

MAY 1984

Proposed Motions for the Gulf of Alaska Emergency Regulation ExtensionsPollock OY

- A. Given the current abundance of pollock in the Gulf of Alaska, the present 1984 harvest of 180,000 mt, the expiration of the current emergency regulation on June 21, and that Amendment #13 will not be in effect until August 16; I move that the Council request the Secretary to extend the emergency regulation, which set the pollock OY at 400,000 mt in the combined Western and Central areas, until Amendment #13 is implemented.
- Specking — y; Nickey (?) 2nd.*
- B. I move that the Council request the Secretary to extend the emergency regulation which sets the pollock OY at 400,000 mt in the combined Western and Central areas until Amendment #13 is implemented.

Southeast Cul-de-sacs

- A. Given that the sablefish resources in the FCZ cul-de-sacs are included in the State of Alaska's guideline harvest level, and that the Council's intent is to have these federal areas included in the inside waters for purposes of regulating the traditional sablefish fishery in this area; I move to request the Secretary to extend his emergency regulation, closing the FCZ cul-de-sacs of Southeast Alaska until the traditional opening of this fishery on September 1, 1984.
- Specking moved winter 2nd*
- B. I move that the Council request the Secretary to extend his emergency regulation closure of the federal intrusion areas within the Southeast archipelago for sablefish until September 1, 1984, the traditional opening date for this area.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council, SSC and AP Members
FROM: Jim H. Branson
Executive Director
DATE: May 17, 1984
SUBJECT: Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP

ACTION REQUIRED

- a. *Extend emergency rule raising the pollock OY to 400,000 mt.*
- b. *Extend emergency rule closing the sablefish fishery in federal cul-de-sacs of Southeast Alaska.*
- c. *Council consideration of domestic observer regulations.*

BACKGROUND

- a. Extend the emergency rule raising the pollock OY to 400,000 mt.

At the December 1983 and February 1984 meetings the Council voted to combine the Western and Central areas for pollock management and to set the OY for the area at 400,000 mt. The Council also voted for an emergency rule to implement their decision in time for the 1984 Shelikof fishery and until the plan amendment (Amendment 13) becomes effective. The emergency rule is scheduled to expire on June 21.

Amendment 13 was submitted for Secretarial review on March 13. The review is progressing smoothly and implementation is expected on August 16. The dilemma is that during the period June 22 to August 15, the previous OY of 143,000 mt for the Central area would be in effect. Because the catch in the Shelikof fishery was about 180,000 mt, this situation would force the closure of the pollock fishery in the Central area for two months.

The Crisis Committee reviewed this situation on May 4 and recommended that the Council consider extending the emergency rule to the implementation date of Amendment 13. This action should be viewed as being consistent with the intent of Amendment 13 and the prior emergency rule.

- b. Extend the emergency rule closing the sablefish fishery in the federal cul-de-sacs of Southeast Alaska.

On January 1, 1984, the FCZ cul-de-sacs (i.e. FCZ intrusions) into the Southeast Alaska archipelago opened to sablefish fishing, along with all other waters of the FCZ off Alaska. Historically, these areas had not opened until

the state seasons of March 15 (southern areas) and September 1 (northern areas). The resources in these areas are included in the state's guideline harvest levels and not in the FCZ OY.

At the February 1984 meeting the Council unanimously voted to close the four cul-de-sacs by emergency rule until the traditional opening dates. This closure solved the problem for 1984 for the southern area (Iphegenia Bay-Summer Strait), which reopened March 15. However, the emergency rule for the northern areas (lower Chatham Strait-Frederick Sound, Sitka Sound, Cross Sound), will expire on June 4, 1984, opening the areas about three months early.

The Crisis Committee discussed this problem during its May 4 conference call and recommends that a plan amendment be prepared to solve the cul-de-sac problem. They further recommend that the amendment be placed on the annual groundfish cycle and that in the interim, an extension of the emergency rule be approved to ensure the areas stay closed until Sept. 1, when they will open with the rest of 'inside' Southeast waters.

c. Domestic observer regulations.

The Council may wish to recommend to the Secretary of Commerce that he implement the draft regulations included here as agenda item D-4(a). These regulations replace the existing, and very general regulation on observers for domestic vessels in the Gulf of Alaska groundfish fishery (50 CFR Sec. 672.27, Observers). All fishing vessels subject to this part must, when so requested by the Regional Director, take aboard an observer).

