

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Richard B. Lauber, Chairman
Clarence G. Pautzke, Executive Director



605 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

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

Telephone: (907) 271-2809
FAX: (907) 271-2817

Approved by _____
Date _____

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES AUGUST 3-4, 1992 JUNEAU, ALASKA

The Advisory Panel for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council met on August 3-4, 1992, at the Baranof Hotel in Juneau, Alaska. Members in attendance were:

John Bruce	Pete Maloney	Harold Sparck
Alvin Burch	Dean Paddock	Michael Stevens
Phil Chitwood	Perfenia Pletnikoff	Beth Stewart
Dave Fraser, Vice Chair	John Roos	John Woodruff, Chair
Kevin Kaldestad	John Sevier	Robert Wurm
David Little		

Minutes for the June 1992 meeting were approved.

INSHORE/OFFSHORE AMENDMENT 18

The AP heard lengthy staff and NMFS reports and took public testimony on Amendment 18.

The AP recommends the Council adopt Alternative 3 as it's preferred alternative with these changes in percentage allocation:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Inshore</u>	<u>Offshore</u>	
1993	35%	65%	
1994	37 1/2%	62 1/2%	
1995	37 1/2%	62 1/2%	(This motion passed 10-6)

Those voting in favor of this motion believe there is clear value in supporting the inshore sector of the industry. They believe the social and economic impacts on a small coastal community of non-allocation will be felt much more than the same impacts of allocation on a much larger community.

Also, in regards to the cost benefit analysis and the modeling program, the AP heard testimony from both sides of the issue that the analysis was flawed due to various poor/erroneous assumptions and inputs. The AP discussed some of these but had no way of verifying them in short order. The AP heard testimony that the output of the analysis could be in a fairly wide range; from a -\$181 mm. to +\$22 mm.

The AP recommends the percentages in Alternative 3 be amended as above because many members think the increase/decrease is too great as originally in the alternative and that the percentages above will provide for more stability.

In regards to the CVOA, the AP is not in favor of establishing a CVOA. (This motion passed 10-6). Most AP members think creation of a CVOA is not necessary as long as a specific allocation plan exists. They believe, if localized resource depletion becomes an issue in the future, a solution can be developed at that time. Further, many of the AP worried that a CVOA would at times drive boats out of productive grounds and into areas that have higher bycatch and that are less safe. Some AP members cite that twice the establishment of a similar area was rejected.

HALIBUT PSC FOR LONGLINE FLEET - BEING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS

The AP recommends the Council rescind the halibut bycatch cap for fixed gear in BSAI for 1992 by emergency action and/or ask the Secretary of Commerce not to implement that portion of Amendment 19 that establishes this fixed gear cap. The intent of this is that whatever action is necessary be taken to allow the fixed gear fleet in BSAI to fish for Pacific cod in 1992 up to the TAC without being restrained by the halibut bycatch cap. Further, this motion recommends the Council revise the BSAI trawl halibut bycatch cap for 1992 from the existing 5033 m/t to 5333 m/t.

(This motion passed 8-7)

Those voting in favor of this motion believe the fixed gear cap was developed in an arbitrary fashion with no data to base it on, that it was never meant to be constraining and that no one at the time thought it would be. They also cite new lower bycatch mortality data for the fixed gear fleet by way of cutting gangions to release halibut. The fixed gear fleet points out that the September through January period is of crucial economic concern since this is most often the time when market prices are highest. Those in favor of this motion also recognize the fairness issue of including the trawl fleet in revising bycatch levels to pre-Amendment 19 levels.

It is the AP's intent in making these recommendations that they would be in effect for only 1992, and that prior to 1993 the industry would devise ways to work under the Amendment 19 cap levels (which are Amendment 20 caps in 1993).

The AP clearly understands that any additional halibut mortality will be taken into account by the International Halibut Commission in setting the 1993 catch levels.

In a separate motion, the AP recommends to the Council that the entire issue of halibut caps, halibut mortality, the validity of the data used, and the equity of the caps be reviewed for presentation in September, and that an industry group be appointed to review and recommend any changes.

(This motion passed unanimously)