SSC Minutes
9/84

TABLE 3

1985 BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS GROUNDFISH

SPECIES	TAC	DAP[2/]	JVP[3/]	DAH	RESERVE[1/]	TALFF
POLLOCK/BS	1,100,000	6,826	274,500	281,326		653,674
POLLOCK/AI	100,000	300	10,000	10,300		74,700
POP/BS	680	578[4/]	0	578		0
POP/AI	3,800	100	2,310	2,410		820
ROCKFISH/BS	1,120	600	20	620		332
ROCKFISH/AI	5,500	5	535	540		4,135
SABLEFISH/BS	2,600	1,979	100	2,079		131
SABLEFISH/AI	3,360	100	417	517		2,339
P. COD	210,000	62,940	40,000	102,940		75,560
YELLOWFIN SOLE	288,700	3,076	57,000	60,076		185,319
TURBOTS	50,000	0	2,000	2,000		40,500
FLATFISH	139,840	907	22,000	22,907		95,957
ATKA MACKEREL	37,700	0	32,045	32,045[4/]		0
SQUID	10,000	0	30	30		8,470
OTHER SPECIES	46,700	1,000	2,800	3,800		35,895
TOTAL	2,000,000	78,411	443,757	522,168	300,000	1,177,832

SSC Minutes 9184

Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish

1. In cases where JVP or TALFF is equal to or approaching zero, some reserves may be apportioned to those fisheries for bycatch. Currently, these fisheries are POP/BS, Atka mackerel and possibly sablefish/BS and rockfish/BS.

2. DAP is set equal to the greater of the NMFS survey results or the projected NMFS 1984 catch, but less than or equal to 85% of the TAC.

3. JVP is set equal to the greater of the NMFS survey result or the projected NMFS 1984 catch, but less than or equal to the remainder of 85% of the TAC minus the DAP.

4. In these cases the survey indicates a demand for the species far in excess of the available resource (EY). The management mechanism in the plan will allow these values to be adjusted upward by the Regional Director to at least the EY. This adjustment will come from reserve.

TABLE 4

1985 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish

Initial 1985 Industry Survey of DAP & JVP

Pollock/BS	6,826	274,500	281,326
Pollock/AL	0	2,875	2,875
POP/BS	4,360	1,010	5,370
POP/AI	0	2,310	2,310
Rockfish/BS	600	10	610
Rockfish/AI	0	535	535
Sablefish/BS	1,979	10	1,989
Sablefish/AI	0	417	417
Pacific Cod	62,940	18,150	81,090
Yellowfin Sole	3,076	57,000	60,076
Turbots	0	2,000	2,000
Flatfish	907	21,824	22,731
Atka Mackerel	0	56,360	56,360
Squid	0	0	0
Other Species	0	600	600
TOTAL	80,688	437,601	518,289

AGENDA D-4
SEPTEMBER 1984

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council, AP and SSC Members

FROM: Jim H. Branson
Executive Director

DATE: September 17, 1984

SUBJECT: Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish 1985 Quotas and Apportionments

ACTION REQUIRED

The Council is scheduled to release for public review preliminary 1985 Total Allowable Catches (TACs) and estimates of groundfish needed for JVP and DAPs.

BACKGROUND

Summaries of the 1985 Resource Assessment Document were mailed to you in August and are included here as Agenda Item D-4(a). The Plan Team's recommendations on preliminary TACs are shown in Table 2. Species of interest are Pacific cod (1985 TAC = 178,400 mt, DOWN from 210,000 mt) and Atka mackerel (1985 TAC = 37,700, UP from 23,130.

As of this writing, NMFS is still assessing the results of their industry groundfish survey. Their results will be available at the Council meeting so that preliminary estimates DAPs and JVPs can be sent out for public review.

If the Council concurs with the Plan Team's 1985 TAC recommendations and the NMFS estimates of 1985 DAP and JVP, a motion is needed to send the figures out for public review. The Council will establish final TACs, JVPs and DAPs at the December 1984 meeting.

2:32.3.1

AGENDA D-4(a)
SEPTEMBER 1984

RESOURCE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT FOR BERING SEA-ALEUTIANS GROUNDFISH

(Applicable for Management of the 1985 Fishery)

Prepared by

Plan Maintenance Team
North Pacific Fishery Management Council
P.O. Box 103136
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

July 1984

Lead Agency for Preparation of Document:

Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
2725 Montlake Blvd. East
Seattle, WA 98112

RESOURCE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT FOR BERING SEA-ALEUTIANS GROUNDFISH
(Applicable for Management of the 1985 Fishery)

INTRODUCTION

This Resource Assessment Document (RAD) for the Bering Sea-Aleutians groundfish resources is applicable for management of the 1985 fishery under Amendment #1 of the Fishery Management Plan. It is an update of the RAD and its supplement previously issued by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council for management of the 1984 fishery (NPFMC 1983a,b). In this RAD, the rationale and management recommendations are presented from a biological perspective only. These recommendations, together with socio-economic and other considerations, will be used to determine optimum yield and other management strategies for the fishery under the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

NEW INFORMATION

Since the RAD and its supplement for management of the 1984 fishery were issued, the following new sources of data have become available to update the status of stocks:

1. Data from the 1983 summer trawl surveys conducted by the Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center and those in cooperation with Japan and the U.S.S.R.

