


M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council Members

FROM: Jim H. Branson   
Executive Director

DATE: January 31, 1985

SUBJECT: Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

ACTION REQUIRED

- (1) Review December Council action on joint venture trawl bycatch limit.
- (2) Review other bycatch needs of domestic and foreign fisheries.
- (3) Establish Council policy on bycatch of fully-utilized species where appropriate.

BACKGROUND

1. December Council action on joint venture trawl bycatch limit.

At the December meeting, the Council addressed the 0-JVP bycatch issue by allocating minimal amounts of sablefish, Pacific ocean perch, and other rockfish for bycatches by trawlers fishing for joint ventures but did not allow them to be sold to foreign processors. The Council resolved the 0-TALFF bycatch problem by setting OY equal to DAH for those species where there was some amount available for distribution to other nations. The joint venture decision has generated considerable discussion because the motion was not clear, was easily misinterpreted, and assigning a percentage of the fully-utilized species OY as a bycatch for other fisheries is a departure from the method used in the past, which was to assign bycatch as a percentage of the target species and not include it in the OY.

The motion by Rudy Petersen was:

I move that as an interim measure for sablefish in the Gulf of Alaska the entire OY be apportioned to DAP. Of this DAP, the amounts of sablefish necessary for incidental trawl catches are allocated to U.S. trawl vessels engaged in joint ventures, not to exceed 10% of the sablefish OY for all areas combined. None of this allocation to U.S. trawl vessels engaged in joint ventures may be sold to foreign vessels in joint ventures.

Subsequent discussions with Rudy and other Council members made it clear that they intended to place a ceiling of 10% of the sablefish OY on the catches of JV trawlers by regulatory area; that is, 10% of the sablefish OY for the Western area for joint ventures in that area and 10% of the sablefish OY for the Central area for joint ventures there. As there have never been any joint ventures in the Eastern area and none are contemplated, no bycatch should be required and therefore none held back.

One legal interpretation of the motion concluded that any U.S. trawler that engages in a joint venture during the year should have all of its sablefish bycatch counted toward the JV bycatch allocation, even though some or most of its deliveries were to U.S. processors.

It seemed clear to everyone that none of the described bycatch could be sold to foreign processors; it had to be returned to the U.S. trawlers (if delivered by cod end) for sale to a U.S. processor or discard.

Many sablefish longliners are very concerned about the allocation of a specific portion of the OY to the trawl fishery as an incidental catch. It is unclear what alternative they would prefer. Sablefish bycatch could be treated as halibut are, where incidental catch in other fisheries is considered as natural mortality and taken off the top before OY is computed.

Some were concerned because they thought the 10% allocation for "all areas combined" in the motion would allow as much as 1,000 tons for bycatch in a single area (10% of the Gulfwide OY). As the motion was intended, the bycatch will be on the order of 500 tons split between the Central and Western areas. That's less than the amount taken in the Western area and only slightly more than was taken in the Central area by joint ventures in 1984. Table 1 shows actual 1984 JVP bycatches, 1984 observed bycatch rates compared with estimated JVP needs, and the 10% allocation. Table 2 shows estimates of joint venture bycatch and other fishery removals in light of EY and OY of fully-utilized species.

The December action needs to be clarified at this meeting.

- (a) Does the 10% joint venture bycatch limit for sablefish, Pacific ocean perch and other rockfish catch apply to individual regulatory area OYs or the Gulfwide OYs?
- (b) Will a bycatch provision for joint venture trawlers be necessary for the Eastern Regulatory Area?
- (c) Does the ceiling apply to trawlers when they deliver to U.S. processors if they have participated in a joint venture at some time during 1985? Does their bycatch in purely U.S. fisheries count against the JV ceiling?
- (d) Although not a point of the motion, the Council said a joint venture processor could hold those bycatch species for return to the U.S. trawler. Several questions arise:
  - (1) What can be done to preserve the fish? freezing? heading and gutting?
  - (2) How long can they be held on the processor?
  - (3) Do they have to be segregated and returned to the boat that delivered them?

Some of those answers will depend on the legal interpretation of the Act and regulations, others might be subject to control by the Council.

