experimental Fishing Permit, SSL Regulation Changes
4	BSAI Crab Rationalization, Scallop FMP
5	Observer Program, IRIU
6	Halibut and Sablefish, Upcoming meetings
	Attachment: Three Meeting Outlook

GOA Rockfish Pilot Program

At its April 2004 meeting, the Council adopted for analysis two alternatives, each with several options, that would establish a demonstration program to rationalize the Central Gulf of Alaska (CGOA) rockfish fishery. The demonstration program is being developed in consultation with NOAA Fisheries, who was directed by Congressional legislation to establish a pilot rationalization program for the CGOA rockfish fishery. At its June 2004 meeting, the Council made minor amendments to the alternatives that it adopted for analysis at its April 2004 meeting. Several of the changes were language clarifications recommended by NOAA Fisheries staff. Substantive changes included options that would:

- limit the years of history recognized for processing to those specifically identified in the legislation;
- provide an option to include eligible fixed gear vessels in the primary program (in addition to the inclusion of ineligible fixed gear vessels in the entry level program); and,
- reduce the incidental catch allocation of Pacific cod under the program to as little as 70 percent of the average historic incidental catch of Pacific cod by eligible participants.

Staff intends to present the Council with a preliminary analysis at the October 2004 meeting. At that time, the Council could consider revisions to the alternatives, including the development of specific sideboard provisions that would limit participants in the rockfish demonstration program to their historic catch in other fisheries. Council final action on this issue could take place as early as February 2005. A complete copy of the alternatives, elements, and options as updated through the June meeting appears on the Council website. Staff contact is Mark Fina.

Farewell Stosh

The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission hosted a reception for the Council and public on Wednesday evening of the Council meeting week. During the reception, we took time to say goodbye to Stosh Anderson of Kodiak, who has served on the Council for three years and participated in the Council process through various committees. We thank him for his contributions, and wish him luck in the future.

Programmatic Groundfish Policy Workplan

At the June 2004 meeting, the Council developed a priority list for further implementing the revised management policy for the groundfish FMPs, adopted by the Council in April 2004 (Amendments 81/74). The list identifies six priority areas, in no particular order of importance: protection of habitat, bycatch reduction, protection of Steller sea lions, prevention of overfishing, ecosystem management, and improvement of data quality and management. Based on these general priorities, the Council has developed a workplan of implementing actions. The workplan, as well as the FMP management objectives from which the priorities are drawn, will be subject to annual Council review. The workplan is posted on the Council website (www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc) and will be incorporated into staff tasking.

The Council also initiated a discussion paper on potential changes to the management of the Aleutian Islands area, including a designation as a special management area. The paper will evaluate area-specific biological, social, economic, and management issues, as well as review ongoing research and develop recommendations for a potential Aleutian Islands ecosystem plan. The paper is scheduled to be reviewed by the Council in late 2004 or early 2005. Staff contact is Diana Evans.

“Cod Alley” Fishery Interaction Study

As part of ongoing research on groundfish fishery interactions with Steller sea lions, the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) is conducting experiments in the Bering Sea near Unimak Island in an area fished by the Pacific cod trawl fleet. The Council received a progress report from the AFSC’s Fishery Interaction Team on preliminary results from the winter 2004 field season. The objective of this study is to gather information on whether trawl fishing may result in localized depletion of P. cod, an important SSL prey item, particularly in winter. The study approach includes surveys of P. cod catch rates (using pot gear) before and after a trawl fishery has occurred in the study area. Before and after catch rates in an experimental area (where trawl fishing occurred) are compared with before and after catch rates in a control area (with no trawl fishing). In 2004, the study results showed that P. cod capture rates in trawled and untrawled areas were similar, providing little evidence of localized depletion. Masking these results, however, was the finding of substantial movement of cod in this area (as shown by tag/recapture studies conducted as part of this research effort). Other factors including the size of the cod population in this area may hamper detecting localized depletion on the time scale of the experimental design. The SSC is supportive of the design of this study and supports its continuation. The Council similarly encouraged this and similar studies to continue. Staff contact is Bill Wilson.

