

# 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

Certified: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES APRIL 21-25, 1991 KODIAK, AK

The Advisory Panel for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council met on April 21-24, 1991, at the Fishery Industrial Technology Center in Kodiak, Alaska. Members in attendance were:

George Anderson  
Loretta Lure  
Pete Maloney  
Dave Woodruff  
Dan O'Hara  
Kevin Kaldestad  
Jay Skordahl

David Little  
Harold Sparck  
Beth Stewart  
Lyle Yeck  
Ed Fuglvog  
John Roos  
Perfenia Pletnikoff

John Bruce  
Al Burch  
Phil Chitwood  
Dave Fraser  
Robert Wurm  
Lyle Yeck

Minutes for the January 1991 meeting were approved.

### C-1 INSHORE/OFFSHORE

The AP received a detailed presentation on Amendment 18/23 (a.k.a. the inshore/offshore amendment) from the analytical team which reviewed the issues, proposed alternatives and the results of the supplemental environmental impact statement. At the request of the AP, Peter Fricke, NMFS also provided a summary of recent NMFS policy decisions and guidelines with regard to preparation and subsequent use of social impact analysis.

The AP unanimously recommends that the Council approve the SEIS analysis for a 45-day public review. In support of this motion, the AP recognize that the Council will be in a position to take final action on this amendment at its June meeting. Some members voiced their concern that without specific Council action on this issue in June, inshore industry could face increased preemption. Other members noted that any industry concerns with the management alternatives and the analysis will be identified during public review.

Among the AP, there was a general understanding that the Council has the ability to modify the 'rules' section of Alternative 3 at the June meeting (i.e., move freezer/longliners back to the offshore sector or modify the 'mothership' classification) within the framework of the Council's analysis

package, as well as the Council's ability to select percentage allocations within the range analyzed as opposed to the specific examples in the EA/RIR.

There was also a motion to initiate development of a community development quota system in association with the inshore/offshore for the June meeting. This motion failed 2-15; the AP felt that CDQ concerns are being handled under limited access proposals.

## **C-2 USER FEE PLAN**

The AP reviewed the EA/RIR analysis of the proposed user-fee program. Given the many alternatives and suboptions presented in the analysis, the AP undertook a process to select their "preferred alternative" by choosing various options under Alternative 2. The AP's recommendations are provided in Attachment 1.

## **C-3 SABLEFISH MANAGEMENT**

The AP received the staff report on the revised Supplement to the SEIS for sablefish limited entry. There was general frustration at having to review a document on such short notice and make a recommendation on whether to send it out for public review. The AP then took public testimony from three persons. A major concern gleaned from this testimony was that a program would be approved which has not been thought out as to the logistics of how it would actually work. This concern was shared by a majority of the AP who felt that the document was deficient in this area.

Specifically, the AP believes that any analysis of limited entry should include thought out details of how the system will work in terms of administration, enforcement, financing. Examples of unanswered questions which were pointed out include: How exactly will NMFS track landings of sablefish for individual QS holders? Where will the unloading sites be and how will this effect the operations of fishermen and processors? What additional costs would be imposed on the fleet due to the methods of tracking landings and due to specific unloading sites? How is the program going to be financed given the tight budgets NMFS is already operating under? Would this program impose such costs on the fishermen and to what degree?

The AP is reluctant to sign off on a system in which these details would be worked out later. Since the sablefish analysis is likely to be a blueprint for all other limited entry analyses, the AP feels these concerns should be answered before the fact, not after. Some members of the AP felt that the document was also deficient in its content of social impact analysis.

A motion was unanimously adopted by the AP which reads "we recommend that the analysis be sent out for a public comment period between now and the June meeting; the Council should at that time chose a preferred alternative for the sablefish IFQ system and that a more detailed analysis of that preferred alternative would be performed before making a final decision". It was the sense of the AP that this analysis would address the concerns listed above.

## **C-4 HALIBUT MANAGEMENT**

The AP received the staff report which outlined the alternatives based on the alternatives in the sablefish package tentatively identified for the halibut IFQ analysis. The AP in general identified the same concerns with this analysis as with the sablefish analysis in terms of the logistics of the system. Again, the same unanswered questions should be answered before the Council makes a final decision.

Public testimony from 2 persons was received during which the same concerns were expressed. The potential need for a social impact assessment was also discussed by the AP.

The AP then undertook to identify a preferred alternative to be analyzed together with the status quo. A main motion was formulated which read: 'the AP recommends to the Council that the staff proceed with an analysis of the 2 alternatives (1) the status quo and (2) Alternative 5 from the spreadsheet (the Tillion/Hegge proposal) amended as follows":

The AP then went down the list of provisions under this alternative and proceeded with amendments to the main motion, to add and/or delete provisions from the alternative. The resultant alternative, which the AP recommends for analysis reads as follows:

1. Gear and areas

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

2. Shares and Quotas

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

3. Initial Assignment of QS

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

4. Qualifying period and Initial QS amount

Option 1 - must have fished 1984-1990; use best 5 of 6 years.

Option 2 - must have fished 1986-1990; use best 3 of 5 years.

5. Emphasis on recent landings

Same as depicted on spreadsheet (no weighting).

6. Vessel category designations

Option 1 - NO vessel categories.

Option 2 - Vessel categories as follows:

(a) < 35' length overall

(b) 35-60'

(c) 60-90'

(d) > 90'

7. Duration of QS program

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

## 8. Calculating IFQ poundages

IFQ poundage is calculated by multiplying the QS percentage times the halibut quota for an area; this is the quota after the 20% set aside has been subtracted.

## 9. Transfer of QS/IFQs

Option 1 - QS/IFQs fully saleable and:

Suboption (a) leasable; any 'Person' may control IFQs. Proof of citizenship or majority ownership and control may be required.

Suboption (b) non-leasable; Any 'Person' may purchase QS, but must own the vessel the QS/IFQs will be used on, or must be on board the vessel using the QS/IFQs as crew or operator.

Option 2 - Applies to both catcher vessels and freezer/longliners - Initial recipients can be 'Persons' and do not have to be on the vessel or sign the fish ticket to use the IFQs. Subsequent users must be (or designate within 90 days) a U.S. citizen as owner of the QS who must be on board the vessel using the IFQ and who must sign the fish ticket, unless an allowable lease exists. Then, the leaseholder must be a U.S. citizen and must be aboard and sign the fish ticket. No more than 50% of any person's IFQs may be leased except in cases of illness, injury, or emergency to be defined by NMFS.

## 10. Limitations on holdings (own/control)

2% of overall fixed gear quota, but initial recipients of more than 2% may continue to own or control the excess but not more. No more than 2% can be used on one vessel. Suboption for a 1% cap on ownership.

## 11. General Provisions

Same as depicted in spreadsheet with the following additions:

\* up to 5% of the fixed gear QS could be purchased by other gear groups. So, up to 5% of the fixed gear quota could be valid for other gear groups.

