

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Clement V. Tillion, Chairman
Jim H. Brañson, Executive Director

605 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99510



Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3136DT
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Telephone: (907) 274-4563
FTS 271-4064

Certified by: *Robert Alverson*

Date: Jan 4 1983

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES Anchorage, Alaska December 6-7, 1982

The Advisory Panel met on Monday, December 6, 1982, from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. in the Portage Room of the Westward Hilton Hotel, Anchorage, Alaska. They reconvened on Tuesday, December 7, from 8:00 to 10:30 a.m. The following members were present: Greg Baker, Robert Blake, Al Burch, Larry Cotter, Jesse Foster, Dick Goldsmith, Eric Jordan, Joe Kurtz, Rick Lauber, Ray Lewis, Kristy Long, James O'Connell, Dan O'Hara, Jack Phillips, Don Rawlinson, Harvey Samuelson, Walt Smith, Tony Vaska, Ed Wojeck and Chairman Robert Alverson.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert Alverson. The agenda was approved by all members. There were no comments on the minutes of the September 20-22, 1982 meeting.

B. SPECIAL REPORTS

B-1 Executive Director's Report. The Executive Director's Report was presented by Clarence Pautzke. It was suggested that members of the AP should be assigned to a workgroup for review of proposed regulations for collection of foreign fees. The AP assigned Dick Goldsmith and Rick Lauber to this committee.

The AP did not take a position on the proposed discounted fees and competitive bidding.

B-6 NMFS Observer Program. No report was available.

C. NEW OR CONTINUING BUSINESS

C-3 Coast Guard Report on Disposition of Violations. No report was available.

C-4 Review of Permit Applications - Foreign and Joint Venture

Directed Fishing

The AP in general feels that vessels with violations still pending disposition should be granted permits unless the violations are very serious. The first five Japanese vessels listed in agenda item C-4 have had their violations resolved and should be granted permits. The AP felt the fines were somewhat light but was unsure of the severity and/or nature of the violations.

Due to the severity of the violations of the DAIEI MARU NO. 2 and HAMAZEN MARU NO. 35 the AP recommends that permits be held until the cases are resolved and if found to be guilty, that these permits from Japan be revoked.

Korea. The AP recommends no permit for the NO. 707 DAI HO or the KYUNG YANG HO.

Taiwan. The AP recommends no permit for the HIGHLY NO. 301 and 302 pending outcome of their cases and if found guilty then denial of the permits. These two vessels' violations involved underlogging or retention of prohibited species.

West Germany. The AP approved the permit but questions the advisability of allowing so much codfish in their directed allocation.

There was one opposed to allowing the application based on past practices.

Norway. The AP suggests no permit for directed fishing. The AP recommends that the Norwegians resubmit for joint venture activities. There were also objections to approving this permit because

- (a) Norway imposes import duties on salmon
- (b) a codfish directed fishery is being requested
- (c) Norway has no previous history in Alaska

Joint Venture Permits

Japan. The AP voted 15 to 4 to approve the Japanese vessels participating in the joint venture.

South Korea. The AP voted 14 to 5 to approve these vessel permits.

The AP approved the West German joint venture permit and Taiwanese permits with six objections. The AP requests that the Taiwanese request for Pacific cod be adjusted to reflect the proportion of Pacific cod to other species approved in other joint venture activities.

USSR. The AP turned down the USSR applications 11 to 3.

The principal feeling was that the Soviets were a liability to U.S. concerns with their activities in Afganistan and elsewhere.

Joint Ventures in General

Those members of the AP that voted against the various joint venture requests submitted the following minority report.