CDQ Program

The Council reviewed a draft analysis for a regulatory amendment to change the management of the CDQ groundfish reserves in the BSAI. The amendment would establish a process by which the Council would recommend which CDQ reserves would continue to be allocated among the individual CDQ groups and which CDQ reserves would be managed at the aggregate (CDQ reserve) level and not allocated among individual groups. The alternatives propose to have the Council make this recommendation as either part of the annual BSAI TAC-setting process (Alternative 2) or in Federal regulations (Alternative 3). Both of these alternatives would also establish how NMFS would manage CDQ reserves in the case that new TAC species categories were developed as part of the annual specifications process. A fourth stand-alone option would add squid to the suite of species allocated to the CDQ Program. Squid was removed from the program in 1999.

The CDQ groups are prohibited from exceeding any of their individual CDQ allocations. The amendment alternatives were proposed by NMFS to address a concern that the CDQ groups are constrained from fully harvesting their target species due to some very small individual allocations of non-target species. The low TACs associated with some of these non-target species are a result of the need to stay below the 2 mmt cap, and not because of low ABCs. When these non-target species are further allocated among the six CDQ groups, the individual group allocations may be insufficient to allow some groups to fully harvest their target species without exceeding their allocations of some non-target species. This amendment proposes to allow the Council to determine which species should be managed on the aggregate level as opposed to the individual group level, meaning NMFS would monitor the aggregate catch of these species and specify additional measures for the CDQ fisheries to control the catch of these species within TAC or ABC as needed.

At this meeting, the Council recommended further analysis prior to releasing the document for public review, in order to address issues raised by the Council and the SSC. The Council requested review of a revised document in October 2004, at which time it will decide whether to release the document for public review.

The Council also added the following as both separate alternatives and as options to Alternatives 2 and 3 for further review in the EA/RIR:

- Allow after-the-fact CDQ transfers between CDQ groups during the year, thus allowing a CDQ group to cover an overage of its allocated quota.
- Allow the CDQ groups to manage the harvest of their respective allocations of target species among themselves in a cooperative manner, pursuant to a contract that is filed with the Council, NMFS, and the State of Alaska. This approach will be modeled on the harvest cooperatives that have developed under the American Fisheries Act.

The Council motion and draft analysis are on the Council website. Council staff contact is Nicole Kimball.

HAPC and EFH

In June, the Council defined the alternatives for establishing habitat areas of particular concern (HAPC). HAPC sites are being considered for seamounts as well as hard corals in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) and Aleutian Islands (AI). The alternatives are summarised below.

Action 1: Seamounts

Alternative 1: No action.

Alternative 2: Designate five named seamounts in the EEZ (Dickens, Giacomini, Patton, Quinn, and Welker) as HAPC, and prohibit all bottom contact fishing by Council-managed fisheries on these seamounts.

Alternative 3: Designate 16 named seamounts in the EEZ off Alaska as HAPC, and prohibit all bottom contact fishing by Council-managed fisheries on these seamounts.

Action 2: GOA Corals

Alternative 1: No action.

Alternative 2: Designate three sites along the continental slope (in the vicinity of Sanak Island, Albatross, and Middleton Island) as HAPC, and prohibit bottom trawling or all bottom contact mobile gear (BCMG) within these areas for five years.

Alternative 3: Designate four areas in Southeast Alaska (in the vicinity of Cape Ommaney, Fairweather grounds NW, Fairweather grounds SW and Dixon Entrance) as HAPC. Bottom contact gear would be prohibited in several subareas within the HAPC designated areas.

Alternative 4: A combination of Alternatives 2 & 3.

Action 3: AI Corals

Alternative 1: No action.

Alternative 2: Designate the six coral garden sites within the Aleutian Islands as HAPC. These areas are in the vicinity of Adak Canyon, Cape Moffett, Bobrof Island, Semisopochnoi Island, Great Sitkin and Ulak Island. Bottom contact gear would be prohibited in several subareas within the HAPC designated areas.

Alternative 3: Designate an area of Bowers Ridge as HAPC, and prohibit bottom trawling or BCMG within the area.

Alternative 4: Designate four sites in the Aleutian Islands (in the vicinity of South Amlia/Atka Islands, Kanaga volcano, Kanaga Island, and Tanaga Islands) as HAPC, and prohibit bottom trawling or all bottom contact mobile gear within these areas for five years.

Alternative 5: A combination of Alternatives 2,3,4.

More details of the alternatives, including maps showing the boundaries of the areas, will be available on the NPFMC web site. The environmental and economic effects of these alternatives will be analysed for initial review at the October 2004 meeting.

