

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
5/13/87

DRAFT AGENDA

77th Plenary Session
North Pacific Fishery Management Council

May 20-22, 1987
Anchorage Hilton Hotel
Anchorage, Alaska

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council will convene at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, May 20, at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska, and continue through Friday, May 22. There is a possibility the meeting may extend into Saturday, May 23. Other meetings to be held at the Hilton the week of May 18 are:

<u>Committee/Panel</u>	<u>Beginning</u>
Non-Profit Fishery Research Foundation	10:00 a.m., Sunday, May 17
Scientific and Statistical Committee	10:00 a.m., Monday, May 18
Advisory Panel	10:00 a.m., Monday, May 18
Crab Management Committee	7:00 p.m., Monday, May 18
Policy & Planning Committee	7:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 19
Finance Committee	7:00 a.m., Thursday, May 21
Domestic Observer Program Overview	7:00 p.m., Thursday, May 21

The Council may meet in executive session at least once during the week to discuss personnel. All other meetings are open to the public.

MAIN ISSUES

Of the items requiring Council attention in May the following are expected to involve the most discussion and public comment:

Groundfish Issues

Final approval of proposed amendments to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP.

Amendment 11 to Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands FMP addresses the following issues:

- (1) Establish DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.
- (2) Revise the definition of "prohibited species."
- (3) Improve catch recording requirements.
- (4) Revise the definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).
- (5) Increase the upper limit of the optimum yield (OY) range.
- (6) Prohibit pollock roe stripping.

Amendment 16 to the Gulf of Alaska FMP addresses these issues:

- (1) Establish DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.
- (2) Revise the definition of "prohibited species."
- (3) Improve catch recording requirements.
- (4) Establish a framework procedure for setting seasons.
- (5) Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crab.
- (6) Update the plan's descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed.

Groundfish Apportionments to DAP and JVP

NMFS recently has resurveyed the harvesting and processing industry to project their tonnage requirements for groundfish through the end of 1987. The Council will review the results of the survey and determine if current species' DAPs and JVPs for the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands need adjustment. Of particular interest will be the pollock resource. No pollock joint ventures have been allowed in the Gulf so far this year, and, in the Bering Sea, joint ventures are expected by Council meeting week to have harvested the original pollock JVP plus over half of the reserves. Any pollock considered excess to U.S. processor needs may be reapportioned to joint ventures. The Council will have the latest results of the NMFS biological survey of Shelikof Strait when making that decision.

OTHER ISSUES

Other items which may require considerable discussion are agenda items C-3 and C-4 concerning plan team operations, processing of plan amendments, and council treatment of halibut proposals. There will be a report by the Council's Policy & Planning Committee and two draft policies for Council review and approval.

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 on the registration table before public comment begins on that agenda item. Additional cards generally are not accepted after testimony has begun. A general comment period (Agenda Item F) is scheduled toward the end of each meeting for comment on matters not on the current agenda.

5/13/87

DRAFT AGENDA

77th Plenary Session
North Pacific Fishery Management Council

May 20-22, 1987
Anchorage Hilton Hotel
Anchorage, Alaska

- A. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
- B. SPECIAL REPORTS
 - B-1 Executive Director's Report
 - B-2 Domestic Fisheries Report by ADF&G
 - B-3 NMFS Management Report
 - B-4 Enforcement and Surveillance Report by U.S. Coast Guard
 - B-5 Joint Venture Operations
- C. NEW OR CONTINUING BUSINESS
 - C-1 Legislative Update
 - C-2 Non-profit Fishery Research Foundation
Status report.
 - C-3 Council Operating Procedures
 - (a) Report of Policy and Planning Committee meeting.
 - (b) Adopt new policies on plan team operations and processing of proposals for plan amendments.
 - (c) Determine if Council's permit review policy needs revision.
 - (d) Review Draft of Secretary's Uniform Standards.
 - C-4 Halibut Management
Council procedures on processing proposed management measures.
 - C-5 Sablefish Management
Results of North Pacific Longline Coalition Survey.
 - C-6 Unrecorded Discards
Report of industry committee on extent of unrecorded discards in trawl operations.
 - C-7 Permit Review
Review vessel permit application for Polish trawler/processor.

- *C-8 Council Observer Program
 - (a) Status report on pilot observer program.
 - (b) Review of policy.

- C-9 NOAA Penalty Schedules for Fisheries Violations
Council review and recommendations.

- C-10 Other Business

- D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
 - D-1 King and Tanner Crab FMP
Crab Management Committee report.

 - D-2 Salmon FMP
Status report.

 - D-3 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP
 - (a) Review results of Shelikof pollock survey.
 - (b) Review NMFS survey of industry and recommend changes in DAP and JVP apportionments as necessary.
 - (c) Final approval of Amendment 16 and implementing regulations.

 - D-4 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP
 - (a) Review NMFS survey of industry and recommend changes in DAP, JVP, and TALFF apportionments as necessary.
 - (b) Final approval of Amendment 11 and implementing regulations.

- E. CONTRACTS, PROPOSALS, AND FINANCIAL REPORT OF FY88 BUDGET
 - (a) Progress report on Dittman Survey.

- F. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- G. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

*On Thursday evening at 7:00 p.m., the Council's Domestic Observer Committee will meet to review the observer program and take comments from industry.

DRAFT MINUTES

76th Plenary Session
NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
March 18-20, 1987
Hilton Hotel
Anchorage, Alaska

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council met March 18-20, 1987, at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska. The Scientific and Statistical Committee and Advisory Panel began Monday, March 16, and the Bycatch Committee met on Thursday, March 19.

Members of the Council, Scientific and Statistical Committee, Advisory Panel and general public in attendance are listed below.

Council

James O. Campbell, Chairman
Rudy Petersen, Vice Chairman
Don Collinsworth
Mark Pedersen for
Joseph Blum
RADM Edward Nelson
Oscar Dyson
Elizabeth Montagne for Robt. Ford

Robert U. Mace for
Randy Fisher
Robert McVey
Henry Mitchell
John Harville
John Peterson
John Winther
Larry Cotter

NPFMC Staff

Jim H. Branson, Executive Director
Clarence Pautzke
Judy Willoughby
Steve Davis
Denby Lloyd

Ron Miller
Ron Rogness
Terry Smith
Helen Allen
Peggy Kircher

Support Staff

Jim Balsiger, NMFS-NWAFC
Jay Ginter, NMFS
Craig Hammond, NMFS
John Pedrick, NOAA-GC
Jim Brooks, NMFS

Fred Gaffney, ADF&G
Loh-Lee Low, NMFS-NWAFC
Jon Pollard, NOAA-GC
Bill Robinson, NMFS
Ron Berg, NMFS

Scientific and Statistical Committee

Phil Mundy, Chairman
Bill Aron
Gordon Kruse for Douglas Eggers
Larry Hreha
Bill Clark
Robert Burgner

Richard Marasco, Vice-Chairman
Terry Quinn
Don Bevan
John Burns
Don Rosenberg

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Advisory Panel

Nancy Munro, Chairman
Bob Alverson, Vice Chairman
Rupe Andrews
Al Burch
Ron Hegge
Rick Lauber
John Woodruff
Joseph Chimegalrea
Terry Baker

Pete Isleib
Thorn Smith
Cameron Jensen
Ron Peterson
Lamar Cotten
Daniel O'Hara
Ed Fuglvog
Oliver Holm
Dave Woodruff

General Public

It was estimated that over 100 people attended the Council meeting during its session, including the following:

Fred Kirkes, American President Lines
Woody Knebel, Columbia Wards Fisheries
Hugh Reilly, American High Seas Fisheries Assn
Stan Crothers, M.A.F., New Zealand
Stephen Johnson, American High Seas Fisheries
Harold Jones, Kodiak
Bob Miller, Seattle
Ben Muse, CFEC
Y. Biao, China Nat'l Marine Fisheries
Mary Truitt, Alamar
Bill Orr, AFTA
Steve Hughes, NRC
Phil Werdal, Jubilee Fisheries
Gary Westman
Steve Grabacki, Graystar
Dean Paddock, Bristol Bay Driftnetters
Earl Kari, Anchorage
Chuck Meacham, ADF&G
Phil Chitwood, MRCI
George Gardner, Ketchikan
Arni Thomson, ACC
John Dooley, California
Peter Block, NorFish
Kenneth M. Allread, Kodiak
Yuuji Niimi, Nippon Suisan (USA) Inc.
O. Rae Elde/Almar
Chris Jones, CNMFS
M. Morimoto, Japan Fisheries Agency
T. Yamamoto, Japan Fisheries Agency
Paul Peyton, DGED
James Crutchfield, NRC
Jacqueline Lindauer, Anchorage
Cindy Lowry, Greenpeace
Mat Oahert, Kodiak
Chip Threinen, Kodiak
Eric Maisonpierre, AJVF