\* QS would be designated a use right and could not be attached.

## 12. Discards

Holders of unused IFQ must retain legal sized halibut.

## 13. Open Access

20% of fixed gear TAC will be set aside for open access fishery as described below (community development quota could be included within this 20% umbrella):

Each area's fixed gear TAC divided 80% IFQs and 20% open access. IFQ holder for any area would not be permitted to fish any area's open access fishery except as noted

in this paragraph. Open access fishery managed by exclusive registration area (existing IPHC areas to begin with). Fourth quarter clean-up fishery open to any person or vessel if they do not own/control unused IFQs. Exclusive areas rescinded.

#### 14. Coastal Community Considerations

Up to 8% of the fixed gear TAC may be used as CDQ to disadvantaged communities. This would come out of the 20% set aside.

#### 15. Administration

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

#### 16. Unloading provisions

Option 1 - No unloading provisions

Option 2 - All first point of sale purchasers of halibut (processed or unprocessed) would be required to obtain a purchaser's license from NMFS. Vessels may unload halibut (processed or unprocessed) only in areas agreed to by industry and NMFS. Prior notification of such offloading may be required by NMFS.

#### 17. Program financing

Same as depicted in spreadsheet.

The main motion, as amended, passed by a vote of 14-4. An additional motion was made to recommend that the analysis for halibut include a social impact assessment (SIA) similar in scope and content to the one prepared for the inshore/offshore analysis. This motion passed by a vote of 16-2.

### C-5 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANNING

#### a. Moratorium

The AP reviewed the staff's moratorium summary document and the recommended revisions of the Fishery Planning Committee as presented in item C-5(a). There was considerable discussion on the general concept of the moratorium and whether its merits, given the Council's current agenda and workload, warrant proceeding with the proposal at this time.

A motion to recommend that the Council withdraw the moratorium proposal from Council consideration failed 6-12. The makers of this motion argued that the Council has a history of announcing their intentions to develop a moratorium or limited entry program and then change direction or change the qualifying criteria which results in increased instability in the regulatory environment.

The majority of the AP view the moratorium proposal as the only proposal before the Council that in any way attempts to directly address the problem of overcapitalization in our fisheries. Many members agree that a moratorium is not the solution to overcapitalization, but a step toward a solution.

Therefore, the AP recommends that the Council instruct staff to proceed with analysis of the revised objectives and elements of a proposed moratorium on all fisheries under its jurisdiction as outlined in Attachment 2 and to develop a schedule for implementation. This motion passed 16-3.

The AP used the FPC's revised list of options as the basis for its recommendations. Attachment 2 presents a further refinement of the list of options to simplify and improve the analysis.

b. Groundfish and Crab Limited Access.

The AP recommends that the Council communicate to the Secretary their desire to develop and have evaluated, a comprehensive management program for the groundfish and crab fisheries in conjunction with a moratorium. This motion passed 11-5.

The AP believes this letter would signal the Council's desire to accept NMFS funds for IFQ analysis and that the Council wants to move ahead with a limited access program.

D-1 Groundfish

(a) Bycatch Management in the Groundfish Fisheries

1. Review performance of new "pelagic" trawls

The AP wishes to reiterate its feeling, as it did originally concerning this issue, that they do not want to see fisheries managed by gear type. For example, they would rather see the directed cod fishery close when a bycatch cap is reached as opposed to trying to manage with a gear definition. The AP unanimously adopted a motion which supports the NMFS efforts to accomplish this ASAP and further recommends that the directed fishing definition for that closed fishery be reduced to some level below the current 20% level to help eliminate "getting around" the closure. The AP recommends emergency action to accomplish this, if necessary, and that the same measures be instituted for the Gulf of Alaska.

2. Status report on revised incentive program

The AP received the report stating that the measures are being reviewed in D.C. and might be in effect by early May.

3. Set bycatch standards for 3rd and 4th quarters

The AP recommends the following bycatch rate standards for the 3rd and 4th quarters of 1991 (unanimous vote):

BSAI Pacific cod - 2.2%

BSAI flatfish -.3% (this was set low to be able to get the vessel who may be fishing at .6%, for example, instead of setting it at .6%)

GOA rockfish - 4.0% (same as preliminary standards)

GOA Pacific cod - 3.29% for 3rd quarter and 5.15% for 4th quarter (same as preliminary standards)

BSAI flatfish (for King crab) - 1.5 animals/mt

4. Report on activities of Ad Hoc Bycatch Committee

The AP reviewed the minutes from the Bycatch Committee; no further action was taken by the AP on this issue.

5. Joint statement on salmon bycatch

The AP reviewed the joint statement.

6. Work schedule for 1992 bycatch management

The AP reviewed the list of 14 bycatch issues currently before the Council and the Bycatch Committee. The AP recommends that the Council begin immediately to develop a comprehensive bycatch management system which will provide for individual bycatch accounting in both the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands areas. This motion passed unanimously.

7. Report on 1991 salmon bycatch and possible Council action.

The AP recommends the following salmon bycatch initiatives be implemented by the Council: (unanimous vote)

A. That in the event that the Council determines that a 4th quarter groundfish fishery will be pursued in the EEZ off Alaska in 1991, that an emergency regulation be put in place to limit king salmon bycatch.

B. That the NPFMC recommend that the Secretary put in place a chinook salmon bycatch plan amendment on an expedited schedule for the 1992 fishing year, and implemented January 1, 1992 by emergency order.

C. That the Council request that the Secretary determine the time and area of salmon of U.S. origin in the international waters of the Bering Sea, the Donut Hole.

D. That the Council seek a Plan Amendment attaching the permits of U.S. vessels permitted to fish within the EEZ that fish in the Donut Hole.

E. That the Council extend its zone of authority beyond the EEZ into waters where scientific evidence demonstrates salmon of U.S. origin, and that the Council request that the Secretaries of Commerce and Transportation put into regulation a rebuttal presumption claim to all waters of the Bering Sea in the event that the Secretary determines salmon of U.S. origin are to be found in that zone, and further seek authority to seize any vessels found in the Donut Hole with salmon on board presumed to be U.S. in origin.

The AP is deeply concerned with the chinook bycatch matter in the International waters of the Bering Sea and in the EEZ off Alaska. We urge the Council to initiate action which will address this issue expeditiously.

**(b) 17/22 Groundfish Plan Amendments**

The AP received a staff review of the proposed Amendment 17/22 package. The amendment is comprised of 5 amendment topics.

The AP recommends that the Council approve the amendment document for public review with the following suggestions:

With reference to the proposed Walrus Islands closed areas: The AP recommends that the team include estimates of the entire Bering Sea walrus population in the document.