The Council also received a preliminary report on the numerous (>33,000) public comments received regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared for essential fish habitat (EFH). After considering these comments, the Council added several options to Alternative 5B for further analysis. In October, the Council will receive a more detailed report on public comments, as well as a report from the Center for Independent Experts that is providing a scientific review on the effects of fishing analysis included in the EIS. Final action on the EFH Environmental Impact Statement is scheduled for February 2005. Staff contacts for habitat related issues are Cathy Coon (HAPC) and David Witherell (EFH).

Testing IWG Gear

The Council received a report from the University of Washington Sea Grant Program on a proposed two-year study of Integrated Weight Groundlines (IWG) as a possible seabird avoidance measure in longline groundfish fisheries. IWG longline gear sinks more rapidly, and may provide an effective deterrent to seabird interactions with baited hooks. Kim Dietrich of Washington Sea Grant presented the experimental plan to the Council, which includes testing groundlines weighted 50 grams/meter to compare their performance (e.g. fish catch rates, longline sinking rate, seabird incidental take) against unweighted conventional longline gear, with and without paired streamer lines. An Experimental Fishing Permit (EFP) is required because part of the experimental approach is to fish IWG gear without using the required paired streamer lines that deter seabird interaction with the longlines. The SSC supported this research and suggested that, if time and resources permit, the experimental approach should consider testing a treatment that has both the IWG and paired streamer lines to explore the possible added benefit from combining the two seabird avoidance measures. The Council approved granting the EFP to Washington Sea Grant for this project. Staff contact is Bill Wilson.

GOA Steller Sea Lion Regulation Changes

In June 2003, the Council asked its Steller Sea Lion Mitigation Committee (SSLMC) to review options for changing Steller sea lion (SSL) protection measures in the Gulf of Alaska to provide economic relief to Gulf fishing communities. The Committee met three times during 2003, received and reviewed many proposals for changes in SSL regulations, and developed a package of seven proposed regulatory changes. These measures were reviewed by NMFS in an informal consultation to determine their potential effects on SSLs. NMFS determined that five of the proposed measures would not adversely impact sea lions, and in early 2004 the SSLMC recommended to the Council that these measures be moved forward for NEPA analysis and eventually for Council approval. At its February 2004 meeting, the Council asked that an EA/RIR be prepared with the intent on taking final action on these measures during the June 2004 meeting. At the June meeting, the Council received comments on the EA/RIR from the AP, the SSC and the public, and approved the proposed changes. The Council's motion is available on the website. NMFS will now prepare the notices and regulatory language so that these measures can be effective for the 2005 fishing season. More details on these measures and the environmental and socioeconomic analyses that supported the Council decision are available on the Council and NMFS web sites. Staff contact is Bill Wilson.

BSAI Crab Rationalization

At its June 2004 meeting, the Council completed its action on rationalization of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands crab fisheries. In February, the Council released the Environmental Impact Statement on crab rationalization for public review. During a 45-day public comment period following that release, NOAA Fisheries received 16 comments from the public. Council and NOAA Fisheries staff prepared a draft comment analysis report in response to those comments, which staff presented to the Council at the June meeting. After reviewing the comment analysis report, the Council took final action on two amendments to the rationalization program that it had previously identified as its preferred alternative. The first of these amendments makes minor changes to limit information sharing among participants to arbitration. These changes are intended limit the exposure of participants in arbitration to antitrust liability. The second change removes a provision that directs cooperatives to manage sideboard limitations on fishing in Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries. These sideboards limit participation of crab harvesters in the Gulf of Alaska fisheries to their historic catch to protect traditional participants in the Gulf fisheries from increases in participation by crab harvesters after rationalization.

The Council also directed staff to prepare an analysis of captain and crew share (C share) landings for consideration by the Council 18 months after fishing begins under the program. The analysis is to examine landings patterns of C shares to determine whether the distribution of landings among processors and communities of C shares differs from the distribution of landings of the general harvest share pool. After receiving the analysis, the Council will consider whether to remove the 90/10 Class A/Class B split from C shares, which is scheduled to take effect three years after fishing under the program begins.