Minority Report. The purpose of the motion to deny all joint venture permits was a reflection of several factors which have gained increased significance:

- (a) The development of a domestic industry for underutilized species has simply not occurred. Although it is true that some domestic effort is being made, it is not substantial and is beset with numerous problems, not the least of which is the difficulty of these operations to procure raw product.
- (b) The increase in the projected allocation to joint ventures is enormous. The increase in the Gulf of Alaska is 220,000,000 lbs. The increase in the Bering Sea is 189,200,000 lbs. The total joint venture allocation for 1983, as a result is 676,500,000 lbs.! This amount is clearly indicative of a desire on the part of domestic fishermen to harvest underutilized species, as well as the availability of a ready foreign market.
- (c) The unemployment rate in the United States stands at an official 10.8% with at least 12,000,000 unemployed accounted for. The 676 million pounds allocated to joint ventures in 1983 reflects literally millions of hours of work for thousands of workers.
- (d) The collapse of the crab stocks has placed the domestic industry Westward in jeopardy. Plants are standing idle, workers are laid off -- in some cases permanently, the economic stability of communities is being threatened. Yet, at the same time, some companies making an effort to process underutilized species are not able to procure product and other companies are merely engaged in joint ventures as opposed to utilizing their own domestic facilities.
- (e) When joint ventures were first approved the program, was to develop a U.S. industry capable of harvesting to a significantly increased degree underutilized species being harvested by the foreign fleets. Although the domestic industry has developed this ability the original program to co-develop a domestic industry has faltered. Given the points already enumerated (a-d), the makers of the motion feel it is time for the Council to give proper attention to the domestic industry and the overall needs of that industry.

It must be pointed out that the vote against the motion does not reflect properly the views of all the AP members. Given the severity of the motion, many AP members felt obligated to vote against the motion. However, these members share a great concern as to the overall direction of the Council as it pertains to the future of the domestic industry versus the ever-increasing grip of joint ventures on underutilized species.

C-5 Halibut Moratorium and Limited Entry Study

- (a) The AP advises that the Council attempt to extend as long as possible a comment and hearing process without prejudice to implementation of a moratorium by May 1. The AP encourages as many on-site hearings as possible and use teleconferencing at other sites. Specific geographic areas of major concern are Sitka, Petersburg, Kodiak, Seattle and the Homer area. The AP suggests time be made available for public hearings at the joint Council/Board meeting in Juneau, January 4-11.

Phil McCrussen testified for a need of all the communities in the Homer area to have hearings.

A list of sites that the AP suggests for teleconferencing is attached. These were suggested by a subgroup headed by Greg Baker.

- (b) In reference to the proposal of 12 mile exclusive fishery zones in the Bering Sea, the AP suggests the proposal be sent to IPHC for consideration as one option of solving the goal of developing the village fishery in the Bering Sea. The AP did not approve or disapprove the recommendation but does support development by the village north of 56°N latitude. There was one opposed to this recommendation.

In addition some of the AP members feel this issue could be better addressed at the annual IPHC meeting where members of industry would all be present.

- (c) Additional Business on Moratorium. The AP heard testimony from Jack Crowley (representing Seattle Vessel Owners Association), Pete Knudsen, John Durken, and Mark Lundston (representing Deep Sea Fishermens Union) on the halibut moratorium. The Seattle group presented the following moratorium concept.

"Individuals who made landings of halibut in vessels of five net tons or smaller between 1978 and 1982 will receive a moratorium permit. The permit will only be used on vessels equal to or less than five net tons.

Landings of halibut made by vessels greater than five net tons may be licensed to fish during the moratorium period. The vessel would have had to have made deliveries between 1978 and 1982. Owners of vessels greater than five net tons would not be able to upgrade during the moratorium past 10 percent of their existing net tonnage for purposes of replacing a vessel or changing vessels."

The AP moved that the proposed rulemaking scheduled to be printed on December 20, 1982 not be interferred with, but to encourage NOAA and the Council to consider other alternatives to the moratorium. The AP would hope the proposed rule at this time be broad enough to be able to accept a moratorium on vessels if that were desired.

- C-6 Joint Venture Logbook Program. The AP recommends that the program be tried for one year and then be reviewed by industry.

D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

- D-1 Salmon FMP. Bill Robinson gave an indepth report of the status of stocks and the U.S.-Canada talks.

The AP has no specific recommendations at this time. One AP member who spent the summer in Oregon, Eric Jordan, indicated he perceived a conservation problem with chinooks being taken by sport fishermen. The sport fishermen catch large chinooks by snagging them and take only the eggs and leave the carcass.

Eric felt that if escapement goals are achieved in southern rivers, the Alaskan fishermen should have a larger quota off Southeast Alaska.