Rod Moore, Rep. Don Young
Bill Woolf, Sen. Murkowski
Joe Plesha, Seattle
Peter Moore, AFDF
Walter Eichner, USGAO
Vic Horgan, OBSI
Kurt Schelle, CFEC
Li Shanxun, CNMFC
Bill Dowd, Mrs. Paul's
Mick Stevens, ProFish
Barry Collier, PSPA
Rodger Davies, DSFU
David Fraser
Ed Zeasor, Mrs. Paul's
Robt. Morgan, Oceantrawl
Stuart Lutton, Kodiak
Norm Stadem, Anchorage
Ted Evans, AFTA
Arne Aadland, NPFVOA
Chris Blackburn, Kodiak
Fred Yeck, Oregon
Larry Garrison, Washington
Jerome Selby, Kodiak
Emory Washington, Florida
David Harville, Kodiak
Vern Hall, Kodiak
K. Nagao, Japan Consulate
Noni Burno, Kodiak
Jeff Stephan, UFMA
Jay Hastings, Seattle
K. Kobayashi, JDSTA
Rich Listowski, Juneau
Bill Dalton, Kodiak
J. Spicciani, Kodiak
Steve Smith, Kemp Fish
John Levy, Chignik

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

James Major, Kodiak
Lynn Gabriel, Anchorage
Lee Daneker, Fishing Co. of Alaska
Bryan Strelisk, Sea-Land

Charles Yates, Seattle
Sam Hjelle, Glacier Fish
J. Cleveland, Sea-Land

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chairman Jim Campbell.

Mr. Campbell introduced John Pedrick, NOAA General Counsel in Juneau, and Elizabeth Montagne attending as the State Department representative. Also in attendance was Mr. Walter Eichner of the U.S. General Accounting Office in Seattle.

Mr. Branson asked that Mr. Eichner be added to the agenda to report on the seafood safety study GAO is preparing for Congress.

The agenda was approved as submitted, with the addition of Mr. Eichner's presentation.

Bob Mace moved to approve the minutes of the December 1986 meeting. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried with no objection. The minutes of the January 1987 meeting were not yet available for approval.

B. SPECIAL REPORTS

B-1 Executive Director's Report

Jim Branson presented the Executive Director's report as provided in Council notebooks. Subjects covered were the recent Chairmen's meeting in Puerto Rico, 1988 Council meeting schedule, progress on sablefish limited entry and the groundfish management alternative survey.

Mr. Branson suggested to Council members that the Policy and Planning Committee should meet prior to selecting 1988 meeting dates to discuss the need for changes in the current amendment cycle and review the composition of plan teams. The Council concurred with this suggestion and the Committee will

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

meet prior to the May meeting to develop recommendations for Council consideration. The meeting for the Policy & Planning Committee was set for April 22-23 in Anchorage.

Seafood Safety Study

Mr. Eichner reported that the General Accounting Office (GAO), an information-gathering office for the United States Congress, is doing a study on the safety of seafoods and labelling of seafood products. He is in Alaska to gather information which will help in their assessment. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the National Fisheries Institute also are studying the possibility of a federal inspection system similar to the USDA inspection of meat products. These two studies will be used by Congress in considering the feasibility of a seafood inspection program.

B-1(a) Report on Alaska Region NMFS & Northwest Center Budgets

Bob McVey, Director, Alaska Region, NMFS reported on the Region's FY 1987 funding. The total operational budget is about \$3.7 million, which represents a reduction of 7.5% to cover shortfalls elsewhere in NMFS. The budget covers 47 full time, permanent employees, most of them in Juneau. They are also recruiting for six additional employees at this time. The \$3.7 million budget is broken down as follows:

Fisheries Management Division	- 23%
Habitat Conservation	- 15%
Industry Services	- 3%
Marine Mammals & Endangered	
Species	- 4%
Enforcement	- 35%
Other Regional Activities	- 20%

Regarding the FY 1988 budget which has been presented to Congress, the total amount proposed for NMFS is \$99.5 million for operations, research and facilities, down from \$162 million in FY 1987. Under that budget, however,

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

the Alaska Region would receive a relatively minor cut of approximately \$200,000 and three people from the Habitat Conservation staff. Even that cut is in the funding which might be restored if the proposed licensing fees are approved. NMFS is asking comments and suggestions from the Regional Councils with regard to the FY 1989 budget.

Dr. Aron, Director of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, briefed the Council on the Center's FY 1987 funding. Dr. Aron pointed out that, according to 1985 catch statistics, about half the total tonnage of fish landed from the United States' EEZ comes from Northwest and Alaska waters. When catch statistics for 1986 are available, that share should escalate. Catches from the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, under the direct jurisdiction of this Council, account for most of the share.

Even though the Council, Alaska Region and the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center deal with fisheries contributing at least 35% of the nation's value in fisheries, the Center's ability to spend money has been substantially reduced, even with limited inflation. Increased costs of pay raises and employee benefits have been borne by the agency without Congressional supplementals. Even at level funding, the amount of work the dollar will buy will continue to decline.

In terms of the FY 1988 budget, the cuts in the NMFS budget would have fairly substantial impacts on the Center. For example, both the COBB & MURRE research vessels have been eliminated from the NOS budget which will affect the Center even though it's not in their budget. Other major reductions include \$8 million for U.S.-Canada salmon programs which will have an impact on Center programs at Auke Bay and in their Coastal Zone Division. The Marine Mammal Laboratory will lose \$1.2 million of its base and there would be cuts in the Center's REFM program. Cuts to the Center would essentially reduce their program by about 40%; some of that would be restored in the contingency program, tied to the passage of the fishing license bill. Dr. Aron also pointed out that their computer is obsolete and that parts are no longer being made for it.

B-2 Domestic Fisheries Report

Southeast Troll Fishery. Since the October 1 opening of the Southeast winter troll fishery, approximately 22,000 chinook salmon have been landed. The winter fishery will close April 14 and is projected to take 30,000-35,000 chinooks. Last year's harvest was 22,000. The average price paid to fishermen is currently \$3.50-\$4.00 per pound.

Tanner crab. In the Bering Sea, 26.9 million pounds of C. opilio have been harvested since January 15. Another 12 million pounds of C. bairdi were harvested in the Gulf of Alaska and the Aleutians. Most areas opened in January. The Western Aleutians opened November 1.

B-3 NMFS Management Report

Bill Robinson reported that the GOA FMP Amendment 15 final rule was filed with the Federal Register on March 9 and will be effective after the 30-day cooling off period expires on April 8. The emergency rule currently implementing the single OY-target quota framework procedures, the crab closures around Kodiak, and the improved reporting requirements for catcher-processors will need to be extended until the final rule takes effect.

A notice of availability of a Secretarial amendment repealing the Tanner Crab FMP and its implementing regulations was published in the Federal Register on March 2. Comments will be accepted until April 22.

The final rule for BSAI Amendment 10 is currently being reviewed by OMB and is expected to be filed with the Federal Register on March 16. All of the amendment except for the field order authority will take effect immediately upon filing because the 30-day cooling off period has been waived.

The Alaska Region has also submitted a regulatory amendment for both the BSAI and GOA plans bringing the federal sponsorship of the State of Alaska fish ticket system for catch data collection into greater conformity in the implementing regulations of the two FMPs and making it clear that landings of

fish from the EEZ, even if landed to a floating processor in the territorial sea or internal waters of the state, require a fish ticket.

NMFS also announced the impending closure of the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf to directed fishing for sablefish with trawl gear, effective at noon, Saturday, March 21, in order to reserve the remaining uncaught portion of the trawl quota for bycatch. This will delay prohibiting retention of sablefish by trawlers and the accompanying waste. NMFS is monitoring fishing in the Central Regulatory Area and expects to take similar action there well before the trawl quota is reached.

Mr. Robinson told the Council that NMFS will require all sablefish longline fishermen who intend to participate in the fishery in the Gulf of Alaska beginning April 1 to register for the area in which they intend to fish. They will also be required to register for new areas if they move from an area that is being closed to one that remains open.

The Council was also informed that the Region has obtained \$350,000 to replace funding lost by ADF&G for administering the State fish ticket program for groundfish. A contract has been negotiated with ADF&G to begin collecting fish tickets in various ports where groundfish are landed and enter them into a data base system at NMFS in Juneau. A data base administrator will be hired to routinely manage the system. The Region also will have two new staff members in the near future, both to work with catch and effort data.

Groundfish Fisheries. The total U.S. processed catch through late February was 53,425 mt with about 45,000 mt coming from the Bering Sea and Aleutians area. Catch composition was 28,632 mt pollock, 1,110 mt sablefish, 14,331 mt Pacific cod, 8,208 mt rock sole, and 1,144 mt various other species.

Joint ventures harvested 377,322 mt, all from the Bering Sea and Aleutians. Catch composition was 358,985 mt pollock, 16,208 mt Pacific cod and 2,129 mt various other species.