Action by the Council on this item requires no change to the current FMP and expands the plan's data collection program. It will also respond to your discussions with the Board of Fisheries in March when they established similar regulations for State waters.

For Information Only

A memo and report from the Prohibited Species Workgroup are included in your notebooks as item D-4(b). The report summarizes the workgroup meeting of March 21, 1984 and their request for a set of management objectives. An oral summary should be available.

On May 15, 1984, a steering group committee meeting on domestic groundfish data monitoring was held in Juneau. The Committee report on the meeting is included as item D-4(c). It recommends that a technical workgroup composed of the two groundfish plan teams, and others as necessary, review in detail our data needs and develop a program to satisfy those needs. They will report back to the Council in September. If the Council has any further instructions to the technical workgroup, they should be given at this time.

DRAFT REGULATIONS

SECTION 672.27 OBSERVERS

(a) For the purposes of collecting scientific data and carrying out such other management and enforcement activities as may be authorized, observers may be assigned by the Regional Director after consultation with the Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, to any fishing vessel regulated under this Part. The owner and operator of any vessel to which such an observer is assigned shall:

(1) after notification of the assignment of an observer, cause the vessel to proceed to such places and at such times as may be agreed upon by the Regional Director and the owner or operator for the purpose of embarking and debarking the observer;

(2) provide true vessel location by Loran bearings or by latitude and longitude accurate to the nearest minute upon request by the observer;

(3) allow the observer reasonable use of the vessel's communications equipment and personnel as necessary for the transmission and receipt of messages;

(4) provide all other reasonable assistance to enable the observer to carry out his duties.

(b) It is unlawful for any person to assault, impede, intimidate, interfere with in any manner, influence, or attempt to influence an observer placed aboard a vessel under this section.




RECEIVED MAY 16 1984

AGENDA D-4(b)
MAY 1984**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICENorthwest and Alaska Fisheries Center
2725 Montlake Boulevard East
Seattle, WA 98112

May 15, 1984

F/NWC2:RJM

TO: North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, SSC, and AP

FROM:  Richard J. Marasco
Chairman, Gulf of Alaska Prohibited Species Workgroup

SUBJECT: Activities of the Workgroup

The working group met last on 21 March. The main purpose of the meeting was to begin discussions concerning measures that could be used to address the prohibited species by-catch issue. During the discussions, it became apparent to the group that allocation was the key issue. It was concluded that design of management measures is critically dependent upon having a well defined set of management objectives for Gulf of Alaska fisheries. Therefore, it was felt that future work would commence once a concise set of objectives is made available to the group.



MINUTES

MEETING OF GULF OF ALASKA PROHIBITED SPECIES WORKING GROUP

Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center
March 21, 1984

ATTENDANCE:

Name	Affiliation
Bob Alverson	Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc.
Eric Anderson	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
William Aron	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Jim Balsiger	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Ron Berg	Nat'l. Marine Fish. Service-Alaska
Barry Bracken	Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
Jim Branson	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Alvin Burch	Alaska Draggers Assoc.
Bud Burgner	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Phil Chitwood	Marine Resources Company
Barry Collier	North Pac. Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc.
Keven Davis	Japan. Deep Sea Trawlers Assoc.
Fred Gaffney	Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
David Harville	Kodiak Fish. Advisory Committee
John Harville	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Sara Hemphill	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Steve Hoag	Internat'l Pacific Halibut Commission
Doug Larson	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Harold Lokken	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Paul MacGregor	North Pac. Longliners & Gillnetters Assoc.
Dick Major	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Richard Marasco	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Russ Nelson	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Tadashi Nemoto	North Pacific Longline Assoc.
Jeff Povolny	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
Lewis Queirolo	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Jerry Reeves	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Dick Reynolds	Alaska Dept. of Commerce & Econ. Dev.
Phil Rigby	Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
Price Roberts	Office of Inspector General-DOC
Gary Stauffer	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.
Jeffrey Stephan	North Pac. Fish. Management Council
G. Sullivan	Office of Inspector General-DOC
Joe Terry	Northwest & Alaska Fish. Ctr.

RAPPORTEUR: Eric Anderson

Marasco called the meeting to order at 8:50 a.m. and reviewed the history of the work which culminated in the Working Group's Phase I Report, Council Document 21. This report contains evaluations of the magnitude of the prohibited species by-catch problem in recent years. He announced that the Council had directed that Phase II be undertaken to study possible remedies for the problem.