2. Data collected by U.S. observers aboard foreign fishing and processing vessels in 1983 and to date in 1984.

3. Data and analyses provided by Japan in documents at the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission in 1984.

4. Data and analyses provided by Japan, the U.S.S.R., the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of China at bilateral meetings this year (NWAFC 1984).

With the new data and analyses, the status of the stocks are reassessed. Table 1 summarizes the updated trends on condition of stocks and compares them to the assessment last year. Relevant and more detailed information from the updated assessment are described for each species group in Parts I and II of this RAD. These parts describe:

Part I: Species-by-species analyses of resource condition--where the more traditional single species assessment and population dynamics techniques are used. Information such as (a) historical catch trends; (b) biological condition of individual stocks, and (c) estimation of the maximum sustainable yield (MSY), and equilibrium yield (EY), of individual species groups are found in this section of the document.

Part II: Multi-species and ecosystem analyses--where the long-term dynamics of the groundfish complex are evaluated by an ecosystem simulation model.

PROPOSED CATCH LEVELS FOR 1985

Amendment #1 to the Bering Sea-Aleutians groundfish FMP provides the framework to manage the resources as a complex. The MSY of the complex ranges from 1.4 to 2.4 million t. The OY is set at 85% of the MSY range, or 1.4 to 2.0 million t. The single species analyses (Part I) of this RAD shows that the EY for the groundfish complex for 1985 exceeds 2 million t (EY = 2,149,330 t). The multispecies/ecosystem analyses (Part II) shows that the long-term sustainable catch level is about 1.8 million t. Since the ecosystem simulations assume a substantially lower biomass for the flatfish and cod components than are presently the case, it is determined that the estimated catch level of 1.8 million t is too low. Therefore, the 1985 catch level for the groundfish complex should be set at the high end of OY or 2.0 million t.

Since the EY values of individual species groups add up to more than 2.0 million t, the catch levels of some species will have to be adjusted from their EY values in order that the total not exceed the high end of OY. The adjustment factor will vary from species to species depending on the status and outlook of stock conditions. Table 2 summaries a proposed combination of species catch levels for 1985. A species-by-species discussion follows:

Pollock: Based on data through 1983, the stock analysis (Part I) shows that EY equals 1.2 million t in the eastern Bering Sea (EBS) and 120,000 in the Aleutians. The ecosystem model (Part II), however, shows a sustainable catch of 1.1 million t because pollock abundance is 2-3 years on a down cycle and may be just past the trough of the cycle. Since the stock analysis shows that three consecutive year classes (1979, 1980, 1981) are weaker in abundance than adjacent years and that these year classes are going to be important components of the catch for the 1985 fishery as 6 yr, 5 yr, and 4 yr-old fish, it is proposed that the catch levels be reduced below EY. These proposed catch levels are 1,150,000 t for the EBS and 100,000 t for the Aleutian region.

Pacific cod: Pacific cod was at a historic high level of abundance in 1984 but is anticipated to decline in 1985 as the strong 1977 year class dies off. The EY for 1985 is projected to be 178,400, and it is proposed that the catch level be set the same in order to take maximum advantage of the 1977 year class before it is lost to high natural mortality.

Yellowfin sole: Yellowfin sole is at a historic high level of abundance and catch levels can be set equal to EY (310,000 t). However, the trawl fisheries for yellowfin sole are conducted on-bottom in areas where Pacific halibut and crabs also occur. Therefore, a lower catch level for yellowfin sole is desirable to minimize the impact of the fishery on the prohibited species. The proposed catch level for 1985 is 244,740 t and is set so that the total for all the species combined equal the groundfish complex total allowable catch (TAC) of 2.0 million t.

Turbot: The catch level for the turbot category is proposed to be similar to the 1984 TAC level. One of the two species (Greenland turbot) in the group has been declining in abundance, and it is not desirable to set the catch level equal to EY (64,200 t). Therefore, the catch level for 1985 is proposed to be 59,600 t.

Other flatfish: The other flatfish category, just like yellowfin sole, is high in abundance. This group can be exploited at the EY level of 150,200 t.