## 2. Bycatch in other fisheries

Domestic. A problem not addressed in December is bycatch by U.S. trawlers not engaged in joint ventures, cod longliners, etc. The FMP now closes all fishing by any gear when the OY is reached. The directed fishery for sablefish will probably catch the OY in the Gulf by mid-1985, effectively closing all other U.S. fisheries that have incidental sablefish catches (except joint venture trawling which could continue until the 10% bycatch ceiling was reached). Table 2 shows our best estimates of domestic trawl bycatch of fully-utilized species.

Several approaches are available to the Council. All assume that small amounts of fully-utilized species should be available for bycatch in joint ventures, domestic trawl fisheries, crab fisheries, and other longline fisheries. Providing bycatches for those fisheries represents a cost to the American fishermen engaged in the directed fisheries. Benefits to other fishermen are the value of the harvest which the bycatch allocation permits.

### A. Bycatch as a percentage of the OY.

This was the course taken by the Council in December when they allocated a percentage of the sablefish OY to JV trawlers. The 1985 OY for sablefish was set at 75% of the equilibrium yield (EY) to provide for rebuilding ( $EY \times .75 = OY$ ).

### B. Bycatch as natural mortality.

Sablefish and other fully-utilized species bycatch can be handled like halibut bycatch always has: estimate the incidental catch in other fisheries and treat it as natural mortality. Sablefish OY for 1985 would then have been set at 75% of EY minus the incidental catches in other fisheries ( $EY \times .75 - \text{incidental catch} = OY$ ). There could still be a lid on the total bycatch by other fisheries if the Council wishes. The incidental catch would probably also have to be treated as a prohibited species as halibut is. But, semantically at least, bycatch would not be coming out of OY.

If OY is to include the actual catch by all forms of fishing gear it is necessary to allocate a portion of the OY openly and explicitly as bycatch. The amount of fish available to the directed fishery should be exactly the same as when bycatch is considered natural mortality as described in the previous paragraph. Direct allocation would seem to have two advantages. First, bycatch, once set as a percentage of OY, would rise and fall with the abundance of the bycatch species. Halibut, salmon and crab bycatches in the past have varied because of changes in the abundance of other species or changes in the fisheries for other species. Second, the remainder of the OY would be earmarked for the directed fishery, a situation that should have long term benefits to the directed fishery. Both advantages are dependent on management maintaining the same percentage between bycatch and the directed fishery over the long term.

C. Set second OY for sablefish in Shelf waters.

The situation is complicated by the fact that the 1985 EY is based on the biomass along the Shelf edge and does not include younger fish on the Shelf, which are approximately 75% of the total biomass. The younger, smaller fish make up most of the incidental trawl catch.

The Council could set a second OY for the sablefish biomass on the continental Shelf, generally shallower than 200 meters. Those populations are large right now because of recent strong year classes. They were not counted when the Plan Team developed EY because they are not targeted by the directed fishery. They are too small to command much market or price. Setting a separate OY should be biologically safe and have minimal impact on the directed fishery in the future when those fish mature and move offshore if OY is set only high enough to permit the minimum bycatch possible.

That would allow all of the OY set by the Council in December (8,980 mt) to be allocated to the directed fishery. It is unlikely this solution will work for very long. It is dependent on strong age classes of immature fish, in numbers exceeding or at least equaling the biomass of mature fish being exploited by the directed fishery. It would be feasible for 1985.

Foreign. If a foreign fishery is allowed in the Gulf this year it would be necessary to provide some fully-utilized species bycatch for it. Estimates of foreign bycatch of fully-utilized species based on potential pollock and cod TALFF of 50,000 mt and 15,000 mt, respectively, are shown in Table 2.

January 31, 1985

TABLE 1. Estimated Gulf of Alaska bycatch (mt) of fully-utilized species by joint venture trawlers.