The Secretary of Commerce will implement the rationalization program, as amended, by amending the Fishery Management Plan for Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs, issuing regulations, and then issuing quota shares to qualified applicants. The Secretary will approve the FMP amendments by January 1, 2005, as directed by recent Congressional legislation. Proposed regulations that would implement the Program will appear in the Federal Register in the fall of 2004. A comment period will allow the public to comment on the rules prior to their finalization in early 2005. The application process for quota shares, processing quota shares, and C shares is expected to begin in the spring of 2005. If this schedule is maintained, NOAA Fisheries believes that fishing under the program will begin with the August 2005 opening of the Aleutian Islands brown king crab fishery. Staff contact is Mark Fina.

Scallop FMP

The Council reviewed the draft EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendment 10 to the Scallop FMP. This amendment analysis evaluates modifying the gear restriction endorsement on two licences under the federal scallop license limitation program (LLP). The Council added an alternative to the analysis and recommended that some additional information be included prior to public review of the document.

The suite of alternatives (including * added by the Council at this meeting) are:

- Alternative 1: Status Quo. Maintain the current 6 ft dredge restriction endorsement.
- Alternative 2*: Modify the current 6 ft dredge restriction to allow vessels with the current endorsement to fish in federal waters outside of Cook Inlet with a maximum of two eight-foot dredges (or two dredges with a combined width of no more than 16 feet).
- Alternative 3: Modify the current 6 ft dredge restriction to allow vessels with the current endorsement to fish in federal waters outside of Cook Inlet with a maximum of two ten-foot dredges (or two dredges with a combined width of no more than 20 feet).
- Alternative 4: Eliminate the current 6 ft dredge restriction such that there are no gear restrictions on any Scallop LLP for fishing in federal waters outside of Cook Inlet.

Additional items to be included in the analysis prior to public review include:

- An update on the break-even analysis from the 1998 analysis (amendment 4 to the FMP);
- A table of harvests and GHRs for the entire history of the fishery;
- A discussion of sea scallop price trends (including both US and world market trends);
- A history of license transfers and the effect on consolidation in the fishery;
- Summary tables showing the overall number of vessels currently operating in the fishery; and
- An overview of landings and ports to evaluate the impact on communities

Once these additional items have been included in the analysis, it will be released for public review. Copies of the analysis will be available on the Council website or by request to the Council office at that time. Concurrently with this analysis, the FMP will be updated to better reflect the current biology and management of the scallop stocks. A draft copy of the revised FMP will be available prior to the October Council meeting. This issue is scheduled for final action by the Council at its October 2004 meeting. Staff contact is Diana Stram.

Observer Program

The Council reviewed a discussion paper and approved two approaches to a fee collection program for inclusion in the ongoing analysis to restructure the current deployment and funding mechanism in the North Pacific Groundfish Observer Program (Observer Program). In the current observer program, vessels and processors contract directly with observer providers for observer services, in order to meet mandated coverage requirements in regulation. In contrast, the amendment would establish a new fee-based Observer Program, in which NMFS would contract with observer providers and use the funds collected from the fee to pay for observer services. The fee would be assessed on all vessels and processors included in the program, regardless of whether the individual vessel was requested by NMFS to carry an observer. Vessels and processors not included in the program would remain under the existing pay-as-you-go program.

Prior to the April Council meeting, the scope of the alternatives was limited primarily to the fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and halibut vessels, and the fee associated with each alternative was based on a percentage of ex-vessel value of retained catch. This fee system was recommended for the Gulf fisheries, primarily because it was determined to be an equitable and broad-based approach to funding observer coverage and because the Gulf fisheries are managed on a fleet-wide basis. At its April meeting, the Council approved new alternatives to the analysis which would include the major BSAI fleets in the new fee-based program. The new Alternative 6 includes all fleets except for the AFA and CDQ vessels, and Alternative 7 includes all GOA and BSAI groundfish vessels and processors and halibut vessels (program-wide).

The new alternatives include major fisheries of the BSAI that are required to have at least 100% observer coverage as part of their individual vessel monitoring programs. A fee based on each vessel's actual observer costs may be more appropriate for vessels and processors with 100% or greater coverage requirements, as the disproportionate cost issues are less significant and the fee can be designed so that fee revenues exactly match coverage costs.

Upon review of the discussion paper, the Council approved the following suboptions to Alternatives 6 and 7 for inclusion in the analysis:

Suboption 1: Establish a uniform ex-vessel value fee for all vessels and processors covered by the program.

