North Pacific Fishery Management Council

James O. Campbell, Chairman Jim H. Branson, Executive Director

411 West 4th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99510



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

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

> > <

Certified:

mun Nancy Munro, Chairman

5.20.87 Date:

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES March 16-18, 1987 Anchorage, Alaska

The Advisory Panel for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council met in the Westward Hilton Hotel on March 16-18, 1987. The following members were present:

Nancy Munro, Chairman Robert Alverson, Vice Chairman Rupe Andrews Terry Baker Alvin Burch Joseph Chimegalrea

Lamar Cotten Edwin Fuglvog Ron Hegge Oliver Holm Pete Isleib Cameron Jensen

Rick Lauber Dan O'Hara Ron Peterson Thorn Smith Dave Woodruff John Woodruff

Minutes of the January 19-20, 1987 Advisory Panel meeting were approved after a suggested editorial change.

B-1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Sablefish Limited Entry

The AP recommends the Council adopt the schedule recommended by the North Pacific Longline Coalition:

Solicit proposals for long-term sablefish management. March - May

These would include traditional management concepts

as well as limited entry.

Review proposals and decide which to have the staff May

develop further.

Review staff drafts and decide which to send out for September

public comment.

Final decision. December

The motion carried 9 to 5.

In their discussions the AP considered: (1) whether the proposed schedule provided adequate time for review; (2) whether the issue should be included on the agenda; and (3) whether any limited entry scheme should include all gear types.

-1-

Minority report. A proposal to establish a rushed and rigid schedule for consideration of limited entry in the Gulf sablefish fishery was heard by the Advisory Panel for the first time on Wednesday, March 18. Nothing in the draft agenda gave notice that such an issue might arise—the only reference to limited entry is an "Overview of Limited Entry Systems in Australia and New Zealand."

The fishermen whose livelihoods would be affected by limited entry are now at sea. Thus, they have been denied an opportunity to advise on the development of a schedule which would allow them to participate meaningfully in a process which may well determine their economic futures. As the Council learned in the halibut moratorium wars, affected fishermen wish to participate directly in these deliberations, and not only through their representatives.

It will not be possible for most of the affected industry to offer comments on sablefish management before the May Council meeting—most sablefish fishermen are fishing, and there are many other weighty issues on the Council agenda. Any apparent attempt to "railroad" limited entry will likely trigger massive opposition. This most volatile issue should be handled deliberately.

We respectfully request and advise that public proposals for sablefish management be requested between the May and September Council meetings. Signed by: Dave Woodruff, Oliver Holm, and Thorn Smith.

D-2 GULF OF ALASKA GROUNDFISH FMP

1987 Pollock Apportionments to DAP, JVP and TALFF

The AP recommends the Council request NMFS to provide updated information at the May meeting regarding TQs, DAP potential, and JVP plans. This would include: (1) any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydroacoustic surveys and age/length studies); (2) the results of a formal survey of DAP processors, including an estimate of DAP processing capacity ready but not able to get fish; and (3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shoreside delivery. The motion carried 14 to 1.

The AP feels in a bind on this subject. Although they recognize that Secretary Calio has asked the Council to review NMFS' findings, they feel there was inadequate information to do so.

Regarding the AP's request for biological information—the AP's understanding is that the TQs and allocations decided upon in December have been established as "preliminary" initial specifications. The point now is to finalize those initial specifications. The AP heard much anecdotal evidence regarding pollock not showing up in Shelikof, very small fish showing up in nets, and low CPUEs—all of which brought back the fears for this stock which appeared in the Resource Assessment Document last fall.

Despite this anecdotal evidence, the AP feels it has no quantifiable information with which to make a recommendation to NMFS regarding finalizing the initial specification for TQ. NMFS indicated to us that new information from hydroacoustic surveys could be available as early as this week and that they were currently conducting age/length studies in Kodiak which could be made available by the May meeting.