Nelson presented an update of Observer Program estimates of foreign and joint venture groundfish fleet incidental catches in 1983 and the first two months of 1984. By-catch was generally higher than in 1982.

MacGregor stated that his study of observer incidental catch mortality data shows that survival of halibut caught by Japanese longliners is probably around eighty percent.

Povolny reported on his analysis of the effectiveness of current measures for dealing with the incidental catch problem. The average size of halibut caught by Japanese trawlers went up after the imposition of time/area closures designed to protect young halibut went into effect in 1975, while total volume of halibut incidental catch remained constant. However, it is not known whether this change in average size was caused by the regulations, or by other factors. Moreover, calculations of the impact of incidental catch on the halibut fishery are quite sensitive to changes in assumptions about mortality rates by age.

Rules requiring foreign trawlers to use pelagic gear in certain times and areas have also had an unknown effect. While the rules may protect halibut, they may also result in an increase in the by-catch of salmon, although salmon are also caught in bottom trawls. Povolny

recommended a reconsideration of the definition of pelagic gear.

Regulations on foreign longliners fishing for sablefish (preventing them from fishing landward of the 400 meter contour in summer and of the 500 meter contour in winter in order to protect young halibut and sablefish) have not been imposed on the more recently developed longline fishery for cod. The proscription on cod longlining landward of 400 meters during halibut open seasons has little effect on the by-catch of halibut because halibut seasons are very short. The rule does prevent gear conflicts, however.

Domestic groundfish trawl fisheries are shut down in the Western and Central Areas when quotas of halibut incidental catch are exceeded. However, since there was no domestic groundfish fishery prior to the imposition of the quota regulation, no before-and-after comparison can be made to evaluate its effect. Cod and flounder optimum yields are set below maximum sustainable yield because the fisheries for these species have high halibut incidental catch rates, but actual cod and flounder catches have been below optimum yields. The optimum yields may become binding in the future as catches increase.

Terry reported on his qualitative evaluation of possible alternative measures for managing the incidental catch problem. In the absence of information about the expected response of groundfish fleets to potential regulations, it was not possible to perform a quantitative evaluation.

Six alternative management measures were considered, separately and in combination: economic disincentives, by-catch quotas, transferrable by-catch quotas, gear restrictions, time/area closures, and voluntary restraints. The measures were considered both with and

without retention of the by-catch being permitted.

They were evaluated against four criteria: enforceability, effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. General conclusions presented differed according to whether the groundfish fishery discussed was foreign, joint venture, or domestic.

In the foreign fisheries, expected levels of observer coverage are high enough to insure that any of the measures would be enforceable. The six alternative measures fall into three groups, according to how well they would meet the other three criteria:

- 1) Those that would tend to be both effective (assure that by-catch target levels are not exceeded) and in some sense equitable (perceived as fair), but not efficient (not likely to maximize net benefits). Includes quota, transferrable quota, and two-tier fee systems.

- 2) One that would tend to be efficient, but neither effective nor completely equitable, namely, a one-tier fee system.

- 3) Those that are enforceable, but do not meet any of the other three criteria, and in conjunction with which retention is probably not feasible: time/area closures and gear restrictions.

In the first group, transferrable quotas and two-tier fees would tend to meet more of the elements of the efficiency and equity criteria than would nontransferrable quotas, and transferrable quotas would tend to be at least as efficient as two-tier fees, while providing additional flexibility in determining the distribution of benefits. Transferrable quotas might be more difficult to administer than the other two measures in this group.

Equity and efficiency are relevant considerations in managing the foreign fleets because imposing costs on them reduces the ability of the U.S. government and industry to negotiate for other benefits. Efficiency is also relevant because providing proper incentives could result in foreigners developing better methods of reducing by-catch.

In joint venture fisheries, fees or transferrable quotas may be more appropriate than in foreign fisheries. The reason is that the equity and efficiency value judgement that those who are willing to pay for the privilege of taking additional by-catch should be allowed to take it may be politically more acceptable. It may also be true that retention is more politically feasible in joint ventures.

In domestic fisheries, there are no observer data, and therefore, the only by-catch control measures which would be enforceable are time/area closures and perhaps gear restrictions. Unfortunately, these measures may not be effective in reducing by-catch, they may impose very high costs on domestic groundfish fleets, and it would be very difficult to determine whether they provided net benefits to groundfish, halibut, crab, and salmon fishermen as a group. Additionally, retention is probably not feasible with these measures because the incentive for covert fishing on prohibited species remains.