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Foreign fisheries harvested only 15,293 mt by late February, mostly Pacific cod in the Bering Sea. There was concern expressed by the Council over foreign directed fisheries on pollock in the international waters of the Bering Sea (i.e., the "donut hole"). Little information is available on this fishery. The Council is strongly encouraging all nations to provide accurate, timely catch information on their operations in the "donut."

Foreign Transshipment. Craig Hammond told the Council that he has received several inquiries recently in regard to regulations concerning the transshipment of product from the U.S. catcher/processor fleet to foreign flag transport vessels. As a result, NMFS has reviewed their established enforcement policy and in early March mailed a letter to the Council and all the permitted catcher/processor vessels. The Magnuson Act clearly prohibits foreign fishing within the territorial sea. That definition of fishing includes such activities as the transfer of fish and fish products and supplying of fuel, provisions, fishing gear and supplies. The definition does not allow the transfer of fish products from a U.S. flag catcher/processor to a foreign flag transport vessel or a foreign flag vessel to provide support to a U.S. flag vessel within the territorial sea. NOAA's interpretation of the Act does not, however, prohibit such transfers if they occur within the confines of a port or an established roadstead. Such transfers can occur beyond the territorial sea, more than three miles offshore, but in that situation it is viewed as a joint venture operation and the foreign flag vessel must have a joint venture permit and comply with the area's reporting requirements.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council concurred with NMFS' plans to extend the emergency rule implementing sections of Amendment 15 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan until the plan goes into effect.

The Council also discussed foreign vessels, particularly those from Poland, fishing in the "donut" area while waiting joint ventures to begin. Council members expressed their continuing concern with the lack of information on the fish harvested in this zone. It was suggested that the Council may base

future privileges to operate in the U.S. EEZ on the foreign country providing this harvest information.

B-4 Coast Guard Reports on Activities

U.S. Coast Guard enforcement efforts off Alaska through February 28 totaled 113 cutter days and 224 aircraft hours. Nineteen notices of violation and written warnings have been issued to foreign vessels and 4 to those from the U.S. vessels. The infractions were mainly for failure to maintain required logs and reports. A Japanese longliner was issued a notice of violation for failure to provide assistance to an NMFS observer as required, and a Chinese processor was cited for conducting fisheries support activities without a NMFS observer on board as well as logbook violations and not keeping its International Radio Call Sign legible.

The Coast Guard reported recent problems with Polish fishing vessels entering U.S. territorial waters without first obtaining Coast Guard approval and stressed the importance of vessels from the Soviet Union, Poland, and China complying with the appropriate regulations regarding entry into U.S. territorial waters or ports.

The Coast Guard also warned that they will be citing vessels running with their high intensity work lights on because of the hazard to navigation, particularly in congested or restricted waters. The lights may obscure navigational lights, deteriorate night vision, and blind other vessels.

B-5 Joint Venture Operations

Joint ventures with five countries reported catching about 430,000 mt by early March. U.S. trawlers delivered 235,407 mt to the Japanese, 170,516 mt to the Koreans, 20,000 to the Soviets, 200 mt to the Poles and 5,500 mt to the Chinese. The harvest stands at about 22 percent of the total requested at the December Council meeting. Fifty-two U.S. trawlers made deliveries in January and 92 in February, a considerable expansion over the first two months of 1984-86.

B-6 Predator-Prey Interactions

Pat Livingston of the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center gave a presentation on predator-prey interactions among fish species.

C-1 Legislative Update

The Council received a briefing on several bills that have been introduced since the beginning of the 100th Congress. There appears to be considerable interest in Washington, DC, in addressing the problem of plastics pollution of the marine environment. H.R. 474, H.R. 940, S. 62, S. 559, S. 560, and S. 633 all focus on various aspects of plastics pollution. The Senate is expected to ratify Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships in the near future.

The issue of the reflagging of foreign vessels is also being considered by Congress. Representative Young introduced a bill, H.R. 438, on January 7, 1987, that prohibits the reflagging of foreign built fishing, fish processing, and tender vessels as U.S. vessels after October 31, 1986. The Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Merchant Marine, and Coast Guard Subcommittees of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will hold a joint hearing on H.R. 438 in Washington, DC, on April 29, 1987, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 1334 of the Longworth Office Building. Senators Stevens and Murkowski have introduced S. 377 that would impose a ten-year moratorium on the ability of foreign built vessels to engage in fish processing under the U.S. flag.

The Council was also briefed on the latest move by the Reagan Administration to implement user fees on commercial and recreational marine fisheries as well as Coast Guard user fees. The current proposal is to levy the fees as part of a Marine Fisheries Conservation Assurance Program. The fee schedule would require a \$6 federal permit to fish in marine waters for commercial and recreational fishermen, a \$25 stamp for buyers or sellers of certain marine fish, a landing tax of 1% of exvessel value of certain fish landed for commercial purposes and a \$25 federal game fish stamp for certain species. Most of the fees would double in two years under this proposal. The Administration is also discussing Coast Guard user fees that could raise

\$355 million in FY88 and \$466 million annually thereafter. No draft legislation on either marine fisheries or Coast Guard user fees has, as yet, been circulated.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members agreed that they should urge the immediate ratification of Annex V to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

Rod Moore, fisheries aide to Representative Don Young, told the Council that the appropriate action would be to convey their concern to the State Department and urge that the ratification documents be transmitted to the Senate as soon as possible. Letters to the appropriate Congressional committees would also be appropriate.

Bob Mace moved to take the actions suggested by Mr. Moore. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and carried unanimously.

C-2 Halibut Management

Ron Miller gave a status report on 1987 regulations for the halibut fishery adopted by the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) in January. The Council, in response to testimony at the January Council meeting, recommended several actions to the IPHC: (1) that the halibut stocks in Areas 4A and 4B be managed as discrete stocks to aid the fishermen of Atka in achieving reasonable access to the halibut resource; (2) that they consider adopting an opening scheme for Area 4B similar to those in effect in Areas 4C and 4E (one day on/one day off, or two days on/one day off); and (3) that the IPHC explore all methods to minimize unlawful fishing, including preseason hold inspections.

In January the Council was also asked to support a proposal to create Areas 4F around Atka with a quota of 400,000 lbs, and Area 4G within Bristol Bay with a quota of 500,000 lbs. The Council determined that since the main aspect of

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

the proposed opening in the nursery area was biological, the matter properly fell within the jurisdiction of the IPHC.

The Commission did not adopt an opening scheme for Area 4B similar to those in effect in Areas 4C and 4E. Also, the Commission decided that the stocks in Areas 4A and 4B should be managed as a unit rather than as discrete stocks. Because of a lack of necessary funding, the Commission decided against mandatory preseason hold inspections.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

There was some discussion on the actions taken by IPHC. Bob McVey explained to the Council the reasoning behind the Commission's actions. He pointed out that although proposals by the Pribilovians for special measures to assure them a larger share of the quota were not adopted by the Commission, they did institute a special trip limit of 10,000 lbs. per vessel until 40% of the quota has been taken; after that time, trip limits would be off and there would be open fishing for residents and non-residents alike though still on a 1 day on, 1 day off routine.

C-3 Non-profit Fishery Research Foundation

Ron Miller reported that since the January 1987 meeting in Anchorage to discuss the creation of a private, non-profit fishery research foundation the steering committee has been reviewing a resolution to be distributed to the industry. Another meeting will be held in the near future in Anchorage to allow representatives from the industry to discuss and act on the resolution.

Rod Moore of Representative Don Young's office has refined draft legislation that would allow industry organizations created to fund fisheries research to require mandatory assessments on members. The legislation is to be introduced in the near future.

C-4 APPRISE

Ole Mathisen, University of Alaska-Juneau, reported on the progress of the Association of Primary Production and Recruitment in Subarctic Ecosystems (APPRISE) project being conducted by School of Fisheries & Science (University of Alaska-Juneau), the Institute of Marine Science at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, the Oceanic Institute in Hawaii, and the NMFS Auke Bay Laboratory. The goal of the project is to develop a predictive capability for larval recruitment which may be applicable to more extensive, less accessible fisheries areas.

C-5 Limited Entry

Bill Robinson, NMFS-Alaska Region, reported on his experience with limited access systems while working on an exchange program in Australia last year.

Stan Crothers of the New Zealand Fisheries Management Agency, working in Washington D.C. on an exchange from New Zealand, gave a presentation on their progress with limited access programs using individual trade quotas.

C-6 Other Business

(a) Sablefish Limited Entry

The Council received a status report from Bob Alverson on industry efforts to develop recommendations on limited access proposals for the sablefish fishery. The Fishing Vessel Owner's Association and North Pacific Longline Coalition (Sitka) sent out a questionnaire to all fishermen who landed sablefish in 1986. Responses are coming in but the results are too preliminary to analyze at this time. Mr. Alverson requested the Council establish the following schedule for sablefish limited entry: Between the March Council meeting and April, the Council solicit public comments for a long-term sablefish management program, to include traditional management schemes as well as limited entry options; review those proposals at the May meeting and choose those proposals to be further developed and instruct the plan team to redraft them for the September meeting; at the September meeting, Council

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

would review the plan team's draft and send out the proposals for public comment with a final decision at the December Council meeting. Mr. Alverson said they feel that timing is important in this issue and that once they get into the 1988 season it will be almost impossible for the Council and industry to develop any coherent plan.