With reference to experimental fishery permits: The AP recommends that observer costs for vessels participating in experimental fisheries be paid by the permit holder. Also, the Regional Director must consult with Council before publishing Notice in the Federal Register (unanimous).

With reference to the issue of a groundfish pot definition: The AP recommends that a 4th alternative be added which would allow for registration and identification (with a tag) of pots. This alternative would address the stated problem by providing management and enforcement with a method of identifying the gear as either a groundfish or crab pot.

The AP also recommends a 5th alternative which is to formally deter Council action on this issue until a Industry/Government Workshop can be held to develop better pot definitions. The AP heard a report from ADF&G staff which mentioned that such a workshop was being planned.

The AP passed this motion by a vote of 18-1.

**(c) Consideration of Schedule for Analyzing Quarterly Cod Allocations in the Bering Sea Aleutian Area**

The AP received a brief staff report regarding the issue of quarterly Pacific cod allocations in the BS/AI.

The AP discussion initially focused on Pacific cod allocation in the Bering Sea-Aleutian Island area. The discussion shifted to problems resulting from having BSAI fishing effort transfer to the GOA when BSAI quarterly allocations were met. Concern was expressed regarding trawl vs. longline vs. pot fishing effort.

The following motion was made in response to this discussion. "The AP requests the council to task the staff with analyzing a plan amendment that would provide the Council with the authority to seasonally/quarterly allocate Pacific cod in both the BSAI and GOA". The motion was adopted, 7-3.

**D-1(e) Prohibit Trawling in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska.**

The AP discussed a request the council had received from the Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association (ALFA) regarding trawling fishing effort in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska.

Discussion centered on initiating this proposal through either an out of cycle Plan Amendment or an emergency order. The AP took public testimony regarding this issue.

The AP questioned the intent of this proposal, whether it was based on conservation or socio-economic intentions. If the intent of the request was to reduce the negative impacts to the



traditional SE hook and line fishing community by trawling effort in the GOA, then the AP questioned the appropriateness of an emergency rule to achieve the objectives of this proposal.

Discussion also included state vs. federal management of Demersal Shelf Rockfish.

A motion was adopted by the AP which reads "The AP recommends that the Council initiate an offcycle Plan Amendment to propose a prohibition of bottom trawling east of 140 West longitude as a priority bycatch issue.

The AP also adopted another motion recommending the Council implement an emergency rule prohibiting bottom trawling east of 140 West longitude due to habitat degradation and socio-economic concerns to be effective July 1, 1991. This motion passed on a role call vote, 7-4. Members voting for the motion include: J. Bruce, L. Lure, P. Pletnikoff, J. Skordahl, B. Stewart, D. Woodruff and R. Wurm. Members voting against the motion include: G. Anderson, P. Maloney, D. Fraser and L. Yeck.

## SUMMARY OF USER FEE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Status Quo - Observers paid for directly by vessels and processors requiring coverage.

Alternative 2: Establish a system of user fees to pay for the costs of implementing the Plan.

### Key Elements and Options of Proposed User Fee System

1. A fisheries research plan will be developed for all fisheries under the Council's jurisdiction excluding salmon.
2. The Plan, or the implementing regulations, will identify the covered fisheries by species group and area. These will be referred to as the plan fisheries. Initially, the plan fisheries will be the Alaska groundfish and halibut fisheries and the BSAI king and Tanner crab fisheries. include all fisheries, except salmon, that are within council jurisdiction
3. Initially, the plan and user fee fisheries will include both State water and EEZ areas.
  - Option 3a: ~~Initial - Do not include donut hole fisheries in program.~~
  - Option 3b: Include donut hole fisheries.
4. The Plan, or the implementing regulations, will identify the research plan fisheries from which fees will be collected. These will be referred to as the user fee fisheries.
  - Option 4a: ~~Initial - collect fees from groundfish, halibut and Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands king and Tanner crab fisheries to support groundfish observers. Do not incorporate State crab observer program into Plan.~~
  - Option 4b: ~~Same as 4a, except exempt crab catcher/processors or floating processors which pay for State observers. Crab catchers not paying for State observers would pay into federal program.~~
  - Option 4c: Same as 4a, but incorporate financing of the State BSAI crab observer program into Plan.
  - Option 4.d ~~User fees will be collected from all processors that receive BSAI king or Tanner crab; however, each processor would receive a credit up to the full amount of its user fee liability for its direct payments for required observer coverage. The State observer program will not be incorporated into the Plan.~~
5. The Regional Director, in consultation with the Council, will establish the fee for the fishing year. The fee will be expressed as a percentage of exvessel value. The fee will be set so that the total fees are expected to equal which ever is less: (1) the cost of implementing the fisheries research plan minus any other Federal funds that support the observer program and any existing surplus

in the North Pacific Fishery Observer Fund; or (2) 1% of the total exvessel value of all the plan fisheries. The fee will be established prior to the beginning of the fishing year for which it will be used.

6. Although the fees may be assessed against all fishing vessels and fish processors, the fees will be collected from all (i.e., onshore and at-sea) processors participating in the user fee fisheries. The total fees to be collected from each processor will be the product of the established fee and the estimated exvessel value of fish the processor received from the user fee fisheries. In the case of a catcher/processor, fish retained for processing are considered to be received fish. The estimate of exvessel value will be based on the amount of fish by species group received for processing and a fishery-wide estimate of exvessel price by species group. The estimates of exvessel prices will exclude any value added by processing. For the purposes of the user fee system, a fishing operation that delivers fish to a processor outside of the Council's jurisdiction (e.g., Canada, Washington, or Oregon) will be considered to be a processor.

Option 6a: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 6b: Both retained catch and discards will be subject to user fees ~~except king and Tanner crab discards in king and Tanner crab fisheries~~

Option 6c: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 6d: Exvessel price and fish usage data provided by each processor who purchased unprocessed fish in the user fee fisheries will be used to estimate the exvessel value of user fee fishery fish for that processor and period. For integrated harvesting and processing operations that do not purchase unprocessed fish, data provided by all processors who purchased unprocessed fish in the user fee fisheries will be used to estimate the average exvessel price by species group for that period.

~~Option 6e: Require at-sea processors to weigh or volumetrically measure the fish to determine the true weight of fish retained for processing, and discards, require catcher vessels to weigh or volumetrically measure discards.~~

7. ~~Each processor that purchases fish from a user fee fishery will calculate the quarterly fee payments based on the amount of fish it received, the fee, and the actual exvessel price paid to the fisherman. Other processors who receive fish from a user fee fishery will base payments on the amount of fish it received, the fee, and the NMFS published exvessel prices. The fees will be due within 30 days of the end of the fishing quarter on which the fees are assessed.~~
8. After each twelve-month period, the actual fee liability of each processor will be calculated by the NMFS. If a processor's fee liability is greater than the ~~monthly quarterly~~ payments that were received, the processor will be billed for the difference and the bill will be due within 30 days. If the ~~monthly quarterly~~ payments exceed the fee liability, the difference will be used as a credit toward future ~~monthly quarterly~~ payments. It would be a violation to make late or inadequate payments. Fee collections will be administered by the NOAA Office of the Comptroller.