<u>Area/Species</u>	<u>Observed 1984 Catch</u>	<u>Bycatch Rate</u>	<u>Projected 1985 Dec. JVP<sup>1/</sup></u>	<u>Bycatch Feb. JVP<sup>2/</sup></u>	<u>10% OY</u>
<u>Western - bt</u>					
Sablefish	264	2.8%	339 mt	245 mt	167 mt
POP complex	1,384	0.6	73	53	130
Other rockfish	203	0.5	60	44	100
<u>Central - mwt</u>					
Sablefish	----	0.005%	13 mt	10 mt	----
POP complex	----	0.02	53	39	----
Other rockfish	----	0	0	0	----
Atka mackerel	----	0.002	5	4	----
<u>Central - bt</u>					
Sablefish	----	1.8%	718 mt	535 mt	----
POP complex	----	0.2	80	59	----
Other rockfish	----	0.3	120	89	----
Atka mackerel	----	0.7	279	208	----
<u>Central - total</u>					
Sablefish	241	N.A.	731 mt	545 mt	306 mt
POP complex	288	N.A.	133	98	390
Other rockfish	87	N.A.	120	89	200
Atka mackerel	577	N.A.	284	212	----

<sup>1/</sup> Estimated JVP adopted by Council in December.

<sup>2/</sup> If all joint ventures in Table 1 (except Spain) of C-5 are approved.

bt = bottom trawl

mwt = midwater trawl

N.A. = not applicable

TABLE 2. 1985 EY (ABC) and OY values of fully-utilized species, with estimates of directed and incidental removals by fishery (mt).

<u>Fully-utilized Sp.</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Directed Fishery</u>			<u>Incidental Bycatch</u>			<u>Total Harvest</u>	<u>EY (ABC)</u>	<u>OY</u>
		<u>DAP</u>	<u>JVP</u>	<u>TALFF</u>	<u>DAP</u> (trawlers)	<u>JVP</u>	<u>TALFF</u>			
Sablefish	W	1,670	0	0	211	245	100-154	2,226-2,280	2,225	1,670
	C	3,060	0	0	229	545	68-268	3,902-4,102	4,075	3,060
	W.Yak.	1,680	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,680	2,240	1,680
	E.Yak.	1,135	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,135	1,135-1,510	1,135
	S.E.	1,435	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,435	1,290-2,580	1,435
Pacific ocean perch	W	1,302	0	0	45	53	27-32	1,427-1,432	1,736	1,302
	C	3,906	0	0	26	98	18-52	4,048-4,082	5,208	3,906
	E	875	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	875	4,530	875
Rockfish	W	4,600	0	0	38	44	13	4,834-4,838	?	5,000
	C		0	0	38	89	12-16		?	
	E	Gulfwide	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	Gulfwide	?	Gulfwide
Atka mackerel	W	0	4,678	0	N/A	N/A	---	4,678	?	4,678
	C	0	0	0	89	212	26	327	?	bc
	E	0	0	0	---	---	N/A	---	?	bc




Mr. Jim H. Branson  
Executive Director, NPFMC  
January 25, 1985  
page 2

Our Association opposes any efforts by emergency regulation which would exclude U.S. fishermen from harvesting blackcod with the gear of their choice. Therefore, we encourage the Council to review all supporting biological data for this blackcod emergency proposal. We suspect this proposal is clearly an allocation issue and recommend the Council, if it so desires, to consider this issue through the normal amendment process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

  
Barry D. Collier  
Executive Director  
NPFVOA

BDC:djp

cc: Ray Arnaudo  
James O. Campbell  
Don W. Collinsworth  
Gene DiDonato  
Dr. John P. Harville  
Sara Hemphill  
Robert Lucas  
Robert U. Mace  
Robert W. McVey  
Henry Mitchell  
Jon M. Nelson  
Steve Pennoyer  
Rudy Petersen  
John Peterson  
Jeffrey R. Stephen  
Bill Wilkerson  
John R. Winther, Jr.  
William G. Gordon



TABLE 2. 1985 EY (ABC) and OY values of fully-utilized species, with estimates of directed and incidental removals by fishery (mt).

Fully-Utilized Sp.	Area	EY(ABC)	Directed Fishery				Incidental Bycatch			Total Harvest
			OY	DAP	JVP	TALFF	DAP Trawl	JVP Trawl	Foreign	
Sablefish	W	2,225	1,670	1,459-1,670	0	0	0-211	245	<del>100-154</del> <sup>140</sup>	2,015-2,280
	C	4,075	3,060	2,831-3,060	0	0	0-299	545	<del>3168-268</del>	3,673-4,102
	W.Yak.	2,240	1,680	1,680	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,680
	E.Yak.	1,135-1,510	1,135	1,135	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,135
	S.E.	1,290-2,580	1,435	1,435	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	1,435
POP	W	1,736	1,302	1,257-1,302	0	0	45	53	<del>3027-32</del>	1,382-1,432
	C	5,208	3,906	3,880-3,906	0	0	26	98	<del>1618-52</del>	4,022-4,082
	E	4,530	875	875	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	875
Rockfish	W	?			0	0	38	44	<del>15-13</del>	4,834-4,838 Gulfwide
	C	?	5,000	4,600	0	0	38	89	<del>10-12-16</del>	
	E	?	Gulfwide	Gulfwide	0	0	---	N/A	N/A	
A. Mackerel	W	?	4,678	0	4,678	0	N/A	N/A	---	4,678
	C	?	bc	0	0	0	89	212	26	327
	E	?	bc	0	0	0	---	---	N/A	---