Mr. Alverson told the Council that they have obtained the services of a University of Washington law student, Bill Mounts, who would be willing to work as a liaison between industry and the Council and NMFS in drafting of regulations for any program devised. They have also secured commitments from industry for \$25,000 to be used as matching funds for this work.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The Advisory Panel recommended the Council adopt the schedule proposed by Bob Alverson.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council felt that they should stay with the original plan -- to wait for specific proposals from industry before developing a schedule of analysis, public review and implementation. If, at the May meeting, the industry comes forward with some proposals they can agree to, then the Council could ask the plan team to prepare them for Council and public review.

(b) Next Allocation of TALFF

The Council discussed the next foreign allocation release, scheduled for April. Mr. Branson reported that there is approximately 32,000 mt of unallocated TALFF and that normally the April allocation is half of that total. The major species available are pollock, 3,700 mt; yellowfin sole, 3,404 mt; Arrowtooth flounder, 3,730 mt; other flounder, 9,958 mt; and Pacific cod, 8,760 mt. The Allocations Board meets April 1 in Washington and the Council agreed that Clarence Pautzke should attend along with a Council member of the Chairman's choosing. It was suggested that in order to expose Council members to this process, the assignment should be rotated among them.

As far as recommendations to the Board, it was pointed out that the main issue would be whether the foreign countries have been living up to their part of the industry agreements.

D. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

D-1 King and Tanner Crab FMP

(a) Annual King and Tanner Crab Hearing in Seattle.

The Council held its annual king and Tanner crab hearing in Seattle on March 4. With membership of the Alaska Board of Fisheries changing, no one from the Board could attend. Approximately ten members of the public attended the hearing. A summary of public testimony was provided in Council notebooks.

(b) Crab Management Committee Update

The Crab Management Committee met with members of the Crab Plan Team to review the first working draft of a combined King and Tanner Crab FMP for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. A report of that meeting was provided to Council members. With the advice provided them, the plan team will work on a new draft and meet again with the committee prior to the next Council meeting. They hope that after the May meeting the plan team will have enough direction to further revise the fishery management plan and complete the associated economic and environmental impact studies during the summer. The revised plan and decision documents will be inserted into the 1988 crab management cycle which calls for the new plan to be implemented sometime in late 1988.

Public Testimony

Arne Aadland/Thorn Smith, NPFVOA, recommended the extension of the 1987 C. opilio fishery in the northwest portion of the Bering Sea since this area is not surveyed well. This year the opilio harvest guideline is lower and fishermen hope that if CPUE remains high the season will be extended by NMFS. NPFVOA is concerned that with budget cuts ADF&G may not be able to monitor

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

CPUE rates as closely as in prior years and that this could affect the outcome of the season extension decision.

NPFVOA is developing a proposal for next year that will look at the possibility of lowering the minimum size limit for king crab. The current minimum size limit is 6½". The Association asked the Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center to examine this question and preliminary results from the analysis suggest that reduction of the size limit may not have an adverse effect on reproductive potential. Further analysis at the Center is planned.

Their Association favors leaving the current Tanner Crab FMP in place.

Arni Thomson, Alaska Crab Coalition. Mr. Thomson participated in the development of the new king and Tanner crab FMP and favors suspension of the current Tanner crab plan.

He also proposed that managers consider a split king crab season (fall/spring) in Bristol Bay to test the feasibility of eventually having a combined king and C. bairdi crab fishery immediately prior to the C. opilio fishery. One advantage of the proposal is that meat recovery or yield will be increased. The Coalition believes that harvesting half the guideline in the winter/early spring months will provide the same number of king crab to the fishery but at a higher average weight which could produce a higher exvessel value of the catch. Another advantage would be that by scheduling king and Tanner crab fisheries together, start-up costs and handling of crab will be reduced. The proposal will be developed further by the Coalition and submitted to the Board of Fisheries and Council in the future.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

The Council approved the Committee's report and time schedule and expressed appreciation for the work done by the Committee, plan team, and industry groups.

D-2 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

(a) 1987 Pollock Apportionments

In December the Council apportioned the pollock quota of 84,000 mt in the Gulf for 1987 as follows: DAP-83,700 mt; JVP-300 mt; TALFF-0 mt. That decision was based primarily on the NMFS industry survey conducted in November and testimony at the December Council meeting. Subsequent reevaluation of DAP requirements by Regional staff indicated there was as much as 21,900 mt available for other than DAP use from the target quota of 84,000 mt. Regional Director Bob McVey recommended that amount be transferred from DAP to JVP (21,900 mt) with the reserve to be held for either category as needed (20% of TQ = 16,800 mt). Under Secretary Calio asked the Council to comment on this recommendation.

Jim Balsiger, Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center, reported on preliminary pollock stock assessment from the ongoing hydroacoustic survey by the MILLER FREEMAN. He stressed that these data were collected on the first of three legs of the survey and are very preliminary. He gave the Council four basic pieces of information: (1) the geographic area of aggregation is smaller than last year; (2) the density of aggregation is less than last year; (3) the first layer, at 100 fathoms, was all three-year-old fish and the second layer, 5 fathoms from the bottom, contained all sizes; and (4) the gonad maturation is similar to past years. Based on these preliminary data, Mr. Balsiger said they have no reason to believe that there will be an increase in the abundance of pollock in the Gulf this year.

Report of the Advisory Panel

The AP recommended 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.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

The SSC declined to consider the matter of Gulf of Alaska pollock apportionments among DAP, JVP and TALFF, as the issues did not include matters of science.

Public Testimony for all groundfish items is found in Appendix I to these minutes.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Council members felt it was important to give the Regional Director direction to finalize the apportionments for 1987, but also felt that the final results of the acoustical survey would be helpful before making any recommendation.

There was also some concern whether the Council should go outside its established procedure and make changes at this point in time and with very preliminary information.

Don Collinworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendation with regard to the apportionment of pollock to DAP and JVP in the Gulf, which is:

That 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.

In the interim, the Council recommends that the Regional Director not release any pollock to JVP in the Gulf.

The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell and carried 9 to 1, with Rudy Petersen voting against and Bob McVey abstaining.

(b) AMENDMENT 16

Amendment 16 to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan addresses the following issues:

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).

Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all gear (include consideration of a 22-inch limit).

Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-longline and pots).

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish year-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider square approximation of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider January through June closures of the 100-mile zones and the entire Bering Sea.

Alternative 4: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all DAP vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from DAP catcher/processors and mothership/processors.

Fishing season framework.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., the setting of seasons will require a plan amendment).

Alternative 2: Establish a fishing season framework to allow the annual setting of seasons, using a more efficient notice procedure.

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

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no bycatch limit other than for halibut can be placed on the groundfish fishery; no authority to set PSC limits on foreign fisheries; when halibut PSC limit is reached, just bottom trawl fisheries close).

Alternative 2: Establish a framework measure to control bycatches of all prohibited species. Will provide authority to set PSC limits for all traditional prohibited species on all domestic and foreign groundfish fisheries.

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

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., existing plan would remain out of date and difficult to use).

Alternative 2: Update FMP, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. This alternative address includes several administrative changes, a description of rockfish management strategies, a revised list of target species, and clarification of legal gear.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

Complete comments of the SSC are found in their minutes, Appendix II.

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish. The SSC pointed out that the analysis provided in the draft amendment indicates that a size limit would not increase the total yield from the stock in view of the current low fishing mortality. While the analysis indicates that there is a possibility of some economic gain to be realized by applying a size limit to the catches of longliners, it must be understood that these gains will be rapidly dissipated if constraints are not placed on the level of effort deployed in the fishery. Given these conclusions, the SSC suggested that if the Council wishes to implement a size limit for the longline fishery, serious consideration must be given to simultaneous implementation of a program to limit effort. They

questioned the advisability of continuing public review of the amendment without addressing limitation of effort.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island. The SSC concluded that the catch/effort equation used in the RIR did not provide the data needed to determine how this action would affect both DAP and non-DAP fishermen. They recommended that the analysis and conclusions based on this CPUE model be removed from the RIR. The SSC made specific recommendations to the plan teams for amending the RIR and recommended the proposal be sent out for public review after the modifications are made.

Revise the definition of prohibited species. The SSC recommended that this proposal be sent out for public review.

