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: Nancy Munro
Nancy Munro, Chairman
Date: 5.20.87

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	Lamar Cotten	Rick Lauber
Robert Alverson, Vice Chairman	Edwin Fuglvog	Dan O'Hara
Rupe Andrews	Ron Hegge	Ron Peterson
Terry Baker	Oliver Holm	Thorn Smith
Alvin Burch	Pete Isleib	Dave Woodruff
Joseph Chimegalrea	Cameron Jensen	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:

March - May	Solicit proposals for long-term sablefish management. These would include traditional management concepts as well as limited entry.
May	Review proposals and decide which to have the staff develop further.
September	Review staff drafts and decide which to send out for public comment.
December	Final decision.

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.

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.

Limited entry groups. A proposal to establish a ruched and rigid schedule for consideration of limited entry to the Gulf sablefish fishery was heard by the Advisory Panel for the first time on Wednesday, March 16. Nothing in the draft agenda gave notice that such an issue might surface--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 aware. 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 future. 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 CHIEF OF ADAPS' CONVENTION TRIP

1977 Pollock Approximate 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 area/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 Gallo 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 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 other were currently conducting age/length studies in Kodiak which could be made available by the May meeting.

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 formal 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 surveys were also difficult to analyze because MMS, due to confidentiality concerns, could not clarify which IAP 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 recalculation numbers.

For that reason the AP suggests that MMS do a formal 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 jobs; 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 operations. 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 December, others thought there might be an opportunity to begin immediately.

Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Amendment 14

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 SIR/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)

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.

Preserve certain recording requirements.

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

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

The motion carried 11 to 3.

Note: The cumulative product log would include only the upper section of the sample card 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) Does time 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 resolution 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.

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:

Alternative 1: 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.

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.

Debate on the AP included:

(1) Concern over using this mechanism for allocation between easy 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 representatives 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 PSC descriptive sections, removing obsolete and incomplete Council policy as directed.

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

B-1 BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS GROUNDFISH FMP

Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish Amendment 11

Establish a minimum size limit for pollock.

Recommended for public review (see Gulf of Alaska groundfish amendment 10).

'AP' authority 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 alternatives:

Alternative 1: No action (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.

Alternative 6: Spread out JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year.

The motion carried 14 to 4. The vote on the 3 indicated that 17 of 18 supported sending out Alternatives 1 and 3 for public review.

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 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?

The AP considered several points in its debate:

(1) After extensive discussion and testimony about the NTR 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 KIK 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 (6).

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 23 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 OY/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 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?

ATTACHMENT 1
MARCH 1987
Advisory Panel Minutes

FISHING LOG

PAGE #	YEAR-NON-DAY	VESSEL NAME	NOON POSITION	OPERATOR

TRAWL OR SET #	FISHING AREA #	GEAR TYPE	SET TIME (GMT)	SET POSITION	COURSE OF SET	SEA DEPTH (METERS)	DEPTH OF SET (METERS)	HAULING TIME (GMT)	HAULING POSITION	# OF POTS OR LL UNITS	# OR HOOKS PER LL UNIT	TRAWL MESH SIZE	HAUL/SET WEIGHT ESTIMATE

SPECIES													
DAILY DISCARDS													
SPECIES/ PRODUCT													
DAILY TOTAL													
CUMULATIVE TOTAL													
CUMULATIVE OFF-LOADED													
BALANCE													