Suboption 2: Establish two separate programs that are differentiated by fee type and coverage level: (1) Vessels and processors in fisheries that generally have less than 100% coverage requirements would pay a uniform ex-vessel value fee and carry observers when requested to do so by NMFS; (2) Vessels and processors in fisheries with mandatory coverage requirements of 100% or greater would pay a daily observer fee based on their required levels of coverage.

The Council also requested that the analysis explore the concept of assessing a different fee in fisheries that have a mix of vessels with <100% and ≥100% coverage requirements. The fee would include a daily observer fee component and an ex-vessel value fee component, and both components would be assessed on all vessels in the specified fishery.

The Council also reviewed a letter sent recently from Dr. Hogarth, in response to questions posed by the Council regarding NOAA Fisheries' policies on observer compensation and eligibility for overtime pay. The letter notes that a comprehensive review is being undertaken to address these issues and a response will be provided as soon as the review is completed. Initial review of the draft analysis is tentatively scheduled for October 2004, pending this review and resolution of the associated cost implications. The Council motion and discussion paper reviewed at this meeting are on the Council website. Staff contact is Nicole Kimball.

IRIU

The Council received discussion papers on a Pacific cod area split, groundfish retention pools, and a multiple cooperative option for Amendment 80b. In addition, the Council also received a report on the recommendations made by the reconstituted IR/IU Technical Committee regarding revisions for Component 10 (underutilized species threshold) of Amendment 80a.

The Council made a few modifications to the components and options for Amendment 80. They broadened all of the eligibility years for the <60' H&L/Pot catcher vessel sector to include 2003 and 2004 up to June 15, 2004 (Option 11.7 of Amendment 80a). Options were added to exempt jig vessels and <60' H&L/Pot catcher vessels from eligibility requirements. A new Option 4.1 was added to Amendment 80b requiring at least 30 percent of eligible licenses to join a cooperative before it is allowed to operate (i.e., allow multiple cooperatives). Finally, the Council added the IR/IU Technical Committee's recommendations for revising the underutilized species threshold as additional options in Component 10.

The Council also requested staff to broaden the Pacific cod area split discussion paper to include the following year combinations for analysis of the historical harvest option (Option 1 of the discussion paper):

- 1995-1997
- 1995-2002
- 1995-2003
- 1998-2002
- 1998-2003
- 2000-2003
- 2002-2003

The Council also requested staff to include in the Amendment 80 EA/RIR/IRFA an analysis of the <60' AI trawl fishery to determine if a new category of LLPs will be needed for these vessels. Included in the analysis should be catch history of vessels less than 60' that participate in the parallel fishery, distribution of endorsements for all gear types, and a discussion on the possibilities for reclassifying endorsements of LLP license to be used in the <60' AI trawl fishery.

A revised list of components and options based on the Council's June actions is available on the Council website. The Council will review progress on this amendment package in October. Staff Contact is Jon McCracken.

Halibut and Sablefish

In June, the Council reviewed a discussion paper prepared by Council staff on eight proposed amendments to the **halibut and sablefish individual fishing quota (IFQ) program**. The Council grouped the eight actions into three packages. The highest priority was given to amending IFQ and community development quota (CDQ) regulations to allow Area 4C fishermen to harvest Area 4C IFQ and CDQ in Area 4D. Another package would address amending regulations to: (1) allow the use of medical transfers; (2) tighten criteria to hire skippers; (3) amend check-in/check-out or vessel monitoring system requirements in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands sablefish fisheries; and (4) change the product recovery rate for bled sablefish. A third suite of amendments address changes to the halibut block program.

The Council also reviewed a discussion paper which addressed six proposed changes to **subsistence halibut** regulations. These include: (1) implementing a possession limit; (2) revising the definition of a charter vessel; (3) revising the customary trade limit; (4) allow fishing in non-subsistence areas; (5) add Naukati and Port Tongass village to the list of eligible communities; and (6) revise gear and annual limits in Kodiak road zone and Chiniak Bay, Price William Sound, Cook Inlet, and Sitka local area management plan.

All analyses are scheduled for initial review in October and final action in December 2004. The discussion papers are posted on the Council website. Staff contact is Jane DiCosimo.