Improve catch recording requirements. The SSC noted that the proposal goes beyond the original reason for the amendment, which was to allow the verification of the amount of groundfish being caught by catcher/processors and mothership/processors. They support the collection of information that is required for fisheries management and research, but feel that it is premature to use this amendment to initiate and define a DAP reporting system. The SSC found that the proposal as presented fails to provide the reader with sufficient information on the types of information to be collected and that the proposal also requires extensive editing. They recommended a fourth alternative be added to the package: "Apply the 'Cumulative Product Log' and the 'Transfer Logbook' recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels." With the additional alternative and clarification, the SSC recommended the proposal be sent out for public review.

Fishing season framework. The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review after minor editorial changes.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs).
The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review after the plan team makes some minor changes for the sake of clarification.

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. The SSC recommended sending this proposal out for public review but stressed the need for the revision to proceed with attention to the need for consistency with the BSAI groundfish fishery management plan.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. Although they recognized the model in the RIR/EA indicates little impact, the majority of the AP felt that it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. The AP also recommended that if the proposal goes out for public review the CPUE model should be translated into language more easily understood by the public.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island. The AP recommended an amended version of the alternatives for this proposal be sent out for public review:

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.

After extensive discussion and testimony about the RIR document the AP recommended numerous changes to the authors. 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 recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

Improve catch recording requirements. The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review, incorporating the SSC's recommendation for a fourth alternative.

Fishing Season Framework. The AP recommended 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.

Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" (i.e., halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crabs). The AP recommended a rewritten and amended proposal be sent out for public review which 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.

They also recommended a third alternative be added: "Defer the issue of bycatch of prohibited species to the Bycatch Subcommittee."

Update Gulf of Alaska FMP descriptive sections, reorganize chapters, and incorporate Council policy as directed. The AP recommended this proposal be sent out for public review.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND ACTION

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Don Collinsworth moved to send the proposal out for public review, incorporating the AP's suggestions for clarification. The motion was seconded by Henry Mitchell, and failed 8 to 3, with Collinsworth, Mitchell and Winther voting for the motion.

Several Council members felt that the analysis did not have compelling enough arguments to prove the benefits of a size limit on sablefish and that it would be a waste of time and effort to continue with this proposal for public review. It was also pointed out that the SSC recommended that a size limit be considered only in connection with a limited entry proposal for the fishery.

Mr. Collinsworth said he made the motion because it is consistent with the AP's recommendation. He also commented that in conversations with fishermen the sablefish size limit has been discussed as a way of regulating the catch which would be an economic advantage.

DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendations, including the 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,

and that the plan team address the concerns of the SSC regarding the CPUE model, before sending out for public review. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried, 7 to 4, with Dyson, Mace, M. Pedersen, and R. Petersen voting against.

There was considerable discussion and debate on this amendment proposal, particularly on whether there was sufficient time to develop the new alternative (6) and get the package out for the 30-day public review period. It was suggested that the plan team could obtain additional technical help from the Regional Office, the Center and the Auke Bay Lab. Many felt that if the proposal was approved for public review it should contain the maximum and most diverse alternatives possible.

Further discussion on the alternatives and, specifically Alternative 6, addressed whether the alternatives were appropriate to the objective of the proposal, priority for domestic processors. Some felt that Alternative 6, spreading JVP allocations over a number of seasons within the year, was another issue and should not be addressed under this proposal. There was also some concern whether the plan team would be able to properly analyze the wide range of alternatives suggested. The Council also discussed whether this proposal would address only pollock or all species in the Bering Sea.

John Winther moved to restrict analysis of this proposal to pollock. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and carried, 8 to 3, with John Peterson, Mitchell, and Collinsworth voting against.

Mr. McVey suggested that between now and the May meeting the plan team and staff could work with industry to prepare a well-developed Alternative 6 along with supporting documents. The Council could approve it for public review at that time and make a final decision in September. If, by January 1, there were compelling conservation reasons for implementing the final decision, perhaps it could be done by emergency rule. Jon Pollard, NOAA-GC, told Council members that he could not predict whether an emergency rule could be used at that time.

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

Some Council members felt that there isn't a problem to be dealt with, that Americanization of the shoreside processing industry is taking place as quickly as possible now; others felt that the proposal should be developed and sent out for public review.

The Council instructed the plan team to proceed with the proposal for public review, completing as much analysis as possible.

Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Henry Mitchell moved to sent the proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by Mark Pedersen and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Improve catch recording requirements.

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendations, which was to send the proposal out for public review including a fourth alternative (Apply the "Cumulative Product Log" and the "Transfer Logbook" recording requirements to catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels. The motion was seconded by Bob McVey and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

There was some concern about the broad scope of the data that would be required under such a program. John Harville pointed out that industry cooperation is a must for logbooks to be effective. He suggested that the development of the details of this proposal should include industry participation. Mr. McVey said that they will work with industry to clarify NMFS' specific needs and to find some common ground.

Fishing season framework.

Don Collinsworth moved to send out this proposal with the AP's recommendation to amend Alternative 2 to include additional criteria for proposal evaluation, including analysis of whether seasons would have an allocative impact. The motion was seconded by Bob Mace and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

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

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP's recommendation: to send out for public review a rewritten and amended proposal which 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, and

that a third alternative be added: "Defer the issue of bycatch of prohibited species to the Bycatch Subcommittee." The motion was seconded by John Winther and, there being no objection, it was so ordered.

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

Don Collinsworth moved to send this proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by Larry Cotter and, there being no objection, it was so ordered. Oscar Dyson was not present for this vote.

There was some concern about the work going into a revision with the current objective of combining the two groundfish plans. However, Steve Davis told Council members that the chapters being updated will have to be done, even for a combined plan. Bob Mace asked that staff come back to the Council with a workable schedule for combining the two groundfish plans.

D-3 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands FMP.

Amendment 11.

Amendment 11 to the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP addressed the following issues (those marked with an asterisk are common to both the Gulf and Bering Sea FMPs):

*Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no minimum size limits).

Alternative 2: Establish a single minimum size limit for all gear (include consideration of a 22-inch limit).

Alternative 3: Establish a minimum size limit for fixed gear only (i.e., hook-and-longline and pots).

*DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.

Alternative 1: Do nothing (i.e., no area restrictions on foreign processors receiving fish from U.S. fishermen).

Alternative 2: Establish year-round area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider square approximation of a 100-mile circle centered on Unalaska Island.

Alternative 3: Establish seasonal area closures. Two sub-alternatives consider January through June closures of the 100-mile zones and the entire Bering Sea.

Alternative 4: Establish a fee structure for foreign processors who receive joint venture fish.

*Revise the definition of prohibited species.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Clarify, but not substantially alter, definition.

*Improve catch recording requirements.

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Require fishing and transfer logbooks for all DAP vessels.

Alternative 3: Require the logbooks only from DAP catcher/processors and mothership/processors.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

Alternative 1: Do nothing.

Alternative 2: Amend definition to conform with that used by Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Increase Upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

- Alternative 1: Do nothing (upper value remains 2.0 million mt).
- Alternative 2: Raise upper value of OY range to 2.4 million mt.
- Alternative 3: Equate upper value of OY range to annual sum of EY/ABCs.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

- Alternative 1: Do nothing.
- Alternative 2: Prohibit JVP roe-stripping.
- Alternative 3: Prohibit JVP and DAP roe-stripping.
- Alternative 4: Establish semi-annual JVP pollock allocation.

Public testimony for this agenda item is found in Appendix I.

Report of the Scientific and Statistical Committee

Complete comments of the SSC are found in their minutes, Appendix II. Please refer to the Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2, for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

The SSC recommended this proposal be sent out for public review. In addition, they recommended that the plan team add the following definition of threshold to the proposal:

The threshold is defined as the minimum size of a stock that allows sufficient recruitment so that the stock can eventually reach a level that produces MSY.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

The SSC suggested to the team a number of editorial changes to the proposal and recommended it be sent out for public comment after those changes are made.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

The SSC recommended this proposal be sent out for public comment.

Report of the Advisory Panel

Please refer to the Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2, for comments on the first four proposals, common to both plans.

Revise the definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

The AP recommended sending this proposal out for public review.

Increase upper value of optimum yield (OY) range.

The AP recommended 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."

Prohibit pollock roe stripping.

The AP recommended the proposal be sent out for public review.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ACTION

Council discussion and action on the following proposals is found under the

Gulf of Alaska agenda item, D-2:

Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.
DAP priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island.
Revise the definition of prohibited species.
Improve catch recording requirements.

Revise definition of acceptable biological catch (ABC).

Don Collinsworth moved to adopt the AP recommendation to send the proposal out for public review after incorporating the definition of threshold suggested by the SSC. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and, there being objection, it was so ordered.

Increase the upper value of optimum yield (OY) range:

Mark Pedersen moved to send the proposal out for public comment after making the editorial changes proposed by the SSC and incorporating the AP's suggestion for Alternative 3 into a new, fourth alternative: "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 was seconded by Henry Mitchell and carried with John Winther objecting. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

Prohibit pollock roe-stripping.

Bob Mace moved to drop this proposal from the package. The motion was seconded by Rudy Petersen and failed, 6 to 4, with Mace, McVey, M. Pedersen, and R. Petersen voting in favor. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote.