Terry reported that estimates of the expected levels of by-catch for the next few years under the existing management regime are forthcoming, and that an evaluation of alternative time/area closures and gear restrictions is being undertaken. He proposed that a small number of other measures be selected for more thorough development and evaluation.

Marasco commented that a fee system would require good monitoring and could not guarantee a minimum incidental catch level, but would provide an incentive to adjust fishing methods and patterns, and if the fees were attached to the exvessel price, the fee would change as the value of the prohibited species changed.

Other comments were offered, including one voicing concern that time/area closures were being discriminated against, and some that time/area closures and gear restrictions can and do work in some cases. Comments on other control measures included one applauding the equity of fees, some voicing concern that observers would feel increased pressure and hostility from fishing crews if fees were imposed, and some indicating there was some confusion about how a transferrable quota system would be implemented.

Povolny reported that Bering Sea time/area closures and gear restrictions have resulted in incidental catches which have been lower than the target levels set by the Council. It was noted, however, that low by-catches of crab may be due to the decline in crab abundance.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a wide ranging discussion of what the objectives of an incidental catch management program should be, and of characteristics of some of the suggested control measures. A list of selected points follows.

Setting quotas requires knowledge of who should get the fish. Setting fees does not. Setting fees would yield some information about costs.

Quotas defined in absolute levels are less flexible than quotas defined in rates, although either can be reviewed and adjusted periodically.

It was proposed that the objective stated in the Bering Sea Groundfish Plan (incremental reduction while permitting the taking of TALFF) be adopted, i.e., reduce incidental catch from current levels.

However, expansion of domestic groundfish fisheries may require permitting an increase in incidental catch.

Another proposed objective was the maximization of net benefits from the resources, subject to holding incidental catch at a specified level which preserves traditional crab, halibut, and salmon fisheries.

Another proposed objective: to allocate resources among users to maximize benefits.

It was agreed that the incidental catch problem is one of allocation of crab, halibut, and salmon - who gets how much - but the question of what allocation procedure should be used was raised without being answered. No allocation mechanism can be effective unless there is adequate monitoring of the catch.

Other questions raised included:

What does "preserve traditional fisheries" mean? Does it mean "maintain income levels?"

At what rate should joint ventures expand? Should expansion be slowed or even halted if prohibited species stocks are depleted?

Marasco announced that he and Branson will appoint a committee to study the question of objectives. After this committee has completed its work, another will be appointed to study procedures for allocation of the catch among the fleets directed at crab, halibut, and salmon, and those catching these species incidentally. An industry group might be convened to address the problem of monitoring incidental catch in domestic fisheries.

It was decided that the Working Group will not meet again until it receives further direction from the Council.

SUMMARY OF INCIDENTAL CATCHES IN THE GULF OF ALASKA FOR
1983 AND THE FIRST QUARTER OF 1984

Preliminary estimates of the incidental catches of halibut, salmon, king crab, and Tanner crab by foreign and joint-venture groundfish fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska are provided in Tables 1 and 2 for 1983 and in Tables 3 and 4 for the period January through March, 1984.

The foreign fishery in the Gulf of Alaska caught about 147,500 t of groundfish in 1983 which represents a 4.0% decrease from the 1982 fishery. The incidental catches of king and Tanner crab were each lower than those taken in 1982 by 53%. In contrast, there was a 23% increase (in numbers) in the incidental catch of halibut and a 74% increase in the incidental catch of salmon. The increase in halibut was primarily due to increased incidental catches in the longline fishery, whereas, the increased salmon catch occurred in the trawl fishery.

The total groundfish catch of about 142,800 t in 1983 by joint-venture fisheries represents a 92% increase in landings over that taken in 1982. In addition to the Shelikof Straits pollock joint-venture, fisheries targeting on Pacific cod, flounders, and other bottom species using bottom-trawl gear developed in 1983. These new joint-venture fisheries were responsible for increased incidental catches of halibut, king crab, and Tanner crab. The incidental catch of halibut in 1983 was about 93,300 fish (327.1 t) as compared to a catch of 2,400 fish (3.6 t) in 1982. The incidental catch of Tanner crab increased from 400 crab in 1982 to about 118,400 crab in 1983. The 1983 catch of 4,600 king crab was greater than the catch of 50 crab taken in 1982. The incidental catch of salmon also increased in 1983. The 1983 catch was about 4,400 fish as compared to 1,500 fish in 1982. The increased salmon catch was the result of increased catches in both the Shelikof Strait joint-venture and the bottom trawl joint-ventures.