42A/AQ -2-

Educative venera. A proposal to establish a rushed and rigid schedule for consideration of limited entry in the Gulf sablefish fixtery was head by the Advisory Parel for the fixet time on Wednerdry, March 18. Nothing in the draft exends gave rutice that ruch on inche sight orige-the only reference to timined antry is an "Overview of Limited Essential in Australia and New Zealand."

The fitsherman whose livelihoods would be effected by limited eathy are now as say, Thus, they baye been dealed an apportunity to saying on the development of a schedule which would allow that to participate mappingfully in a process which may well determine that reconstic futures. As the duncil leaves in the halflow moratorium wars, affected fithermen wish to participat directly in these deliberations, and ast only through their representatives.

It will not be possible for most of the affected industry to offer comments on rabladish management before the May Council mention—most sabladish dishermen are fishing, and there are many other weighty insues on the Council agends. Any apparent attempt to "ratiroad" I sited entry will likely sugger messive opposition. This most velectle issue should be handled deliberately.

We respectfully remast and advise that positic proposals for emblefish menagement be requested between the May and September; Council mentions, Signed by: Dave Woodruff, Oliver Molm, and Thorn Smith.

D-2 GITH OF ALASK! GROUNDFISH FMR

1947 Follock Apportionments to UAP, JVP and TAREF

The AF recommends the Council request NMTS, to provide updated information at the May meeting reporting TQs, TAP potential, and TVP plans. "This would include: '() any new and pertinent biological information (including results from the hydrocoustic surveys and applicable ctudies): (2) the evalue of a formal survey of TAP processors, including an estimate of DAP processing corradity ready but not able to get fish; and (3) an indication of the number of vessels gearing up for shoreside delivery. The motion certied 14 to (.

The AP fasts in a bind on this subject. Although they recognize that Scoretary Calio has asked the Council to review HMFS' thedings, they feel there was inadequate information to do so.

Regarding the AP's request for biological information—the AP's understreding is that the TOs and allocardens decided upon in December have been established as "preliminary" initial specifications. The AF heard, much anecdetal evidence regarding pollock not showing up in Shelikof, very small fish thou up up in nets, and low CPUEs—all of which brought back the fears for this stock which appeared in the Resource Assessment Document lost fall.

Despite this anesdotal evidence, the AP feels is hes no quantifiable information with which to make a recommendation to WMFS regrating finalising the initial exectfication for MQ. WMFS indicated to us that new information for m hydroacoustic surveys could be available as early as this week and that has were correctly corductive age/longth studies in Both half to which could be noteen available by the May exerting.

AP Minutes March 1987

The results of revised DAP surveys were also difficult to analyze because NMFS, due to confidentiality concerns, could not clarify which DAP operators had been discounted or exactly how the discount assumptions were made. Industry testimony suggests that some of the assumptions may have been faulty, but there was no information with which the AP could review the reallocation numbers.

For that reason the AP suggests that NMFS do a <u>formal</u> survey of processors. The survey: (1) could prove substantially different from an informal telephone survey; (2) could include discussions and cross-checking with discounted processors; (3) could include questions regarding plants that have the processing capacity available but which are not able to get fish; and (4) could include analysis of vessels gearing up for shoreside delivery.

A final aspect of the AP's discussion was whether this decision to delay the allocation decision would hurt joint venture operators. The AP heard conflicting testimony on that point—some people thought it wouldn't make any difference to wait until May since the joint ventures wouldn't begin again until October, others thought there might be an opportunity to begin immediately.

Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Amendment 16

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion carried 7 to 6.

Although they recognize the model in the RIR/EA indicates little impact, the majority of the AP feels this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. The majority feels problems in the model will come out during the public comment period. The minority feels the model shows this proposal will have minimal biological or economic impacts, and feels it is a waste of Council and industry time to comment on it.

If the Council decides to release this issue for public comment, the AP strongly recommends that the model be translated into lay language for public review.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Recommended for public review as amended. (See Bering Sea groundfish Am. 11)

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Recommended for public review. (See Bering Sea groundfish Amendment 11)

The results of revised DAP souveys were also difficult to easily a because MNEY, due to confidentiality concerns, could not clarify which LAP operators had been discorpted or exactly how the discount assumptions were made. Industry cestimony suggests that some of the assumptions may have been faulty, but diere was no information with which the AP could review the reallocation numbers.