The reason for this motion was previous testimony by the original proposers of the amendment indicating they wished to withdraw it.

Henry Mitchell moved to send this proposal out for public review. The motion was seconded by John Peterson and carried, 6 to 4, with Mace, McVey, M. Pedersen and R. Petersen voting against. Mr. Dyson was not present for the vote. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that public testimony indicated some people

DRAFT MINUTES
COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 1987

still feel there is a need for this proposal to be analyzed and public testimony solicited.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bob McVey reported on the GATT negotiations with Japan. Negotiators have been successful in gaining IQ considerations on pollock and herring. It won't be a formal agreement, but an exchange of letters. Under pollock there will be a new quota category for which the initial allocation will be 100,000 tons round weight and will be available for any willing buyer and seller with no qualification other than a legitimate contract. There is also a mechanism for increasing the amount if needed. This should be functional by the first of April. On herring, the Japanese IQ will be broken into two parts, with one for Pacific herring at 50,000 tons round weight; quota shares will be divided equally among traders and users. A more detailed report will be prepared upon completion of the negotiations.

Paul Fuhs, Mayor of Unalaska, commented on the video he had shown during public testimony. He apologized for the controversy caused, but said that it was shown in good faith. The film was recorded about five weeks ago and there was no deliberate intent to misrepresent the facts. The point was to stress the importance of managing stocks conservatively.

Council member Larry Cotter asked to have a report at the May Council meeting on the issue of "dumping" excess fish so that the Council can have more information in order to discuss the problem. Al Burch was asked by the Council to prepare a report for the May meeting.

Paul MacGregor. Mr. MacGregor expressed concern over the Council's discussion on the impending TALFF releases. He reported on the progress of various projects provided for in the 1987 Japanese-U.S. industry agreements: (1) a Japanese research cruise has been scheduled; (2) a delegation is on the way to Nelson Island to implement a program to try to develop a groundfish fishery with Nelson Island residents; (3) they have agreed to put more money into a pink salmon project in Unalakleet; (4) have pursued negotiations with KEG fishermen for a project in Norton Sound later this summer; (5) they have

contacted every U.S. processor they can about the availability of import quotas in Japan; and (6) have been active participants and supporters of negotiations between the United States and Japan on herring and pollock IQs.

F. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Campbell adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, March 20.

Public Testimony - Groundfish Agenda Items

D-2(a) - Gulf of Alaska Pollock JVP/DAP

Jerome Selby, Mayor of Kodiak Island Borough. Mr. Selby thanked the Council for allocating the total pollock harvest in the Gulf to domestic operations. He gave the Council statistics supporting their ability to harvest and process the total allocation and asked that the Council not change their earlier decision.

Oliver Holm, Kodiak Longliners' Assn. Mr. Holm said that there is more processing capacity for pollock right now than there is catching capacity because boats can make more money catching for joint ventures, but that is not a valid reason to allow joint ventures. He also feels that the Council has made a mistake in managing pollock -- the plan team told the Council in 1985 that the stock was declining and it has.

Steve Johnson, High Seas Fisheries Association. Mr. Johnson told the Council that this new association represents joint ventures from California, Oregon, Washington and Alaska. He stressed that if there is excess fish over domestic needs they should be made available to joint ventures. In this way the net return to the U.S. is maximized. He also stressed that the Council has set up a system so the Regional Director can make such allocations and that they should stay with that system.

Henry Kim, Alkod Seafood Inc., Kodiak. They opened their processing plant on February 15, 1987, and are having problems getting roe sources. They would like to to work with a joint venture of 10,000 mt in the Shelikof Strait.

Vic Horgan, Ocean Beauty Seafoods & King Crab, Inc. Mr. Horgan told the Council they have handled 770 tons cod in the last two weeks and have processed 145 tons pollock to date. They will have 7 draggers and 19 longliners fishing for them by the end of the month and will be able to operate year-round. They have 75 new jobs for groundfish processing only and will have approximately 210 employed during the peak cod season. They do have some concern about the pollock resource and urged the Council to be conservative in the total catch quota.

Thorn Smith/Mick Stevens, NPFVOA, ProFish. Joint ventures have been the driving force in full development of the groundfish fisheries and paved the way for DAP processing both at sea and shoreside. All of the joint venture operators recognize they are in a transition period and will be phased out, but in the meantime they ask only that fish excess to DAP needs are apportioned in a timely manner to JVP so that American harvester engaged in joint ventures can help to achieve OY and maximize the benefits of the resource to the nation.

Mick Stevens read a letter from Walter Pereyra of ProFish into the record. The letter, addressed to Dr. Calio, stressing the importance of allocating excess DAP pollock in the Gulf to JVP interests.

Dave Woodruff, Alaska Fresh Seafoods, Kodiak. In the past 30 days they have expanded from 8 or 9 fish lines to 19 and at least 3 more are on the way. Their biggest problem has been getting vessels to bring the fish in. Right now, they are processing about 70% cod and approximately 30% pollock.

Annie Burnham, Alaskan Joint Venture Fisheries. The main issue is whether there is a surplus of pollock in the Gulf for joint ventures in 1987. The Regional Director is the one who has the authority and information to make this decision and he should be supported. Joint venture companies need to know what the allocations are as early in the year as possible for planning purposes.

D-2/D-3 Groundfish Amendments

Paul Fuhs, Mayor of Unalaska. Mr. Fuhs told the Council that one solution to solving the problem of getting product to shoreside plants may be marketing. He is not necessarily locked into the 100-mile closure idea and hopes the Council will take into consideration the AP's remarks on this proposal. He also asked that the Council at least send it out for public comment at this time.

Bill Orr, Alaska Factory Trawlers Assn, gave comments on several of the amendment proposals: Catch reporting requirements. He said they can't support sending this proposal out for public review because it's not clear as to how it will work and what impacts there will be. If it goes out for public review, he suggests an additional alternative which would address updating the current weekly reporting log and an additional transfer log that could take care of at-sea transfers. Also, if it does go out for public comment, it should apply to all vessels, not just catcher/processors. Sablefish size limit. Cannot support this proposal as no long-term economic benefit can be proven and there is nothing that could improve management, the resource, or industry. Increase upper OY limit. This should be looked at very seriously by the Council but should not go out for public comment at this time as there should be more analysis of the relationship between the domestic harvest and that in the "donut." PSC definition. This proposal is not ready to be sent out for public review yet. The analysis is too general and the public cannot determine how it will actually work. Fishing season framework. He feels this proposal fails to include the regulatory language and FMP language that will put this proposal into effect which makes it very difficult to comment on or to know how it would work.

Barry Collier, PSPA. PSPA recommended that the Council follow the advice of the Advisory Panel with regard to the DAP priority proposal (send out with all six alternatives). With regard to the proposed increase in OY for the Bering Sea, PSPA is opposed to any change in the Bering Sea OY structure until they have more information on the impacts of current intensive roe fisheries and catch statistics on U.S.-origin pollock being harvested in the Soviet Union and the "donut" area.

Cindy Lowry, Greenpeace. They favor balanced management of the diverse Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands ecosystem. Such balance involves successful management of fishery stocks to maintain long term sustainability and preservation of

marine mammal and seabird species. They oppose raising the OY to 2.4 million mt. They would favor an additional alternative setting OY equal to ABC with an overall cap of 2 million mt.

Joe Plesha, USA Coalition. USA Coalition supports the DAP priority proposal. They are anxious and eager to work with all segments of the industry to obtain the most viable methods to benefit all segments of the U.S. industry.

Jim Crutchfield presented a prepared paper on the DAP priority proposal. His main point was to let market forces and efficiency dictate how Americanization is achieved.

Eric Maisonpierre, Alaskan Joint Venture Fisheries. He feels the DAP priority proposal is an example of one segment of the industry asking for special measures to their benefit. Americanization should be allowed to evolve naturally, not through artificial constraints.

Mick Stevens, Thorn Smith, Fred Yeck and Annie Burnham, representing an industry ad hoc workgroup on joint venture policies. Mr. Yeck, representing the American High Seas Fisheries Assn., said their association originally proposed the prohibition of pollock roe stripping but, after further reflection, they feel that roe stripping is not the cause of the problem and that further regulation of the fishery would be inappropriate and asked the Council to withdraw the proposal. Suggested industry be allowed to self-regulate or that the season be split into two seasons with the JVP divided among the two.

Thorn Smith suggested the Council might allow industry to work on the problem of rationalization of the pollock industry rather than going forward with the roe stripping proposal at this time.

Oliver Holm, Kodiak Longliners' Assn, commented on several amendment proposals: Season Framework. Recommended this go out for public comment. DAP Priority. This proposal should go out for public preview. The intent of the MFCMA is to ensure domestic priority. Sablefish size limit. They do not recommend this proposal go out for public review. Very little economic benefit would be derived from the proposed regulation. Recommend all proposals except the sablefish size limit go out for public comment.