Option 8a: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 8b: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 8c: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 8d: ~~[Deleted]~~

Option 8e: Quarterly payments with annual reconciliation.

9. All fish processors participating in plan fisheries will be required to have a federal permit. Processors will apply for a federal permit annually. The permits will be issued semi-annually to any processor that is current with respect to its fee payments.
10. The information necessary to implement the Plan will be made available by improving the fish ticket system or by changing reporting requirements.
11. The best available information will be used to determine: (1) the fee to be used each year; (2) the exvessel prices that will be published and used by ~~catcher~~processors to calculate their ~~monthly~~ ~~quarterly~~ fee payments; and (3) the exvessel prices that will be used to calculate post season fee liabilities. The information and the resulting fee and prices will be subject to public review prior to becoming final.
12. Each operation with an observer requirement will be responsible for obtaining observers from the NMFS. The lead time required to obtain an observer will be specified by the Observer Plan. ~~It is expected to be two months. The Observer Plan Industry/Council Oversight Committee will address lead time.~~
13. Funding is required to implement the North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan in early 1992.

Option 13a: Preferred - sufficient federal funds are available through special appropriation to implement plan without a transition period.

~~Option 13b: Fall back - No start-up funds are available and observer program is suspended until sufficient fees have been collected.~~

Option 13c: No start-up funds available; some operations must continue to pay directly for required observers.

Suboptions:

~~i. Vessels and plants required to take observers continue to pay directly to contractors and the user fee would be assessed without regard to the direct payments to contractors.~~

~~ii. Vessels and plants required to take observers continue to pay directly to contractors, but these vessels and plants would not be subject to the user fee for catch associated with the observer coverage.~~

~~iii. Vessels and plants required to take observers continue to pay directly to contractors, but these vessels and plants would be subject to only half of the normal fee for catch associated with the observer coverage.~~

iv. Full fees for all operations but user fee credits for direct payments for required coverage.

~~Option 13d: No start-up funds available; require pre-payments by industry.~~

14. Options to be used if the user fees are not adequate to fund the Plan.

~~Option 14.a Increase the exvessel value of the Plan fisheries.~~

~~Option 14.b Initial Reduce the cost of the plan.~~

~~Option 14.c Have Congress and the President increase the limit above 1%.~~

~~Option 14.d Have a supplemental observer program.~~

~~Option 14e: Have Observer Plan Industry/Council Oversight Committee address this issue. In addition the AP recommends that the Council write a letter to the Secretary requesting support for funding of this Plan.~~

15. Council appoint a Observer Plan Oversight Committee.

REVISED (as modified by AP on 4/23/91)  
OBJECTIVE AND ELEMENTS OF A PROPOSED MORATORIUM

**Moratorium Objective:** To control continued growth in fishing capacity while the Council assesses alternative management measures including, but not limited to, limited and open access measures to address the overcapacity problem and to achieve the optimum yield from the fisheries.

**Key Elements**

1. **Earliest Qualifying Date:** Must have made landings at least once during or after:

Option 1: 1980  
Option 2: 1976  
~~Option 3: No date~~

[AP recommends deletion of Option 3; No need to go back to beginning of time; Motion passes 14-5]

2. **Latest Qualifying Date:** Must have made landings on or before:

~~Options 1 & 2 combined:~~ September 15, 1990 with due consideration given those vessels that are active by January 15, 1992 if contracts by September 15, 1990 (or contracted by January 1, 1991, if disadvantaged by January 19, 1990 cutoff), as described in paragraphs a and b.

[AP recommends combining the option to reflect wording in FR Notice; Motion passes unanimously]

3. **No minimum qualifying poundage, just a legal landing in any qualifying year.**

4. **Exemption for Small Vessels**

Option 1: No exemptions for smaller vessels.  
Option 2: Exempt vessels less than 40' LOA  
~~Option 3: Exempt vessels less than 43' LOA in GOA and/or BSAI~~  
Option 4: Exempt vessels less than 60' LOA in GOA and/or BSAI

[AP recommends deletion of Option 3; save staff time during analysis; Motion passes 17-2].

5. Exemption for Disadvantaged Communities

Option 1: No exemptions.

~~Option 2: Use size exemption approach above assuming that disadvantaged communities will use smaller vessels.~~

Option 3: Define disadvantaged communities, define vessels, and then exempt its vessels. (Council include additional landings requirements.)

**[AP recommends deletion of Option 2; Options 1 and 3 are adequate for analysis; Motion passes unanimously]**

6. Exemption for Qualifying Vessels Lost or Destroyed Immediately before Moratorium begins (Two options for defining "immediately"; since 1/1/90 or since 6/15/89.)

Option 1: Can be replaced with similar capacity.

~~Option 2: Can be replaced with increased capacity limited to, for example, 20% more in LOA and/or width.~~

**[AP recommends deletion of Option 2; the AP is concerned that the 20% restriction may not allow compliance with anticipated US Coast Guard vessel safety regulations and deletion of this option also will prevent a person from increasing his vessel capacity under both Elements 6 and 10; Motion passes 11-9]**

7. Moratorium will be applied equally to all sector of industry.

(Sectors tentatively defined to include catcher/processors, catchers, and mothership processors.)

8. Length of Moratorium

Option 1: Until Council rescinds or replaces, not to exceed 4 years from implementation.

Option 2: Same as Option 1, but Council may extend for 2 years if limited access is imminent.

9. Fisheries Crossovers During Moratorium

Option 1: Any boat that qualifies to fish at all, may fish in any fishery (groundfish, crab, or halibut).

Option 2: Same as Option 1, but Council would be able to use a regulatory amendment to limit participation in specific fisheries to those who participated in the fishery before the moratorium was imposed.

10. Replacement of Vessels Lost or Destroyed During Moratorium.

- Option 1: Can be replaced with similar capacity.
- Option 2: Can be replaced with increased capacity limited to, for example, 20% more in LOA and/or width.

(Caveat: replaced vessels cannot be salvaged and come back into fishery.)

11. Replacement or Reconstruction of Vessels During Moratorium

- Option 1: Can be replaced with similar capacity but replaced vessel must leave fishery.
- Option 2: May increase capacity of vessel by 20% in LOA and/or width, once during moratorium years.
- Option 3: May reconstruct vessel to upgrade processing equipment and stability, but not increase fishing capacity through changes in LOA, width or horsepower, or other suitable index of fishing capacity.
- Option 4: May reconstruct vessel once during the moratorium to upgrade processing equipment and stability, but not increase catch carrying capacity by more than: (a) 20% for vessels 125' and greater, (b) 30% for vessels between 80'-125' (c) 40% for vessels 80' and less.