For that reason the AD suggests that MSFS do a formal survey of processors. The smivey: (1) could prove subscantially different from an informal telephone survey: (2) could include discussions and cross-charking with discounted processors; (3) could include questions regarding plants that have the processing councity available but which are not able to get libb; and (4) could include analysis of vessels gearing up for aboraside delivery.

A filed aspect of he AP's discussion was whether this decision to delay the allocation decision would hurt foint venture operators. The AP heard coefficing tretimony on that point—some people thought it wouldn't make any difference to wait until May siace the joint ventures couldn't begin again until Occober, others thought there might be an opportunity to begin translated.

Gulf of Alacke Croundfish Amendment 15

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion carried 7 to 6.

Although they recognize the model in the RIR/VA indicator little immact, the majority of the AP feels this is on important issue that he decise to be addressed. The majority feels problems in the model will come out during the public comment period. The minority feels the model shows this proposal will have winimal biological or aconomic impacts, and feels it is a waste of Council and industry time to convent on it.

If the Council decides to release this issue for public comment, the AP strongly recommends that the model be translated into key larguage for public recies.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Bralaska Island.

Recommended for public review as thended. (See Bering Sea groundfish Am. 11)

Pavise the definition of probibited species.

Recommended for public review. (See Bering See groundfish Amendment 11)

Improve catch recording requirements.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review incorporating the SSC's recommendation for a fourth alternative:

Alternative 4: Apply the "Cumulative Product Log" and the "Transfer Logbook" recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels.

The motion carried 11 to 3.

Note: The cumulative product log would include only the lower section of the sample catch log presented by NMFS (see Attachment 1).

Several questions and points came out during the AP debate:

- (1) Why are the requirements applied to only one part of the fleet?
- (2) Will scientists and others believe the information coming from discard logs?
- (3) Widespread opposition to showing detailed set positions, set courses, etc.
- (4) Questions regarding the need for reporting accuracy to .01 of a metric ton.
- (5) A recommendation that NMFS clearly define violations (sampling studies) and penalties.

Fishing season framework.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review with Alternative 2 amended to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation. That criteria would include an analysis of whether seasons would have an allocative impact. The motion carried 14 to 1.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).

The AP recommends a rewritten and amended proposal be sent out for public review. The rewritten version would:

- (1) Clearly outline examples of how this may impact a particular fishery.
- (2) Clearly outline how PSC limits will be determined, enforced, and appealed.
- (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis.

The proposal would be amended to include a third alternative.

Alternative 3: Defer the issue of bycatch of prohibited species to the Bycatch Subcommittee.

The motion carried 11 to 3.

Especye catch recording requirements.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review incorporating the CSC's recommendation for a fourth alternative:

alterrective 4: Apply the "Cumulative Product Log" and the "Transfer Logbook recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor methods processor methods.

The motion corried I! to 3.

More: The cumulative product log would factuals only the cover section of the sample cauch log presented by NMFS (see Augachment 1).

Severel questions and points came out during the AP debate:

- (1) Why are the requirements applied to only one part of the floot?
- (2) Will schentists and others believe the information coming from discard logar
- (3) Widespread opposition to showing detailed set positions, set courses, atc.
- (4) Questions respecting the need for reporting securacy to .01 of a metric ten.
- [5] A recommondation that HMFS clearly define violations (sempling studies) and penalties.

Fishing season framework.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public newler with Alternative 2 amended to include additional critaric for proposal contration. That exiteria could include an analysis or whether sessons would have an ellective improve. The motion correct 14 to 1.

E pand the suisting halibut PSC framework to include all creditioned "prohibited spacies" (i.e., halibur, solven, sing and Tanuar crabs).