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



January 18, 1985  
NO. 10

## 1985 FOREIGN FISHING ALLOCATIONS

The Department of State, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, has recently issued the 1985 allocations of fishery resources available for foreign fishing in the U.S. exclusive economic zone. The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act requires the Department to give consideration in its allocation decisions to those countries which are actively contributing to the development of the U.S. fishing industry. Other criteria such as historical fishing patterns, cooperation in enforcement and the exchange of scientific information are also taken into consideration. However, economic factors such as trade, tariffs, and joint venture cooperation, receive principal consideration in allocation decisions. The Department of State, together with the Department of Commerce, and the relevant regional fishery management councils, will be closely monitoring the performance of all countries receiving allocations of U.S. fish to assure the continued effective implementation of U.S. fisheries law and policy. In this regard, these initial allocations represent about 50 percent of the projected country allocations. After evaluating each country's cooperation with U.S. fisheries development, the Department will make decisions on additional releases.

Raymond V. Arnaudo  
Office of Fisheries Affairs  
(202) 632-5690

1985 U.S. FOREIGN FISHERY ALLOCATIONS FOR THE BERING SEA

PR NO. 10

	<u>JAPAN</u>	<u>ROK</u>	<u>PORTUGAL</u>	<u>U.S.S.R.</u>	<u>POLAND</u>	<u>UNALLOCATED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Pollock	111,531	22,606	43	1,409	6,931	87,310	229,830
Atka Mackerel	25	4	1	3	2	15	50
Turbots	10,720	1,314	28	50	55	18,533	30,700
Yellowfin Sole	13,000	11,635	12	8,296	100	71,252	104,295
Other Flounder	7,000	4,562	31	1,034	97	28,641	41,365
Pacific Cod	15,000	250	440	132	48	21,130	37,000
Pacific Ocean Perch	230	30	1	7	3	229	500
Other Rockfish	2,700	249	1	19	8	1,150	4,127
Sablefish	298	33	3	19	6	91	450
Snails	1,500	0	0	0	0	1,500	3,000
Squid	2,600	739	15	37	80	5,029	8,500
Other Species	<u>2,639</u>	<u>1,990</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>737</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>25,782</u>	<u>31,343</u>
TOTAL:	167,243	43,412	600	11,743	7,500	260,662	491,160

Initial allocations effective January 1, 1985

Department of State  
January, 1985

TABLE 1. 1985 ATLANTIC ALLOCATIONS (January 1-December 31)

COUNTRY	RED HAKE	SILVER HAKE	RIVER HERRING	OTHER FINFISH	SHARKS
	----- (Metric tons) -----				
EEC (ITALY)	50	250	2	500	---
EEC (NETHERLANDS)	50	250	20	500	---
FAROE ISLANDS	--	---	---	---	---
GDR	50	250	20	500	---
ICELAND	--	---	---	---	---
JAPAN	50	250	2	500	---
NORWAY	--	---	---	---	---
PORTUGAL	--	---	---	---	---
SPAIN	50	250	2	500	---
USSR	--	---	---	---	---
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>---</b>

Department of State  
January, 1985

TABLE 2.