[AP recommends adding Option 4; Motion passes 15-3; ]

12. Appeals Procedure: Use adjudication board of government persons and nonvoting industry representatives.

[AP recommends the addition of active fishing industry representatives to the Board; this expertise will be necessary to properly evaluate appeals; Motion passes 15-3]



# 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

Certified: Richard B. Lauber  
Date: 6/19/91

## MINUTES Scientific and Statistical Committee April 21-23, 1991 Kodiak, AK

The Scientific and Statistical Committee of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council met April 21-23 at the University of Alaska, Fishery Technology Center. Members present were:

Richard Marasco, Chairman  
Doug Eggers, Vice Chairman  
Jack Tagart  
Larry Hreha

Gordon Kruse  
Dan Huppert  
John Burns  
Bill Aron

Don Rosenberg  
Terry Quinn  
Bill Clark  
Marc Miller

### Election of Officers

Drs. Bill Clark and Terry Quinn were elected Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the remainder of 1991. They will begin their terms of office on May 1, 1991.

### C-1 Inshore/Offshore

The SSC reviewed the Inshore/Offshore SEIS/RIR along with the associated Community Profiles. It also received a presentation of the various analyses from Council staff and the author of the SIA. The SSC notes the stringent time and budget constraints imposed on both the development of the analyses and associated reviews. These constraints may put the findings at risk and may result in incorrect conclusions concerning the effects of the proposed alternatives.

The SSC agrees with the Conclusions section of the SEIS/RIR, p.5-6, "...all five of these management alternatives point to the inability of the proposals to remedy the underlying catching and processing capacity that drives the preemption-related problems."

The SSC recommends the following revisions.

- (1) The Executive Summary should be expanded and rewritten. We recommend that it match the organization of Section 5.0. Care must be taken to assure that the summary accurately reflects information presented in the document. A summary chart displaying general results and consequences of options should be included.

- (2) The SSC recommends the inclusion of a table presenting annual Inshore and Offshore domestic processing of BSAI cod and pollock and GOA cod and pollock. The table should display inshore/offshore harvest shares for these categories. The historical tonnages and shares through 1990 should be followed by what the 1991 tonnages and shares would be with each alternative and what the tonnages would be for a reasonable historic range of TACs.
- (3) The text (Sec. 4.2.6 fourth paragraph) should indicate the social impact assessment is preliminary and suggestive rather than conclusive. The profiles are useful descriptions, and should stimulate research; but they are insufficient to provide conclusions about impacts. The SIA section should reference figures and calculations in the economic impact section wherever appropriate.
- (4) Because results of the I-O analysis depend on numerous parameter estimates, the results of the sensitivity assessment should be reflected in the Conclusions. Results of the sensitivity analysis should be presented along with the discussions of model results. A graphical presentation would be helpful.
- (5) The concluding section of the economic impact analysis notes that stability of inshore and offshore sectors is not assured by a once-for-all allocation of cod and pollock. The underlying problem is open access competition for limited harvest quantities in both sectors. As long as overcapacity exists both sectors are left vulnerable to economic strife when prices and stock decline. In contrast, the social impact analysis assumes that the inshore/offshore allocation creates stability in the inshore sector. The SSC recommends that the two sections of the report be made consistent with the conclusions of the economic impact chapter.
- (6) The draft should explain the differences between benefit/cost and input/output analyses.

In addition to these comments, the SSC will informally forward to the preparers minor corrections and drafting suggestions.

The SSC believes the following issues need to be addressed.

- (1) The MFCMA and associated regulations require that any proposed action be evaluated in terms of the "net benefit to the nation, as a whole." A benefit-cost analysis would normally be done to meet this requirement. At a minimum a qualitative discussion of possible effects on consumers should be made. An assessment also should be made of producer benefits. Such an analysis would include addressing the transfer of capacity between sectors.
- (2) The SSC recommends that additional material be added in Sections 5.6 and 2.3. regarding possible impacts on northern sea lions and marine mammals. The points to be addressed should include comments on impacts of noise, recent changes in incidental catches of marine mammals, potential effects of increased vessel traffic on marine mammals at such locations as Akutan and St. Paul, recent status estimates of harbor seals, and other data that are available. The points of concern by the SSC have been conveyed to Council staff.

- (3) The analysis does not take into account the impact of various bycatch management schemes. Without an assessment of the bycatch issue, the public will be unable to make an informed judgement about the probable costs and benefits of any of the alternative allocations.

The SSC was unable to make a recommendation on releasing the document for public review. Finally, the SSC wants to stress to the Council the importance of timely submission of lengthy and technical documents. In this instance, the SSC was unable to give this important analysis a thorough evaluation. Accordingly, we request that the next such document (such as the SEIS/RIR for halibut IFQs) be distributed to SSC members at least two weeks in advance of Council meeting.

### **C-2 North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan**

The SSC reviewed the draft document entitled "Environmental Assessment/Regulatory Impact Review/Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for the North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan". The document was discussed with the council staff and the NMFS personnel.

The SSC recommends the adoption of Alternative 2 with the following comments:

- (1) A key element of Alternative 2 is the development of an observer plan. It was our understanding that the initial observer plan under Alternative 2 would be the current plan with minor modifications. The SSC noted that more than minor modification may be required in light of the start-up problems and the limitation on total funding. It was suggested that NMFS develop a plan for 1992. The new plan would include a description of the objectives, the type and methods of data collection and data entry.
- (2) The SSC discussed the possibility of biasing the data by linking the fee to the amount of fish received. We concluded that there are sufficient checks in the reporting system to prevent under reporting.
- (3) With regard to options under Alternative 2 (covering the transition period) the SSC opposes any option that would disrupt the collection of data under the program.

The SSC also noted that the North Pacific Research Plan provides for the collection and entry of data from the fishing fleet. The Council must recognize that for the system to be fully effective provisions must be in place for data entry, editing, and analysis. The Council and the NMFS must take whatever steps may be necessary to assure appropriate support is available for the complete data collection and analysis.

### **C-3 Sablefish Management**

The SSC has reviewed prior documents on this subject. The supplemental EIS/RIR arrived only two days before the meeting, and not all members were able to read it thoroughly. Those that did, however, believed the analysis was well done.

The SSC wishes to emphasize a potential conflict between each of the IFQ alternatives and the present halibut PSC in the Gulf of Alaska. As mentioned in the analysis, continuation of an

open-access PSC would continue the race for fish and therefore reduce the benefits of an IFQ system.

#### **C-7 Marine Mammals**

##### **(a) NMFS-proposed amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act**

The SSC received a report from Charles Karnella, NMFS - Washington, D.C., that described a regime that NMFS is developing to govern the incidental taking of marine mammals in commercial fisheries after October 1, 1993.