The AD recommends a raweitten and amended proposed be sent our for public veriew. The rownicten version upuid:

- (1) Classly outline examples of how this may impace a particular fichery.
- (2) Clearly outline Low 190 Maits will be determined, and ampealed.
 - (3) More clearly state the cost/benefit analysis.

The proposal would be amended to include a chird alternative.

Alternative 3: Defer the issue of bycatch of puphibited species to the Avcatch Subcommittee.

The motton carried II to 3.

Debate on the AP included:

- (1) Concern over using this mechanism for allocation between gear types (like setting a PSC limit to zero for a specific area).
- (2) Concern about how PSC limits would actually be set. The staff indicated the procedure for setting limits would be identical to those used in the halibut framework. Industry testimony indicated that the halibut procedure was not overly clear. "It seems like a number which comes out of the computer at the December meeting."

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public comment. The motion carried unanimously.

D-3 BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS GROUNDFISH FMP

Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish Amendment 11

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Recommended for public review (see Gulf of Alaska groundfish Amendment 16).

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

The AP recommends an amended version of the alternatives for this proposal be sent out for public review. The amended version includes the following six alternatives:

<u>Alternative 1</u>: Do nothing (no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed only for those fishing for DAP operators.

Alternative 3: Establish a year-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°N. latitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed for those delivering to DAP operators or for those delivering to foreign processors laying outside the small square.

Alternative 4: Establish seasonal area closures within the small square.

Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

 $\underline{\text{Alternative 6}}$: Spread out JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year.

The motion carried 14 to 4. The vote on the AP indicated that 17 of 18 supported sending out Alternatives 1 and 6 for public review.

42A/AQ -5-

Debate on the AP included:

- Goncern over using this mechanism for allocation between easy types (like setting a PSC limit to zero for a specific area).
- (2) Concern observition PSC limits would according be sen. The staff indicated the procedure for serting limits would be (deptical to case used in the halibut stamswork, fodustry restimons indicated that the halibut procedure was not everly clear. "It some like a number which comes out of the computer at the December meeting."

Indate Gulf of Alaska FM descriptive notions, reorganize charters, and incomponent Council policy as directed.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public connect. The motion carried unontmously.

D-3 BERING SHA/ALEUTIAN ISLAMBS CROUNDFIEL MIP

Sering dea/Alautian Island: Groundfish Amandmer 11

Nstablich a minimum ofte limit for asbleftsh.

becommended for public review (see Gulf of Alasky groundfish broadmant 46).

MAP priority within 100 miles of Unalceka helend.

The AP recommends an amended version of the alternatives for this proposal be sent out for public review. The smeaded version includes the following simplicernatives:

Atternative 1: 00 noticing (no ones restrictions on foreign processors sectiving fish from U.S. (ishermen).

Alternactive 2: Establish a year-round area closure not to enced the small square (the area bounded by 52°30' and 55°K. layitude between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within that area would be allowed only for those fishing for DAP operators.

Alternative 3: Natablish a pear-round area closure not to exceed the small square (the area bounded by 50°30° and 55°N. Lauturke between 164° and 169°W. longitude). Fishing within their area would be allowed for those delivating to DAP operators or for those delivating to foreign processors laying outside the small square.

Alternative 4: Escablish sensoned area closures within the small square.

Alternative 5: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture filsh.

Alternative 6: Speed out JVP allocations over a number of sensons within the year.

The motion carried 14 to 4. The vote on the .T indicated that 17 of 18 supported sanding out Alternatives 1 and 5 for public maview.

The AP considered several points in its debate:

- (1) After extensive discussion and testimony about the RIR document the AP recommended numerous changes to the authors.
- (2) One major cause of concern was uncertainty over what problem this proposal is trying to solve. For example:
 - (a) In the RIR the plan team focused on getting fish to shore.
 - (b) The proposer testified that the key problem is Americanization.
 - (c) Much testimony centered on widespread fears about concentrating fishing effort on spawning stocks.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion carried unanimously.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Recommended for public review (see Gulf of Alaska groundfish Amendment 16).