Through March, 1984, the foreign groundfish fishery had landed about 11,400 t of fish which is 15.2% greater than that taken through March, 1983. No salmon and few king crab were taken during the first quarter of 1984, which is comparable to the low levels of incidental catch which occurred during the first quarter of 1983. The incidental catch of Tanner crab through March, 1984, was 59.5% lower than that of 1983. The incidental catch of halibut, however, increased 114% in numbers and 127% in weight. During both years, most of the fishing was conducted by longline vessels targeting on Pacific cod. In 1983, the fishery was concentrated in the Chirikof area, while in 1984 the fishery has been centered in the Shumagin area.

In the first quarter of 1983, the only joint-venture activity was the fishery for pollock in the Shelikof Straits. In 1984, there was again a pollock fishery in the Shelikof Straits, but also bottom-trawl fisheries for flounders, cod, and pollock. Through March, 1984, the joint-venture fisheries had landed about 176,300 t of groundfish. This is a 36% increase in catch over the first quarter of 1983. There were substantial increases in the incidental catches of halibut, Tanner crab,

king crab, and salmon through March, 1984. The increases in the incidental catches of halibut (from 200 to 39,800 fish), Tanner crab (from 0 to 11,200 crab) and king crab (from 0 to 800 crab) were due to the addition of a bottom-trawl fishery. The threefold increase in the incidental catch of salmon (from 1,800 to 7,300 fish) resulted from increased incidental catches in the Shelikof pollock fishery.

Table 1.--Monthly prohibited species summary (by number) in the Gulf of Alaska.

Month/Nation	Groundfish catch (1,000's t)		Numbers (1,000's)							
	1982	1983	Halibut		Salmon		King Crab		Tanner Crab	
			1982	1983	1982	1983	1982	1983	1982	1983
January										
Japan	3.1	1.5	12.0	20.7	<0.1	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.1	0.5
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	3.9	3.7	<0.1	<0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
February										
Japan	4.3	4.0	28.1	39.0	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	0.8	3.2
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	19.8	41.4	<0.1	0.1	0.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
March										
Japan	3.3	4.4	32.5	49.7	0.0	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	0.6	1.5
Korea	<0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.0
Joint-Venture	40.3	84.4	<0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	<0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
April										
Japan	1.6	0.9	38.7	22.6	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	2.2	0.8
Korea	0.1	0.2	3.1	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	1.8
Joint-Venture	10.3	2.5	<0.1	0.6	0.1	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.0	<0.1
May										
Japan	0.7	1.1	16.8	19.2	<0.1	0.0	0.1	<0.1	0.6	1.6
Korea	0.3	0.1	7.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	0.4	0.9
Joint-Venture	0.2	0.8	2.3	2.1	0.0	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.4	<0.1
June										
Japan	9.3	12.6	65.6	72.2	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.5	17.3	4.0
Korea	16.6	2.5	34.7	1.6	0.3	0.1	1.0	<0.1	8.0	0.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.0
July										
Japan	9.7	10.5	12.6	34.9	0.6	0.9	0.1	0.1	3.2	1.1
Korea	5.0	7.6	11.2	7.4	<0.1	0.3	<0.1	0.0	0.4	0.3
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.3
August										
Japan	9.3	9.8	14.8	31.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	4.0	1.7
Korea	3.6	7.1	6.7	5.1	<0.1	0.8	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	0.5
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.7	0.0	17.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.1	0.0	33.6
September										
Japan	21.2	9.4	35.7	29.8	0.5	0.3	1.0	0.1	2.8	1.7
Korea	6.1	3.3	1.9	0.4	0.1	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	0.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.5	0.0	13.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.8	0.0	29.6
October										
Japan	17.3	18.2	58.2	93.1	0.6	1.7	0.2	0.1	2.9	1.1
Korea	11.9	10.8	14.4	4.7	0.6	0.5	0.0	<0.1	12.8	1.0
Joint-Venture	0.0	0.8	0.0	3.9	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	2.8
November										
Japan	16.8	20.3	77.6	143.7	0.7	2.0	0.2	0.5	2.4	2.2
Korea	5.7	17.0	4.2	14.3	0.5	1.0	<0.1	<0.1	0.7	1.5
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.3	0.0	15.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.4
December										
Japan	6.8	6.2	85.4	101.1	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	3.2	3.8
Korea	1.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
Joint-Venture	0.0	3.1	0.0	36.9	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.5	0.0	49.7
Total through December										
Japan	103.4	98.9	478.0	657.2	3.8	6.8	2.5	1.6	40.1	23.2
Korea	50.3	48.6	84.7	33.6	1.7	2.8	1.1	0.1	23.2	6.4
Foreign Total	153.7	147.5	562.7	690.8	5.5	9.6	3.6	1.7	63.3	29.6
Joint-Venture	74.5	142.8	2.4	93.3	1.5	4.4	<0.1	4.6	0.4	118.4