##### **(b) Draft Recovery Plan**

The SSC was unable to comment on the Draft Recovery Plan for Steller Sea Lions. No copies were made available to the SSC. The SSC notes that the deadline for review expires within one week. We also note that this plan could have significant impacts on North Pacific fisheries. The SSC recommends that the Council seek an extension of the comment period to permit review by the Council family.

#### **D-1 Groundfish Amendments**

The SSC reviewed the EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendment 17/22 and for a regulatory amendment to define groundfish pots. The following comments are offered. Once these comments have been addressed the SSC recommends that the document be sent out for public review.

#### **Section 2.0 Experimental Fishing Permits**

The SSC recommends several changes to the amendment proposal for experimental fishing permits. First the SSC recommends that the Council emphasize the "experimental" nature of the fishing permit. That is, those requesting an experimental fishing permit should have a structured experiment in mind which includes a testable hypothesis, a sampling plan and a description of how the experiment will be evaluated. Additionally, under the heading of "Application Requirements" item 4: the SSC recommends inserting the phrase "and pay for" between the words "... carry observers, ...". Furthermore, we suggest an additional item which requires public disclosure of all data collected during the experiment.

The SSC endorses the development of a method to permit the issuance of experimental permits. We suggest Alternative 2 be divided into three options: (1) full Council review of all requests for experimental fishing permits, (2) full review only by the NMFS Regional Director, or (3) a combination of full review by the Council and/or expedited review by the Regional Director (the current amendment proposal).

Finally, the SSC recommends two additional grounds for denial of an experimental fishing permit. First, the permit should be denied if the proposed experimental design is judged to be flawed. Second, the permit should be denied if the requestor under a previously issued experimental fishing permit failed to provide access to all relevant data or failed to provide a final report as required by the permit.

### **Section 3.0 Establish Walrus Islands Groundfish Fishery Closure.**

The SSC recommends that this section of the amendment package go forward for public review with minor modifications.

The last sentence on page 12 should be restated to reflect the fact that the number of walrus seen on haulout beaches, since 1988, has remained stable. This stability is indicative of the importance of the haulouts in northern Bristol Bay. The use of haulouts in other parts of the walrus' range has declined, commensurate with a downward readjustment of the walrus population.

In the discussions the references to numbers of walrus seen on the haulouts should be combined across individual haulout areas to reflect that walrus move from one to the other.

The SSC also noted that the following should be included in discussion of options: TAC's can be taken elsewhere and the Alaska Region has not received any complaints about the closure from the industry, during the period of the closures.

On page 27, the following statement appears, "...the maximum benefit to be expected from reopening the area..." is about 24,000 mt, etc. The maximum is determined by multiplying the size of the biomass in the area by the appropriate exploitation rate and the net value per ton. This approach assumes that the biomass is associated with the area.

On the top of page 28, CPUE comparisons are made. Care should be taken to ensure that the comparisons are for the appropriate time periods.

The SSC requests that personal communications references should be stated in the text and not in the literature cited section.

### **Section 4.0 Rescind Gulf of Alaska Statistical Area 68.**

The SSC recommends that the section be modified to reflect the impact of the alternatives on management of shelf demersal rockfish before it is forwarded for public review.

### **Section 5.0 Establish a Bogoslof District**

This section was added because of the emergency rule for Bogoslof Area 515 in effect in early 1991.

The SSC believes that two major modifications must be made to this amendment before public review.

First, the potential impacts of the alternatives on marine mammal populations must be discussed. Proximity of the large Bogoslof Island sea lion rookery and the recently established fur seal colony should be mentioned and considered to the extent that available information allows. The juxtaposition of these marine mammal populations, large assemblages of seabirds, and the annual aggregation of spawning pollock in the area must be better described.

Second, the implications of the alternatives on ABCs and TACs are not adequately discussed. On page 61, the document refers to estimates of ABC by federal fishery scientists, without mentioning the difficulties the SSC and the Council have had in determining ABC for the Bogoslof area. In December 1990, the SSC was unable to make an ABC determination for this area, because of its connection with the Aleutian Basin component, including the Donut Hole.

Under Alternative 1 (Status Quo), no TAC in the Bogoslof area would occur, because an emergency rule cannot be used twice to establish a TAC for the Bogoslof area. This would leave the Bogoslof area component unprotected, unlike in the past. Under Option 1 of Alternative 2, the Bogoslof District would be separate from the Bering Sea subarea and the Aleutian Islands, requiring the determination of ABC and TAC. Given that the Donut Hole component may be overfished, an ABC as low as zero could conceivably be set in the Bogoslof District. Under Option 2 of Alternative 2, the current practice of setting a TAC for the Bogoslof area would continue. However, the TAC would be incorrectly counted against the TAC for the shelf component. These implications need to be described in the document.

On page 62, the document refers to a "roe season estimate of ABC" that should be correctly worded "a TAC", because the setting of a district within a management area does not involve the setting of an ABC. For example, the District specification within a management area is currently being used for Shelikof Strait, but no ABC for Shelikof is determined.

In some years, significant catches in the Bogoslof area occur in the last two quarters of the year (82% in 1989). At present, it is unclear whether these catches should be counted against Basin pollock, shelf pollock, or some other component. The options for Alternative 2 split the current Bogoslof area 515 into two areas 518 and 519 with a dividing line at 167°W., as shown in Figures 3 and 4. The motivation for this division needs to be better explained in relation to the occurrence of pollock stocks at different times of the year and the oceanography of the area. This information is needed so that the Council can determine whether a season or annual TAC is needed.

If this amendment is to be considered in June, the approach of setting ABCs for Bering Sea pollock needs to be reviewed and clarified between now and June. The SSC is willing to convene an *ad hoc* subcommittee of the SSC to participate with plan team members and AFSC scientists to address this subject. The major issues are how to treat the Bogoslof area in the determination of the Aleutian basin component and what the interrelationships between the Basin component and the shelf components are. Recent international developments have led to progress and new approaches to estimating biomass and ABC for the entire Bering Sea, although this work is incomplete. The selection of the best alternative in the Amendment package is dependent on the method of determining ABC; therefore the architecture of this process needs to be constructed before the June meeting.

### **Miscellaneous Items:**

#### **Team Membership**

- (a) Salmon Plan Team

The SSC recommends that Mr. Jim Berkson be appointed to replace Dr. Schaller on the Salmon

**Plan Team.**

**(b) BSAI/GOA Groundfish Plan Teams**

The SSC recommends that a marine mammal specialist from Alaska be appointed to the two groundfish plan teams.