## 1984-85 ATLANTIC ALLOCATIONS (APRIL 1-March 31)

COUNTRY	MACKEREL LOLIGO SQUID ILLEX SQUID BUTTERFISH TOTAL (TABLE 1&2)				
	(Metric-tons)				
EEC (ITALY)	50	5,000	800	72	6,724
EEC (NETHERLANDS)	12,500	25	25	10	13,380
FAROE ISLANDS	---	---	---	---	---
GDR	9,900	25	25	10	10,780
ICELAND	---	---	---	---	---
JAPAN	50	700	500	54	2,106
NORWAY	---	---	---	---	---
PORTUGAL	---	---	---	---	---
SPAIN	60	6,500	900	78	8,340
USSR	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	22,560	12,250	2,250	224	41,330

Department of State  
January, 1985

TAPE TRANSCRIPTION  
SITKA COUNCIL MEETING  
February 7, 1985

BOB ALVERSON: . . .in regards to directed allocation for incidental catch purposes for the DAP trawlers, we were waiting for a industry-to-industry agreement between the drag industry and the line industry and I believe that they have come to some resolution on that issue, Mr. Chairman, and the AP would defer to the industry group. I believe Ron Hegge, Mark Lundsten and Dave Harville would be willing to make those numbers available to Council members.

CAMPBELL: Are you prepared to do that, Ron? Well, I guess Bob is suggesting you do it; it should be done on the record then rather than to just one member.

HEGGE: What we have agreed upon, Mr. Chairman, as Bob explained to you, is 800 tons, 790 tons, out of the unassessed biomass which is from the area that the trawling does take place, would be delegated to the joint venture; this would not come out of the OY since the fish are not considered in the OY biomass. On the domestic trawl fleet, we would allocate 5% of the OY in the Central and Western Gulf to the DAP druggers.

DAVE HARVILLE: Mr. Chairman, that's essentially what we're looking at on a bandaid or emergency type situation. There is, however, one variable which we have not been able to assess and that is the requirements of the emerging factory trawler fleet. They were not present in any of our deliberations and we have some fears as to what might be their impact on the industry and I certainly hope that the Council would look at that.

CHAIRMAN: Any questions of Council?

BRANSON: I have one, Mr. Chairman. Dave, do you expect the factory trawlers to be working in the Gulf this year?

DAVE HARVILLE: The factory trawlers have been working in the Gulf and they have been taking significant amounts of black cod and on one particular instance we had one member of one crew brag to us about direct fishing on black cod and this alarms us because the small trawler fleet does not target on black cod and if in fact we have an unknown quantity coming to the Gulf and targeting on black cod, this is going to throw the whole system out of whack and I would hope, I don't like to see anybody throw a product away; I don't like wanton waste, but I would hope there would be some mechanism by which any trawler, including my own personal vessels, I think it's going to be very necessary that we be excluded from direct fishing on black cod. I want to further clarify that by making the statement that I am speaking as an individual. I am not speaking with much credibility; I'm speaking as an individual because I was available as a trawler to help in these negotiations so please don't think. . . I'm not representing the trawl fleet with any credentials.

WINTHER: Dave, that trawler that was targeting on black cod, was he after the ones up on the shelf or the ones down in deeper water.

DAVE HARVILLE: It comes under alarming hearsay. We've been told that in certain instances when this one particular factory trawler was targeting on codfish. Well, if you're fishing codfish in the evening the codfish come off the bottom and it's very hard to catch anything and we were informed, again I say this is hearsay, that they were going over the edge at night and targeting on black cod in the deep water. If this is a fact, that means that they are out there on the Dover sole grounds and nobody is taking Dover sole which means that they're guilty of wanton waste and discarding a lot of bycatch. But, I'm not accusing anybody, I just hope there's a mechanism by which the Council can look into this before we have the same problem as the pot fishermen and the longliners that you just heard from them. I hope we don't get in an adversary position where the small trawlers and the factory processors get into a battle.

RUDY PETERSEN: Dave, you mentioned about a bandaid solution to this. Is this the intent, to be a temporary thing to take place of the motion that was made at the last meeting? Or are you look for something more permanent?

DAVE HARVILLE: You have to understand that I have told this group that I personally would be . . . that it would be very easy for my boats to work inside of 5% but we haven't take this to the entire trawling community. There might be some others . . . I may be doing something that isn't acceptable to the trawling community.

RUDY PETERSEN: That was my next question. I was just kind of wondering why you were speaking for yourself, not that I have a problem with that, but where are the rest of the fellows who are in this whole activity here where they're not represented as a whole group.

DAVE HARVILLE: Well, there for four days this was a very intense thing, you know. We were trying to testify before you people, we were trying to help with the black cod, Al was involved with the AP, and we were spread pretty thin. And, the bulk of the trawl fleet is out working.