Table 2.--Monthly prohibited species summary (by weight) in the Gulf of Alaska.

Month/Nation	Groundfish catch (1,000's t)			Weight (tons)		
	1982		1983	1982		1983
	Japan	Korea	Joint-Venture	Salmon	King crab	Tanner crab
January	3.1	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.5
Japan	1.5	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	26.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1
February	4.3	4.0	117.1	105.0	0.0	2.4
Japan	4.0	0.0	41.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	19.8	4.0	0.2	0.3	1.6	0.0
March	3.3	4.4	85.3	172.9	0.0	1.3
Japan	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Korea	<0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<0.1
Joint-Venture	40.3	84.4	0.2	1.1	1.0	0.0
April	1.6	0.9	134.5	85.4	0.0	0.6
Japan	0.1	0.2	12.4	0.2	0.0	1.8
Korea	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	<0.1
Joint-Venture	10.3	2.5	0.2	2.6	0.1	0.0
May	0.7	1.1	77.5	82.4	0.0	1.3
Japan	0.7	1.1	77.5	82.4	0.0	0.4
Korea	0.3	0.1	32.5	1.3	0.0	0.3
Joint-Venture	0.2	0.8	2.8	17.5	0.1	0.8
June	9.3	12.6	308.1	453.5	3.4	1.8
Japan	12.6	9.3	308.1	453.5	3.4	11.9
Korea	2.5	2.5	92.9	10.2	1.3	5.3
Joint-Venture	0.0	0.5	0.0	15.6	0.0	0.1
July	9.7	10.5	175.7	249.0	2.1	0.8
Japan	10.5	9.7	175.7	249.0	2.1	0.8
Korea	5.0	7.6	107.1	33.5	0.1	0.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.1	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.3
August	9.3	9.8	162.7	189.6	1.0	1.3
Japan	9.8	9.3	162.7	189.6	1.0	1.3
Korea	3.6	7.1	36.5	24.7	0.2	0.4
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.7	0.0	64.4	0.0	0.4
September	21.2	9.4	250.1	173.6	2.1	1.4
Japan	9.4	21.2	250.1	173.6	2.1	1.4
Korea	6.1	3.3	15.9	4.2	0.5	0.1
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.5	0.0	38.4	0.0	0.1
October	17.3	18.2	294.0	533.3	2.8	0.7
Japan	18.2	17.3	294.0	533.3	2.8	0.7
Korea	11.9	10.8	152.7	30.4	1.1	4.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	0.8	0.0	29.1	0.0	0.3
November	16.8	20.3	307.2	571.1	2.6	1.4
Japan	20.3	16.8	307.2	571.1	2.6	1.4
Korea	5.7	17.0	44.0	88.2	1.2	0.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	1.3	0.0	60.1	0.0	1.1
December	6.8	6.2	249.5	436.0	0.2	3.5
Japan	6.8	6.2	249.5	436.0	0.2	3.5
Korea	1.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.1	0.2
Joint-Venture	0.0	3.1	0.0	88.1	0.0	0.0
Total through December	103.4	98.9	2,188.0	3,112.4	14.3	17.5
Japan	103.4	98.9	2,188.0	3,112.4	14.3	17.5
Korea	50.3	48.6	502.1	192.7	4.5	4.7
Joint-Venture	74.5	142.8	3.6	327.1	2.8	63.1
Foreign Total	153.7	147.5	2,690.1	3,305.1	18.8	22.2
Japan	153.7	147.5	2,690.1	3,305.1	18.8	22.2
Korea	50.3	48.6	502.1	192.7	4.5	4.7
Joint-Venture	74.5	142.8	3.6	327.1	2.8	63.1

Table 3.--Monthly prohibited species summary (by number) in the Gulf of Alaska.