DRAFT AGENDA

97th Plenary Session  
North Pacific Fishery Management Council  
June 24-28, 1991  
Anchorage, Alaska  
and  
August 13-16, 1991  
Juneau, Alaska

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

B. REPORTS

- B-1 Executive Director's Report
- B-2 ADF&G Report
- B-3 NMFS Management Report
- B-4 Enforcement and Surveillance Report

C. NEW OR CONTINUING BUSINESS

C-1 Sablefish Management

- (a) NMFS report on how an individual fishing quota system would be implemented and enforced.
- (b) Consider approving individual fishing quota system for Secretarial review.

C-2 Inshore-Offshore

~~Consider approving Amendment 23/18 for Secretarial review~~  
\*\*Proposed regulations may be available for Council approval.

C-3 North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan

Receive report from Data Committee and consider approving plan for Secretarial review.

C-4 International Fisheries

Review high seas driftnet agreements and results of international fisheries meetings.

C-5 Marine Mammals

- (a) Review NMFS-proposed amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act
- (b) Review Draft Recovery Plan for Steller Sea Lions

C-6 Anti-Reflagging Act of 1987

Review recent court decision and its implications.



**C-7 Halibut Management**

- (a) Status report on 1991 fishery.
- (b) Approve halibut IFQ alternatives for public review.

**C-8 Future Management Planning**

- (a) Receive report from NMFS on procedures and requirements necessary to develop a moratorium on entry into all fisheries under Council jurisdiction, except salmon, and to develop individual fishing quota systems for those fisheries.
- (b) Establish schedule for design and analysis and task staff as appropriate.

**C-9 Other Business**

**D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**D-1 Groundfish: Plan Amendments and Regulatory Actions**

- (a) NMFS status report on plan and regulatory amendments, and emergency rules.
- (b) Approve proposed groundfish amendment 17/22 for Secretarial review.
- (c) Consider industry request to increase TAC for deepwater flatfish in the Central Gulf to 35,000 mt (ABC is 38,900 mt).
- (d) Initial consideration of any proposed changes in groundfish seasons and recordkeeping/reporting requirements for 1992.
- (e) Consider schedule for analyzing quarterly cod allocations in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands.

**D-2 Groundfish: Bycatch**

- (a) Receive report of IPHC workgroup on halibut bycatch and report on halibut bycatch by gear type in the Gulf of Alaska.
- (b) Receive report from Ad Hoc Bycatch Committee and task staff with analysis of bycatch amendment.
- (c) Review of herring bycatch management and effectiveness of special closed areas.

**E. FINANCIAL REPORT**

**F. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**G. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT**

# 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

June 21, 1991

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**97th Plenary Session**  
**North Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**June 24-28, 1991**  
**Hilton Hotel**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council will convene at 8:00 a.m. on Monday, June 24, at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska, and possibly continue into Saturday, June 29. Other meetings to be held during the week are:

**Committee/Panel**

Ad Hoc Bycatch Committee--**Aleutian Room**  
Advisory Panel--**Dillingham Room**  
Scientific and Statistical Committee  
--**Katmai Room**

**Beginning**

8:00 a.m., Sunday, June 23  
10:30 a.m., Sunday, June 23  
10:30 a.m., Sunday, June 23

**NOTE:** The Finance Committee will meet at a time to be determined during the week.

All meetings except Council executive sessions are open to the public. Other committee and workgroup meetings may be scheduled on short notice during the week.

**INFORMATION FOR PERSONS WISHING TO TESTIFY AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**

Those wishing to testify at Council meetings on a specific agenda item must fill out and deposit a registration card in the box at the registration table **before** public comment begins on that agenda item. Additional cards are generally not accepted **after** public comment has begun. A general comment period is scheduled toward the end of each meeting for comment on matters not on the current agenda.

**Submission of Written Testimony at Council Meeting.** Some agenda items have a formal, published deadline for written comments; for example, June 14 for agenda item C-1, Sablefish Management, and agenda D-1(b), groundfish Amendments 17/22. For those items, written comments submitted after the published deadline or at the Council meeting, other than simple transcripts of oral testimony, will be stamped "LATE COMMENT." They will not be summarized or analyzed in preparation for the Council meeting, nor will they be placed in the Council member notebooks. All "LATE COMMENTS" will be placed in a special notebook, marked as such, and made available to the Council members only upon their request.

**DRAFT AGENDA**

**97th Plenary Session  
North Pacific Fishery Management Council  
June 24-28, 1991  
Hilton Hotel  
Anchorage, Alaska**

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

**B. REPORTS**

B-1 Executive Director's Report

B-2 ADF&G Report

B-3 NMFS Management Report

B-4 Enforcement and Surveillance Report

**C. NEW OR CONTINUING BUSINESS**

C-1 Sablefish Management

(a) NMFS report on how an individual fishing quota system would be implemented and enforced.

(b) Consider approving individual fishing quota system for Secretarial review.

C-2 Inshore-Offshore

Consider approving Amendment 23/18 for Secretarial review.

C-3 North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan

Receive report from Data Committee and consider approving plan for Secretarial review.

C-4 International Fisheries

Review high seas driftnet agreements and results of international fisheries meetings.

C-5 Marine Mammals

(a) Review NMFS-proposed amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act

(b) Review Draft Recovery Plan for Steller Sea Lions

C-6 Anti-Reflagging Act of 1987

Review recent court decision and its implications.

C-7 Halibut Management

(a) Status report on 1991 fishery.

(b) Approve halibut IFQ alternatives for public review.

C-8 Future Management Planning

- (a) Receive report from NMFS on procedures and requirements necessary to develop a moratorium on entry into all fisheries under Council jurisdiction, except salmon, and to develop individual fishing quota systems for those fisheries.
- (b) Establish schedule for design and analysis and task staff as appropriate.

C-9 Other Business

**D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

D-1 Groundfish: Plan Amendments and Regulatory Actions

- (a) NMFS status report on plan and regulatory amendments, and emergency rules.
- (b) Approve proposed groundfish amendment 17/22 for Secretarial review.
- (c) Consider industry request to increase TAC for deepwater flatfish in the Central Gulf to 35,000 mt (ABC is 38,900 mt).
- (d) Initial consideration of any proposed changes in groundfish seasons and recordkeeping/reporting requirements for 1992.
- (e) Consider schedule for analyzing quarterly cod allocations in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands.

D-2 Groundfish: Bycatch

- (a) Receive report of IPHC workgroup on halibut bycatch and report on halibut bycatch by gear type in the Gulf of Alaska.
- (b) Receive report from Ad Hoc Bycatch Committee and task staff with analysis of bycatch amendment.
- (c) Review of herring bycatch management and effectiveness of special closed areas.