Steve Hughes, Midwater Trawlers' Co-op, Highliners Assn. In evaluating the DAP priority proposal, he feels that there is a fair amount of analysis based on foreign fishing data in order to show the distribution of cod and pollock catches by foreign nations in the past, and he feels that the data is not relevant as foreign fishing was not allowed in the area in Dutch Harbor during the years evaluated. This area is extremely important, particularly for pollock and cod, and there is no information in the proposal package to show this. If the proposal goes out for public review it should be strengthened to make it credible.

Thorn Smith, NPFVOA. On the DAP priority proposal, they feel there is already rapid progress toward full development of the U.S. groundfish fisheries off Alaska and that closing such a large area of fishing grounds to joint venture and foreign fisheries is not going to solve the main problem which is transportation. They recommend that the proposal not be sent out, or if the Council wishes to pursue it that they delay sending it out until the documentation can be improved. NPFVOA recommended the OY proposal be sent out

for public comment and prefer the regular amendment process for changing seasons rather than a framework.

Al Burch, Alaska Draggers' Assn. In regard to sablefish limited entry, Mr. Burch feels that the only way to approach this would be total limited entry on all fisheries, not just for a single species. He has some problems with expanding the halibut PSC framework, particularly with the zero caps, and suggested this be referred to the bycatch committee. Because their association includes both joint venture and shorebased trawlers the issue of priority of access of particular interest to them. Their association has a history of working to encourage shorebased trawling, but they find the idea of closing off the area around Dutch Harbor, or any other area, unacceptable.

David Fraser, Gary Westman, and Lyle Yeck, Midwater Trawlers Co-op. With regard to the DAP priority proposal, Mr. Yeck said that fishermen should have the opportunity to deliver to the best market available and not be restricted by regulations such as this one.

Mr. Westman told the Council he has two vessels, one delivering to a joint venture processor and one delivering to a domestic floating processor. If the DAP priority proposal is approved his fishing operation will be severely impacted. The steady and reliable market with the joint venture company has allowed his company to purchase and outfit the second vessel which is now delivering to a domestic processor. Feels this proposal is contrary to the Americanization process. Urged the status quo on this proposal.

Mr. Fraser said he is concerned about some aspects of the way the fisheries are progressing under the current "olympic" system. He feels there is a danger of an overcapitalized harvest sector which could result in pressure for inflated OYs. Suggested a forum to brainstorm for ideas for managing the fishery such as nation-by-nation allocations, periodic releases or individual share quotas. They feels the best forum for this is the ad hoc industry workgroup on joint ventures. He feels the DAP priority zone would be counter-productive to the Americanization process.

John Dooley, Bob Watson, American High Seas Fisheries Assn. They are opposed to the DAP priority proposal and urged that the Council allow time for industry to develop naturally.

Dean Paddock, Bristol Bay Driftnetters. Urged the Council to send out the PSC framework proposal for public review and to include salmon and crab in the PSC framework as soon as possible.

Mick Stevens, ProFish, had the following comments on Bering Sea amendment package proposals: ABC Definition. Recommended it be sent out for public review and that Council adopt Alternative 2, to amend the definition as recommended by the SSC. OY. Supported Alternative 3, to equate the upper value of the OY range to the annual sum of EY/ABCs. DAP priority. Recommended this proposal be removed from the amendment package.

Barry Fisher, was not able to attend the meeting but sent a taped statement. He is totally opposed to the DAP priority proposal. If this is put into effect, effort and production will be curtailed and the higher costs of production will be passed on to the American consumer.

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 Phil Mundy
Phil Mundy, Chairman

Date 5/8/87

MINUTES
Scientific and Statistical Committee
March 16-17, 1987
Anchorage, Alaska

The Scientific and Statistical Committee met March 16-17, 1987 at the Hilton Hotel, Anchorage, Alaska. Members present were:

Phil Mundy, Chairman
Rich Marasco, Vice Chairman
John Burns
Terry Quinn
Larry Hreha
Don Rosenberg

Don Bevan
Bill Clark
Gordon Kruse(alternate)
Bill Aron
Robert Burgner

Pollock apportionments to DAP, JVP and TALFF for 1987

The SSC declined to consider the matter of Gulf of Alaska pollock apportionments among DAP, JVP and TALFF, as the issues did not include matters of science.

Groundfish Plans

The SSC recommends the development of an amendment to combine the two groundfish plans for the next cycle.

To accomplish this the SSC requests that a special team be appointed (members from the existing teams) to identify the areas of inconsistency between the two plans and to develop recommendations for resolving them. This special team should provide a report to the SSC and to the Council at the next meeting, including a schedule for the development of a plan amendment for the next cycle. The SSC consulted with the plan team and much of this is already finished.

D-2 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan Amendment 16

- Establish a Minimum Size Limit for Sablefish (also BS/AI Amendment 11)

At the last meeting the SSC recommended that this amendment be assigned a high priority but for consideration during the next cycle. The reason for that recommendation was to allow sufficient data to be obtained and evaluated with regard to a minimum size limit. The SSC was concerned that time and personnel were insufficient between January and this meeting for the team to gather, document and fully analyze this information. The SSC would like to commend the team on the effort expended in accomplishing this difficult task in the short time available. The SSC only received this analysis and a supporting document at the beginning of this meeting and therefore, our review has been limited.

The SSC points out that the analysis provided in the draft amendment indicates that a size limit would not increase the total yield from the stock in view of the current low fishing mortality. While the analysis indicates that there is a possibility of some economic gain to be realized by applying a size limit to the catches of longliners, it must be understood that these gains will be rapidly dissipated if constraints are not placed on the level of effort deployed in the fishery. Given these conclusions, the SSC suggests that if the Council wishes to implement a size limit for the longline fishery, serious consideration must be given to simultaneous implementation of a program to limit effort. The SSC questions the advisability of continuing public review of the amendment without addressing limitation of effort.

- DAP Priority within 100 miles of Unalaska Island (also BS/AI Amendment 11)

Critical to the examination of the benefits and costs of this proposal is knowledge of how both DAP and non-DAP fishermen will be affected by the proposed action.

Individuals supporting the closure claim that excluding JVP and foreign fishing fleets will increase CPUE experienced by DAP vessels. In the RIR a catch/effort equation was used to examine this issue. The equation, which was taken from the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Amendment #6 RIR (NPFMC July 1983, p. 23), was developed from data for the 1979-81 Japanese trawl fishery. After its initial examination of the equation in question the SSC concluded in 1983 that:

"While monthly Japanese catch data for 1979, 80 and 81 were used to statistically estimate the relationship between catch and effort, it is not clear that the results provided information about the relationship. During the course of any given year, there are any number of factors that could mask the relationship between catch and effort. Seasonality is an example of one such variable. Given the data used in the analysis, seasonality could be an important explanatory variable. Failure to account for its influence could lead to erroneous conclusions concerning the effect on catch rates of changes in the level of foreign fishing effort. That is, it might be concluded that, as the result of incomplete analysis of the data, effort reductions by the foreign fleet would increase catch rates when in reality no such increases would occur."
(SSC minutes July 1983, p. 4)

The SSC still supports this position and recommends analysis and conclusions based on this CPUE model be removed from the RIR. Proper analysis of the CPUE effects of the proposed closure requires estimation of catch/effort equations for the DAP and JVP catcher boat segments of the fishing fleet. It must be pointed out that the limited nature of the data will make it difficult to state definitely how CPUE will be affected by the proposed action.

As is true for DAP fisheries, determination of how non-DAP fisheries would be affected by the 100 mile closure requires knowledge of how the catch and effort are related. The dynamics of these fisheries may require development of catch/effort relationships that are time and area specific. As was noted in the case of DAP fisheries it will be very difficult to make definitive statements about how CPUEs of joint venture operations will be affected by this measure. The RIR indicates that the proposed closure has the potential for significantly reducing gross revenues accruing to the joint venture fleet.

Data presented in the request indicate that the cost associated with adoption of the proposed action could be substantial. The SSC feels that there is considerable uncertainty associated with benefits that might accrue from the proposed action. If any benefits accrue they would stem mostly from CPUE modifications. Evidence is currently lacking that clearly demonstrates that exclusion of JVP vessels from the proposed area would improve DAP vessel CPUEs.

The SSC notes that information contained in the RIR contributes to the understanding of the issue. The usefulness of this document would be increased by elimination of the CPUE analyses, inclusion of detailed information indicating the spatial and temporal distribution of catches, and by making several editorial corrections. The SSC supports sending the document out for public review once the modifications are made.

- Revise the Definition of a Prohibited Species (also BS/AI Amendment 11)

The SSC recommends that this be sent out for public review.

- Improve Catch Recording Requirements (also BS/AI Amendment 11)

The SSC received a presentation from the NMFS region staff on the proposed amendment to improve the catch reporting requirements. The SSC notes that the original reason for the amendment was to allow the verification of the amount of groundfish being caught by catcher/processors and mothership/processors. The amendment, as presented, goes beyond what is required to correct the current reporting problem, expanding into the areas of collecting effort and discard data from all DAP vessels.