Month/Nation	Groundfish catch (1,000's t)		Numbers (1,000's)							
	1983	1984	Halibut		Salmon		King Crab		Tanner Crab	
			1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984
January										
Japan	1.5	2.3	20.7	37.6	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.5	0.7
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	3.7	5.9	<0.1	32.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	7.5
February										
Japan	4.0	7.3	39.0	80.3	0.0	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	3.2	0.5
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	41.4	83.0	0.1	6.0	1.0	4.9	0.0	<0.1	0.0	3.4
March										
Japan	4.4	1.8	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.3
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	84.4	87.4	0.1	1.4	0.4	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Total through March										
Japan	9.9	11.4	59.7	127.7	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	3.7	1.5
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foreign Total	9.9	11.4	59.7	127.7	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	3.7	1.5
Joint-Venture	129.5	176.3	0.2	39.8	1.8	7.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	11.2

Table 4 .--Monthly prohibited species summary (by weight) in the Gulf of Alaska.

Month/Nation	Groundfish catch		Weight (tons)							
	(1,000's t)		Halibut		Salmon		King crab		Tanner crab	
	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984
January										
Japan	1.5	2.3	60.6	121.0	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.5	2.3
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	3.7	5.9	0.1	40.3	0.7	1.6	0.0	1.2	0.0	3.7
February										
Japan	4.0	7.3	105.0	227.8	0.0	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	2.4	0.4
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	41.4	83.0	0.3	10.9	1.6	13.2	0.0	<0.1	0.0	1.9
March										
Japan	4.4	1.8	0.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<0.1	0.0	0.2
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Joint-Venture	84.4	87.4	1.1	2.5	1.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total through March										
Japan	9.9	11.4	165.6	375.8	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	2.9	2.9
Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foreign Total	9.9	11.4	165.6	375.8	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	2.9	2.9
Joint-Venture	129.5	176.3	1.5	53.7	3.3	19.7	0.0	1.2	0.0	5.7

SUPPLEMENTAL
MAY 1984

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council, SSC and AP members

FROM: Jim H. Branson
Executive Director

DATE: May 21, 1984

SUBJECT: Information on sunken gillnets in Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries

At the April Council meeting the Council requested information on the status and use of sunken gillnets in the Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries which was prompted by reports indicating that a number of vessels would be using this gear for sablefish fishing this year.

STATUS

1. Regulations

- (a) Currently there are no federal regulations governing the use of sunken gillnets for groundfish fishing in the FCZ off Alaska.
- (b) The State of Alaska prohibits the use of sunken gillnets for bottomfish except in the Kodiak area, the Cook Inlet area, and the Aleutian Islands area. The state has a provision for use of sunken gillnets in other areas by special permit only.

- 2. As of April 16, 56 vessels had received federal permits from NMFS to use gillnet gear off Alaska in 1984. The permits are not specifically for sunken gillnets, but rather reflect the permit application form on which "gillnet" is listed with eight other gear types. Applicants routinely check most or all of the gear types listed on the form. It's doubtful if many of them are seriously interested in using gillnets.
- 3. Robert Alverson told the Council staff that two longline vessels from his Association will use sunken gillnets for sablefish in the Kodiak area after the first halibut opening. He said that both vessel skippers will welcome observers while they are fishing the sunken gillnets.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE

We have received some information on sunken gillnets. Please let me know which publication or report you would like to have so we can copy it and send it to you. Number 1 is directly pertinent to current Alaska activity.

- 1. Klein, Steve, 1984. "The 1983 Experimental Set Net Fishery for Groundfish," NWAFC Processed Report 84-03.
- 2. Larsen, A.K., 1970. "The Bottom Gillnet".

3. Pedersen, Mark, 1980. "Review of the Set Net Fisheries for Groundfish in Puget Sound, Washington, 1974-1976," Progress Report No. 113, State of Washington, Department of Fisheries,
4. Pedersen, Mark G., 1981. "Review of the Set Net Fisheries in Washington State During 1977-1979," Progress Report No. 138, State of Washington, Department of Fisheries.
5. Eastwood, James, 1981. "1980-81 Sunken Gillnet Fishery in Southeastern Alaska," ADF&G.
6. Bracken, Barry E., 1980. "The Sunken Gillnet in Alaska, A Fishery Status Report - 1979," ADF&G.