**E. FINANCIAL REPORT**

**F. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**G. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT**

**Proposed Schedule  
ADVISORY PANEL  
June 1991  
Hilton Hotel  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Sunday, June 23**

10:30 AM C-2 Inshore/Offshore  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-2, continued  
5:00 PM Recess

**Tuesday, June 25**

8:00 AM C-3 North Pacific Fisheries  
Research Plan  
D-1/2 Groundfish  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-5 Marine Mammals  
5:00 PM Recess

**Monday, June 24**

8:00 AM C-1 Sablefish Management  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-1, continued  
5:00 PM Recess

**Wednesday, June 26**

8:00 AM C-7 Halibut Management  
C-8 Future Management  
Planning

**ATTENTION: THOSE WISHING TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE ADVISORY PANEL**

The Advisory Panel has revised its operating guidelines to incorporate a strict time management approach to its meetings. Therefore, new rules on testimony have been developed which are similar to those used by the Council. Members of the public wishing to testify before the AP **must** sign up on the list for each agenda topic listed above. Sign-up sheets are provided in a special notebook located at the back of the room. The deadline for registering to testify is when the agenda topic comes before the AP. The time available for individual and group testimony will be based on the number registered and determined by the AP Chairman.

**Proposed Schedule  
SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE  
June 1991  
Hilton Hotel  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Sunday, June 23**

10:30 AM C-3 North Pacific Fisheries  
Research Plan

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM C-2 Inshore/Offshore  
Allocation

5:00 PM Recess

**Monday, June 24**

8:00 AM C-2, continued

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM C-1 Sablefish Management

5:00 PM Recess

**Tuesday, June 25**

8:00 AM C-7 Halibut Management

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM D-1/2 Groundfish  
C-5 Marine Mammals

5:00 PM Adjourn

**NOTE:** The above agenda items may not be taken in the order in which they appear and are subject to change as necessary.

**North Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**June 24-28, 1991**  
**Anchorage Hilton Hotel**

Monday June 24	Tuesday June 25	Wednesday June 26	Thursday June 27	Friday June 28	Saturday June 29
8:00 A Call to Order/ Approve Agenda B-1 ED Report C-1 Sablefish (a) NMFS Rpt Staff Report/ Public Comment	8:00 **C-2 Inshore-Offshore Staff Report/ AP/SSC Rpts Public Comment Council Action	8:00 C-3 North Pacific Research Plan C-4 Int'l Fisheries C-5 Marine Mammals C-6 Anti-Reflagging  Act	8:00 C-1 Sablefish AP/SSC Rpts Council Action	8:00 C-7 Halibut Mgmt	8:00 Continue as necessary
12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Executive Session	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch
1:00 Reconvene C-1 continued (Council action begins on Thursday)	1:00 Reconvene C-2 continued  6:30 Women's Fisheries Network	1:30 Reconvene B-2 ADF&G Report B-3 NMFS Mgmt Rpt B-4 Enforcement Rpt D-1/2 Gen'l Grfsh	1:00 Reconvene C-1 continued	1:00 Reconvene C-8 Future Mgmt Planning	Continue as necessary

**\*\*INSHORE-OFFSHORE ISSUES MAY BE TAKEN UP AS EARLY AS MONDAY AFTERNOON PENDING COMPLETION OF STAFF REPORTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT ON C-1, SABLEFISH IFQS. THE ABOVE AGENDA ITEMS MAY NOT BE TAKEN IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY APPEAR AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NECESSARY; OTHER ITEMS MAY BE ADDED. ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCIL EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.**

**NOTE:** A Finance Committee meeting will be scheduled at some appropriate time during the week.

**North Pacific Fishery Management Council  
June 24-28, 1991  
Anchorage Hilton Hotel**

Monday June 24	Tuesday June 25	Wednesday June 26	Thursday June 27	Friday June 28	Saturday June 29
8:00 A Call to Order/ Approve Agenda B-1 ED Report C-1 Sablefish (a) NMFS Rpt Staff Report/ Public Comment	8:00 **C-2 Inshore-Offshore Staff Report/ AP/SSC Rpts Public Comment Council Action	8:00 C-3 North Pacific Research Plan C-4 Int'l Fisheries C-5 Marine Mammals C-6 Anti-Reflagging  Act	8:00 C-1 Sablefish AP/SSC Rpts Council Action	8:00 C-7 Halibut Mgmt	8:00 Continue as necessary
12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Executive Session	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch
1:00 Reconvene C-1 continued (Council action begins on Thursday)	1:00 Reconvene C-2 continued  6:30 Women's Fisheries Network	1:30 Reconvene B-2 ADF&G Report B-3 NMFS Mgmt Rpt B-4 Enforcement Rpt D-1/2 Gen'l Grfsh	1:00 Reconvene C-1 continued	1:00 Reconvene C-8 Future Mgmt Planning	Continue as necessary

**\*\*INSHORE-OFFSHORE ISSUES MAY BE TAKEN UP AS EARLY AS MONDAY AFTERNOON PENDING COMPLETION OF STAFF REPORTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT ON C-1, SABLEFISH IFQS. THE ABOVE AGENDA ITEMS MAY NOT BE TAKEN IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY APPEAR AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NECESSARY; OTHER ITEMS MAY BE ADDED. ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCIL EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.**

**NOTE:** A Finance Committee meeting will be scheduled at some appropriate time during the week.



**Proposed Schedule  
SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE  
June 1991  
Hilton Hotel  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Sunday, June 23**

10:30 AM C-3 North Pacific Fisheries  
Research Plan

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM C-2 Inshore/Offshore  
Allocation

5:00 PM Recess

**Monday, June 24**

8:00 AM C-2, continued

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM C-1 Sablefish Management

5:00 PM Recess

**Tuesday, June 25**

8:00 AM C-7 Halibut Management

Noon Lunch

1:00 PM D-1/2 Groundfish  
C-5 Marine Mammals

5:00 PM Adjourn

**NOTE:** The above agenda items may not be taken in the order in which they appear and are subject to change as necessary.

**Proposed Schedule  
ADVISORY PANEL  
June 1991  
Hilton Hotel  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Sunday, June 23**

10:30 AM C-2 Inshore/Offshore  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-2, continued  
5:00 PM Recess

**Tuesday, June 25**

8:00 AM C-3 North Pacific Fisheries  
Research Plan  
D-1/2 Groundfish  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-5 Marine Mammals  
5:00 PM Recess

**Monday, June 24**

8:00 AM C-1 Sablefish Management  
Noon Lunch  
1:00 PM C-1, continued  
5:00 PM Recess

**Wednesday, June 26**

8:00 AM C-7 Halibut Management  
C-8 Future Management  
Planning

**ATTENTION: THOSE WISHING TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE ADVISORY PANEL**

The Advisory Panel has revised its operating guidelines to incorporate a strict time management approach to its meetings. Therefore, new rules on testimony have been developed which are similar to those used by the Council. Members of the public wishing to testify before the AP **must** sign up on the list for each agenda topic listed above. Sign-up sheets are provided in a special notebook located at the back of the room. The deadline for registering to testify is when the agenda topic comes before the AP. The time available for individual and group testimony will be based on the number registered and determined by the AP Chairman.