- D-2 Herring FMP. The AP voted to recommend that no herring fishing be allowed outside state waters, but to incorporate the herring resource into an FMP with management delegated to the State of Alaska. This passed 11 to 4.

The AP also moved that the Bering Sea Herring FMP be amended so that it reflects a desire for research to identify stock abundance and segregation before herring are harvested outside of three miles. This passed 17 to 1.

Those in favor of harvesting inside felt that the existing herring fishery and subsistence fishery were established and should have precedent over any proposed offshore fishery.

Those opposed had these problems with the proposed fishery management:

- (a) There were insufficient pluses and minuses of the herring savings areas as these applied to domestic fishermen.
 - (b) The herring ABC did not include all age classes of the fishery.
 - (c) What happens if the market fails for roe or icing conditions preempt an inside fishery.
 - (d) The proposed formula for determining the quota for an offshore fishery does not have any biological basis as per the SSC report in Sitka.
- D-4 Tanner Crab FMP. Steve Davis gave the Tanner crab report. The AP approved the amendment to go out for public review. There was one opposed due to having received the amendment on such short notice.

- D-5 Gulf of Alaska FMP

- (a) The AP endorsed their previous support for no directed pot fishing for blackcod from 140°W to Cape Addington. There was one opposed.
- (b) EY level for sablefish. The AP recommends no change and would like to emphasize that even with the continued reductions in ABC and OY in westward areas, no improvement in the stocks has been noticed. The AP suggests a conservative approach.

- (c) The AP recommends that the Council coordinate a workgroup to study the problems of prohibited species by-catches in the Gulf of Alaska. After this group's initial data collection, the AP requests appropriate participation in designing alternatives to reduce the by-catch. One was opposed to the workgroup
- (d) The AP recommended approval of "frameworking" the establishment of OY.

D-6 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP. The AP had no proposed changes in DAH or JVP.

December 1982
AP Minutes
ATTACHMENT
12/07/82

TO: Robert Alverson
FR: Halibut moratorium hearing site sub group

Bob, here are the sites the sub-group recommends for face to face " and teleconference hearings in Alaska and Washington.

Sites undeclined should be considered for face to face "hearings, except that in Southeast Alaska Bureau or Sifka are acceptable locations.

Sites checked should be considered for teleconference sites. In addition, Kristi Long is going to explore the need for teleconference hearings in the BST area. She will be contact you with her findings.

Deey Baker

Handwritten signature or name at the top of the page.

Handwritten text, possibly a title or introductory sentence, located in the upper middle section.

Handwritten text, likely a paragraph or list item, located in the middle section.

Handwritten text, possibly a paragraph or list item, located in the lower middle section.

Handwritten text, possibly a paragraph or list item, located in the lower section.

Handwritten text at the bottom right corner, possibly a date or reference number.

LIST OF TIME ZONES AND ABBREVIATIONS

EST	PST	YST	AST	BST		
4:00 p.m.	1:00 p.m.	12:00 p.m.	11:00 a.m.	10:00 a.m.		
Washington, D.C.	WDC ✓Haines ✓Hoonah <u>Juneau*</u> ✓Ketchikan ✓Petersburg <u>Sitka*</u> ✓Wrangell	HNS HOO JNU KTN PSG SIT WRG	✓Yakutat YAK	Anaktuvuk Pass <u>Anchorage</u> Barrow ✓Bethel ✓Cordova ✓Dillingham Delta Junction Fairbanks Fort Yukon Galena <u>Homer</u> ✓Hooper Bay Kaktovik <u>Kodiak</u> Matanuska-Susitna <u>Sand Point</u> ✓St. Paul ✓Seward Soldotna ✓Unalakleet ✓Unalaska ✓Valdez	ANA Gambell ANC ✓Kotzebue BAR ✓Nome BET Noorvik COR Point Hope DLG Savoonga DJT Shishmaref FBX Wainwright FTY GAL HOM HPB KAK KOD M-S SPT STP SEW SOL UNK UAK VAL	GAM <u>Seattle</u> KOT NOM NOR PTH SAV SHS Wai

Sites underlined = face-to-face hearings
 Sites checked = teleconference hearings
 *Either Juneau or Sitka are acceptable locations for Southeast.