HEGGE: In response to one question there, we asked the trawlers what they thought they needed as a bycatch on particular the flounder fishery as I understand is starting and they didn't have enough history in it to really make an assessment so we gave them an amount that they felt would get them through this year and then there will be enough history to know probably with a little more guesswork what their needs really are.

RUDY PETERSEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that I'd like to explain a little about the last meeting. I think the intent was to come up with an amount that would allow the JV fisheries to go on without being stopped on account of a bycatch problem. The 10% I think was completely blown out of proportion. My intent was to base it on numbers that we knew that had some history, not some particular amount. I don't think the amount is significant; whether it's 2% or 10%, I think that's what we were looking for, to come up with.

DAVE HARVILLE: As long as we're fishing on the shelf where we are now, 5%, I feel, is more than acceptable. If in fact we ever get into a fishery where we're going to be involved in Dover sole and hardheads and deep water fish, this is a total unknown to us, but it's also a very exciting thing from a standpoint of work for the shorebased plants if we ever get into a flatfish

filet thing and this is down the road. On the shelf I'm sure that 5% we can work with.

RUDY PETERSEN: I've heard a lot of numbers. You know, Steve Davis has had numbers; the rest of the staff has had numbers and while I have no objection to 5% if that's what it is, I wish we could get a little closer to what it actually takes, whether it takes 5% or whether it takes 3%, I think that's where we should be, but I wouldn't have a problem with this one; I just wish we could develop these numbers so we don't take more than we need or we take as much as we do need.

HEMPHILL: Two questions, one to Ron (Hegge). I understand that it is your intention representing the longliners to reevaluate whatever numbers or whatever percentages you have at the end of this year as a result of the performance to take a look at that to, if you will, accommodate or work with the developing trawl fishery. Is that right?

HEGGE: That's correct.

HEMPHILL: The other question I have of Dave (Harville) is, I'm not quite clear on where you are numbers-wise. You have a set figure, is that right, 780 tons, and that's just for JVP?

DAVE HARVILLE: That's correct.

HEMPHILL: And the 5% is bycatch for the DAP? Or is it the equivalent or substitute for what is now 20% that the trawlers can bring back to shore; isn't that right, 20% sablefish without a permit?

DAVE HARVILLE: They can bring back 20% of their catch. That doesn't refer to the OY in any way, it's just 20% of their catch.

HEMPHILL: Is that still something that we're going to have in place? Or are we trading that?

DAVE HARVILLE: I think it would still be in place, wouldn't it, wouldn't it Al (Burch)?

AL BURCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this 5% is, as Dave said, is an unknown figure; we figure we can within it. The 20% was the figure of the actual product we delivered back to shore and to tell the truth we never did discuss that part of the equation so really I can't answer that. But the 5% was based on the OY and would come out of the OY.

HEMPHILL: I guess I would have a question then of Mr. Collinsworth. I don't understand where that leaves us.

CAMPBELL: Are we done with the two witnesses?

HEMPHILL: Yes, I'm sorry.

BRANSON: Mr. Chairman, there's some confusion here still in the percentages that we're talking about. The 5% that I hear from the industry group is 5% of the sablefish OY as a bycatch in the DAP trawl fishery. The 20% that Sara



just alluded to, I don't really understand. Could that be elaborated? There is some confusion.

HEMPHILL: That's why I'd like the State to comment.

BRANSON: Is there a State regulation that says you can't bring in more than 20% of your catch as sablefish?

DAVE HARVILLE: You'd have to buy a permit. You can buy a permit and bring in 100%; without a permit you're allowed . . .

BRANSON: But this doesn't have anything to do with the bycatch thing that we're talking about?

CAMPBELL: No, it shouldn't even be in front of us because it wasn't discussed in the group to any degree.

BRANSON: I mean, 20% of an individual load has nothing to do with 5% of the sablefish OY.

JOHN PETERSON: I need some clarification, Mr. Chairman. The 5% is 5% of the OY of sablefish.

\_\_\_\_\_?: That's correct.

BRANSON: That was for the Western and Central area as I understand it.

JOHN PETERSON: (Not sure of this, muffled) . . . so that would be Central and Western tons, then. O.K.

CAMPBELL: O.K. Where are we?

BRANSON: We need the team report, Mr. Chairman.