Non-Target Species Actions

The Council received a brief report from the **Non-Target Species Committee**. The Committee plans to work over the summer to develop a problem statement and alternatives for Council consideration in October. A discussion paper on the status of this initiative is posted on the Council website. During its discussions, the Council requested a discussion paper addressing rockfish management alternatives to guide the Council in future actions. This followed an action the Council took during its discussion on the Groundfish Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement when it added language to consider new management strategies to reduce incidental rockfish bycatch and discards. The paper would address harvest rates, spatial management, and habitat considerations. Previously prepared papers on rockfish are posted on the Non-Target Species website. An update on the preparation of the new paper will be provided in October 2004. Staff contact is Jane DiCosimo.

Upcoming Committee Meetings

Groundfish Plan Teams	September 15 (T), 16, 17
Groundfish Plan Teams	November 15-19
SSL Mitigation Committee	July 19-21
Fur Seal Committee	TBA
Crab Plan Team	September TBA



NPFMC Tentative Meeting Dates for 2004-2007

	February Week of/Location	April Week of/Location	June Week of/Location	October Week of/Location	December Week of/Location
2004		3/29 Anchorage	7/Portland	4/Sitka	6/Anchorage
2005	7/Seattle	4/Anchorage	6/TBA*	3/Anchorage	5/Anchorage
2006	6/Seattle	3/Anchorage	5/Kodiak*	2/Anchorage	4/Anchorage
2007	5/Portland*	2/Anchorage	4/Sitka*	1/Anchorage	3/Anchorage

*Meeting dates subject to change depending on availability of meeting space. Any changes will be published in the Council's newsletter.

DRAFT NPFMC THREE-MEETING OUTLOOK - updated 6/16

October 4, 2004 Sitka, Alaska	December 6, 2004 Anchorage, Alaska	February 7, 2005 Seattle, Washington
Halibut Subsistence Changes: Initial Review	Halibut Subsistence Changes: Final Action	
CDQ Eligibility Amendments: Report		
CDQ Fisheries Management Issues: Initial Review	CDQ Fisheries Management Issues: Final Action	
IFQ Program changes: Initial Review	IFQ Program changes: Final Action	
GOA Rockfish Demonstration: Preliminary Review	GOA Rockfish Demonstration: Initial Review (T)	GOA Rockfish Demonstration: Final Action (T)
GOA Rationalization: Review Progress/Refine Alternatives	GOA Rationalization: Action as necessary	GOA Rationalization: Action as necessary
HAPC: Initial review	HAPC: Action as necessary	HAPC: Final Action
EFH: Receive CIE review and comment report; action as necessary	EFH: Action as necessary	EFH: Final Action
Groundfish FMP Updates: Final Action	Crab SAFE Report: Review	
Flatfish IRIU Trailing Amendment 80A & 80B: Review discussion papers and progress	Flatfish IRIU Trailing Amendment 80A & 80B: Preliminary Review (T)	Flatfish IRIU Trailing Am 80A & 80B: Initial Review
AI Pollock ICA: Review Discussion Paper (T)	Observer Program: Initial Review (T)	Observer Program: Final Action (T)
Rockfish Management: Review initial discussion paper	Rockfish Management: Review Discussion Paper	
	AI Special Management Area: Review initial discussion paper	AI Special Management Area: Review Discussion paper
Protected Species Issues: Report/Updates		
Scallop LLP and FMP update: Final Action (T)		
Groundfish Specifications and SAFE: Initial Review	Groundfish Specifications and SAFE: Final Action	
Advisory Panel Structure: Approve new policy		

TAC - Total Allowable Catch
 BSAI - Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands
 IFQ - Individual Fishing Quota
 AFA - American Fisheries Act
 HAPC - Habitat Areas of Particular Concern
 LLP - License Limitation Program
 PSC - Prohibited Species Catch

MSA - Magnuson Stevens Act
 GOA - Gulf of Alaska
 SSL - Steller Sea Lion
 VIP - Vessel Incentive Program
 SEIS - Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
 CDQ - Community Development Quota
 IRIU - Improved Retention/Improved Utilization

SAFE - Stock assessment and fishery evaluation
 VMS - Vessel Monitoring System
 CV - Catcher Vessel CP- Catcher Processor
 SSC - Scientific & Statistical Committee
 FMP - Fishery Management Plan
 DPSEIS - Draft Programmatic Groundfish SEIS
(T) Tentatively scheduled

North Pacific Fishery Management Council
605 W 4th Ste 306
Anchorage, AK 99501

PRSRT-STD
US Postage
PAID
Anchorage, AK
Permit #69