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion carried unanimously.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review with two changes:

- (1) Deletion of all editorial comments. An example of editorial comments is on page 73 which describes Alternative 3 as the most "conservative and protective".
- (2) Amend Alternative 3 to read: "Annually set the upper end of the OY range equal to annual estimates of EY/ABC but not to exceed 2.0 million metric tons."

The motion carried 17 to 1.

Debate within the AP clearly indicated that the majority believes we \underline{do} need an artificial constraint or cap on the catch.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion carried 12 to 4.

The AP considered several points in their debate including:

- (1) Deep concern over whether harvesting such a large percentage of the pollock quota during the spawning season has adverse biological impacts on the resource.
- (2) What problem are we trying to solve? Biological or economic waste?

42A/AQ -6-

The AT considered several points in its debate:

- (1) After excensive discussion and destinony about the RIR document the AP recommended numerous changes to the authors.
- (2) One major cause of concern was uncerrainty over what problem this proposal is trying to solve. For avancha:
 - (a) In the RIR the plan team focused on getring fish to shore.
- (b) The proposer testified that the key problem is Americaniastion.
- (d) Much descimony centered on widespread fears about concentrating fishing effort on spawning stocks.

Mey'se the definition of prohibited species.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The motion couried unanimously.

improve catch recording requirements.

Recommended for public review (see Gulf of Alaska eroundiish Amendment (6).

Pavise definition of acceptable biological reach (ABC).

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for public review. The metion carried unanimously.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (CY) range.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent out for miblic review with two charges:

- (1) Deletion of all editorial comments. An example of editorial comments is on page 73 which describes Alternative 3 as the most "conservative and proceedive".
- 2) Amend Alcernative 3 to read: "Aurually set the upper end of the QY range equal to annull ostimates of WY/ABC but not to exceed 2.0 sillion matric tons."

The motion cappaed 12 to 1.

Debate within the AP clearly instructed that the majority believes so do need an artificial constraint or day on the ortch.

Prohibit pollock ree-stripping.

The AP recommends this proposal be sent our for public coview. The motion carried 10 to 4.

The AT considered several points in their dehate including:

- Deep concern over whather harvosticg such a large percentage of the pollock quots during the spanning season has edverse biological impacts on the rescures.
- (2) that problem are we trying to solve? Bidlogical on constant worself.

FISHING LOG

:				RME	TROON POST	TION :	OPERATOR		i						
	FISHING REA	: :GERR:	SET : TIME : (GNT)		set Set Sition	COURS OF SET	DEPTH			HRULIN POSITI	s I	OF POTS:	# OR HOOKS:	TRRHL MESH	
	103 34.											<u></u>			i
							-					i	· ·		-
									ı						i
		:					-;								
		; ;				;		·							
	-¦	:		******			_ ;								
	-¦		:												<u> </u>
MMMMM	-;	 	 *******************************	*******	***********	;	**************************************	KKKKKKKKK	*************	**********	***********		HEMMERKERSE	*****	*******
PECIES	:		1	:	:		1		!	:		: 	<u> </u>		
RILY									•			•	_		
	5		:	•					i !			i ! 		:	
	5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		i Markakaka	ARREPRESS	44444444×	MANAMANA	KPRHHHHHHHH	 		 			
ISCRRO	имминими / :	HHHHH	і Намана і		HARRAKKE	авиненияна	-чинининини	никинина никинина	ARRINARIA I	иниминини	инининини 	: : : : : : :	(HAMMAMAMAMA)	нижими	
ISCARD	MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM		CHAMMAN		MARKAMMEN		«ЧИМИМИКЬ» «Напримикь»	жинийний 	**************************************			HANKAMANA)			**************************************
PECIES PRODU AILY T	MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM				MARKAMEKE MARKAMEK MARKAME		**************************************	######################################	**************************************				**************************************		
PECIES PRODU AILY T SESSE UMULAT	OTAL IVE	CHECK			SECOLULES SECOLU						***********		•		