The SSC supports the collection of information that is required for fisheries management and research, but feels that it is premature to use this amendment to initiate and define a DAP report system. Reporting requirements for the DAP fisheries beyond the existing fish ticket system need careful definition and justification. The first step should be to itemize data needs and specify the uses (analyses) of those data for assessment and management. Then the specific reporting requirements should be developed and prepared for public review.

The Gulf plan team leader informed the SSC that some members were unable to support the expansion of this amendment into this broader area of collecting effort and discard data, since certain types of information in the fishing log could only be verified by onboard observers.

The SSC finds that the amendment as now presented fails to provide the reader with sufficient information on the types of information to be collected under the "Fishing Logbook." It was not until the SSC reviewed the draft data collection forms that the full extent of the reporting requirement became clear. The SSC recommends that if the Council wishes to send the full amendment out for public review, the description of this section needs to be greatly improved.

For example, Alternative 2 would apply this totally new reporting requirement to all DAP fishing and processing vessels. The discussion of this alternative needs to include information on how this alternative fits the existing reporting requirements. Does it replace fish tickets or is it supplemental to the fish ticket system?

The SSC also found that the amendment needs extensive editing. For example, a single section of the "Fishing Logbook" is called by three different names: Daily Cumulative Product Log, Cumulative Product Log, and Daily Accumulative Product Log. In the presentation to the SSC, this section was referred to by an additional title, "Production Log."

In order to insure that the original reporting problem is addressed by this amendment, the SSC recommends that a fourth alternative be added. That alternative would read as follows:

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

The SSC would also like to point out that care must be taken in the final editions of these amendment packages when they apply to both the Bering Sea and Gulf Plans. For example, within this amendment under social and economic impacts, the number of vessels and catcher processors used in the analysis is the total number off Alaska, not just the Gulf. The text needs to make it clear that the analysis represents total effort off Alaska.

With the additional alternative and clarification, the SSC recommends this for public review.

- Fishing season framework (GOA only)

The SSC recommends sending out for review this fishing season framework which allows the annual setting of seasons using a more efficient notice procedure. Several points which needed clarification were identified by the SSC, and Council staff agreed to make the necessary changes, including dropping the term "risks" on page 17, and deleting the phrase referring to risks in that section of the EA/RIR/IRFA.

- Expand the existing halibut PSC framework to include all traditional "prohibited species" of halibut, salmon, and king and Tanner crabs. (GOA only)

The SSC recommends sending out for review this measure which is necessary to provide additional regulatory flexibility. Steve Davis agreed to make several changes for the sake of clarification, including answering the question of the regulatory action needed when the PSC limit is attained.

- Overall FMP revision (GOA only)

The SSC recommends sending this out for review. The SSC is concerned that the revision proceed with sufficient attention to the need for consistency with the Bering Sea Groundfish Fishery Management Plan.

D-3 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery Management Plan Amendment 11

- Establish a minimum size limit for sablefish.

Not recommended. Same reasoning as for GOA groundfish Amendment 16.

- DAP Priority access within 100 miles of Unalaska.

Recommended for review. See GOA groundfish Amendment 16.

- Revise prohibited species definition.

Recommended for review. See GOA groundfish Amendment 16.

- Catch recording for at product sea transfers.

Recommended for review. See GOA groundfish Amendment 16.

- Revise definition of acceptable biological catch.

Recommended to be sent out for review. The SSC further recommends that the plan team add the following definition of threshold to follow the last paragraph in section 6.2.1 (p. 61) agenda D-3(a);

The threshold is defined as the minimum size of a stock that allows sufficient recruitment so that the stock can eventually reach a level that produces MSY.

Implicit in this definition are rebuilding schedules. They have not been explicitly specified since the selection of a schedule is a part of the OY determination process.

- Increase Upper Value of Optimum Yield (OY) Range

The SSC suggested to the team a number of editorial changes to the draft amendment that we feel are of some importance. The SSC recommends the revised amendment be sent out for public review.

- Prohibited Pollock Roe-Stripping

After reviewing this section of the Amendment package, the SSC suggests that it go out for public comment.

.....End Amendment Proposal Recommendations.....

Arctic Research and Policy Act

The SSC received a report on the Arctic Research and Policy Act (federal). The research initiative provided by the Act makes a research proposal on arctic marine ecosystems with an emphasis on fisheries most timely. The SSC endorsed the concept of subarctic fisheries ecosystem study described below, however the actual text was not seen by the entire SSC until after the Council meeting.

Subarctic Fisheries Ecosystem Study (SAFE)

The rapid expansion of domestic fisheries in high latitudes has clearly pointed out serious gaps in our fundamental understanding of the Subarctic ecosystem. During the past decades populations of some species (seals, sea lions, king crab, Tanner crab, greenland halibut) have undergone significant declines that cannot be directly ascribed to exploitation, while others (pollock, cod, yellowfin sole, arrowtooth flounder) have undergone large increases, and the interactions of these species with their environment and each other is at best poorly understood.

Environmental shifts, entanglement in derelict fishing gear, predation and disease have been suggested as reasons for the population changes. None of these speculations, however, is sufficiently well based to provide predictive capability, and none is sufficiently documented to allow sound long term management decisions. The growing capital investment in subarctic fisheries and the reasonable expectation that they will support a multi-billion dollar industry virtually demands a development of the capacity to understand the causes behind these variations.

To close our knowledge gap and provide for the kinds of information needed a five-year study of the subarctic fisheries ecosystem (SAFE) is proposed. The work would be accomplished as a new initiative involving scientists from academic, private industry and state and federal agencies. The work would supplement critical ongoing studies and bring together a wide spectrum of oceanographers, metrologists, biological scientists, social scientists and modelers in an attempt to synthesize existing knowledge with newly collected information to develop a predictive model of the Subarctic system which would benefit fisheries management decisions. A \$19.5 million budget is proposed: 1st year, \$1.5; 2nd year, \$3; 3rd year, 4th, and 5th, \$5.

Procedures and Personnel

The SSC met in closed session to consider several matters; (1) the annual Council meeting schedule, (2) the procedures for preparing SSC minutes, (3) the memorandum on SSC operational policies and procedures of December 8, 1980, and (4) SSC membership with respect to disciplinary representation.

The SSC endorses Mr. Branson's recommendation to retain the January meeting for initial proposal screening, while moving the next two meetings to late April and late June to avoid rushing preparation of proposal evaluation. A Council Policy and Planning Group will meet prior to May to prepare recommendations on both the meeting schedule and the amendment schedule. The SSC also supports the concept of having both one- and two-year amendment cycles. More difficult issues need to be placed in a two-year cycle in order to provide time for proper evaluation and consideration.

The SSC agreed to rotate note keeping among duets of members on each issue. Duets will be chosen and assigned by the chair for each agenda item. A duet would document the position of the SSC and submit a written copy of the opinion to the chair before departing the meeting.

To more adequately document SSC proceedings, a number of lap top and/or portable computers and a single printer are needed. As an interim measure, copying facilities on the site of the meeting will be needed in order to share a written draft among the members of the SSC. The SSC is now an inefficient paper mill compared to similar organizations elsewhere on the west coast.

The majority of SSC members supports the concept of seeking an economist to replace Don Rosenberg at such time as he may retire. The actual choice may not necessarily be an economist, since willingness to serve and availability are important considerations. Members will seek recruits and forward names to Rich Marasco who will report at the next meeting.

The memorandum on operations and policy of December 8, 1980 is out of date, although it contains many worthy concepts. Don Rosenberg will prepare a working revision to reflect the current situation, and mail it to the SSC 15 days before the next meeting.

Terms and Definitions: Overfishing.

The SSC of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council and the Pacific Council have agreed on a set of definitions for Allowable Biological Catch (ABC), Threshold, Overfishing, Annual Surplus Production (ASP), Equilibrium Yield (EY), Total Allowable Catch (TAC), Allocate, and Optimum Yield (OY).

Since the time these definitions were presented to the Council last September, a minor revision in the definition of overfishing has been requested by the Pacific Council. The two revised versions of the definition of overfishing accepted by your SSC are:

Overfishing is a level of fishing mortality that jeopardizes the capacity of stock(s) to maintain or recover to a level at which it can produce maximum biological yield on a long-term basis under prevailing biological

and environmental conditions. (NOTE: This definition differs slightly from that found in the Guidelines for Fishery Management, 50 CFR Part 602, p. 27228.)

Overfishing is the application of exploitation rates that drive the stock below its threshold. Exceeding acceptable biological catch need not result in overfishing, unless the excess is taken over sufficient time to reduce the population below the threshold.

We recommend the Council adopt the definitions and direct the Plan Teams to use them in future plan amendments.

The SSC meeting ended at 5:30 p.m. March 17, 1987.