Pacific ocean perch: The stocks in both the EBS and Aleutian region have remained poor and stable for many years. Although equilibrium yields have been estimated at 1,360 t in the EBS and 11,400 t in the Aleutians, the stocks are in severely depleted states. Therefore, the stocks need rebuilding and catch levels should be set no higher than 50% of EY. In the EBS, the 1985 catch level is set at 680 t or 50% of EY. This catch level may be somewhat low for incidental catch purposes and may have to be increased during the fishing year to allow uninterrupted fisheries for other groundfish species. In the Aleutian region, the 1985 catch level is set below 50% of EY at 3,800 t to promote faster rebuilding of the stock. The combined catch levels total 4,480 t or equal to the 1984 TAC.

Other rockfish: The other rockfish group is stable and average level in abundance. The 1985 catch level is proposed to equal EY in the EBS (1,120 t), since a reasonably large amount has to be available as incidental catches. In the Aleutian region, the 1985 catch level is proposed to equal the 1984 TAC (5,500 t) and is slightly lower than estimated EY (7,790 t) to promote some rebuilding.

Sablefish: Sablefish stocks have recovered slightly from the low abundance levels during 1977-80 and may be exploited at EY levels. Therefore, the 1985 catch levels are proposed as 2,600 t in the EBS and 3,360 t in the Aleutian region.

Atka mackerel: The 1985 catch level for Atka mackerel is set equal to EY at 37,700 t. The resource appears to be in reasonably good condition.

Squid: The 1985 catch level for squid is conservatively set at 10,000 t, since the resource size is not known but believed to be substantial in size.

Other groundfish: The other groundfish group may be exploited at the estimated EY level of 51,200 t.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

SPECIAL NOTICE

This RAD is based on data analyses through July 1984. Between July and December, when the Council is scheduled to make final determinations of catch levels for each species group, new data from the commercial fishery and the summer field research program may become available which may change some of the recommendations made in this RAD. The user is therefore cautioned to take special notice of such new data that may become available over the next several months.

Low 3.2.1

Table 1.--Comparison of MSY and EY from the 1983 Resource Assessment Document and the 1984 Update, with remarks on the current condition of the resources.

Species	MSY(t) 1983 RAD	MSY(t) 1984 Update	EY(t) 1983 RAD	EY(t) 1984 Update	Current stock condition	Remarks
Pollock						
(Eastern Bering Sea)	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	Good	Concern about weak 1979-81 year-classe Needs close monitor ing in 1984-85.
Aleutians)	100,000	120,000	100,000	120,000		
Pacific cod	--	--	291,300	178,400	Good	Abundance declining from peak in 1984.
Yellowfin sole	150,000-175,000	150,000-175,000	310,000	310,000	Excellent	Historic high abundance, expected to remain high in near future.
Turbots				57,500		
(Greenland turbot)	96,200	86,700	67,500	64,200		Poor 1979-81 year-classes of Greenlan turbot; abundance o adults has declined.
(Arrowtooth flounder)	(72,000)	67,000	(47,500)	(44,200)	Fair	
	(24,200)	(19,700)	(20,000)	(20,000)	Good	
Other flatfish	88,100-150,200	88,100-150,200	150,200	150,200		
(Alaska plaice)	(45,100-70,000)	(45,100-70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	Excellent	Abundance high for all principal specie
(Rock sole, flathead sole, and others)	(43,000-80,200)	(43,000-80,200)	(80,200)	(80,200)	Excellent	
Pacific ocean perch	12,000-17,000	12,000-17,000				
(Eastern Bering Sea)	--	--	>1,360	1,360	Poor	Abundance low and stable, both regions
(Aleutians)	--	--	>10,800	11,400	Poor	
Other rockfish						
(Eastern Bering Sea)	7,000-15,000	7,000-15,000	3,100	1,120	Fair	Abundance may be average and stable. MSY estimates probably too high.
(Aleutians)	23,000-45,000	23,000-45,000	11,000	7,790	Fair	
Sablefish		(15,100)				
(Eastern Bering Sea)	13,000	--	4,430	2,600	Improved from low, stable levels during 1976-81	Although improved abundance remains be historical levels
(Aleutians)	2,100	--	1,755	3,360		
Atka mackerel	23,000-28,000	37,700	25,500	38,700 / 37,700	Good	Abundance in 1983 higher than in 1980
Squid	>10,000	>10,000	10,000	10,000	--	Abundance trend unkn
Other species	67,200	67,200	61,400	46,600? / 51,200	Good	Abundance declined slightly
TOTAL GROUNDFISH	2,091,600-2,218,700	2,116,800-2,238,900	2,248,345	2,149,330		

Table 2.--Proposed catch levels (t) for the groundfish complex in the Bering Sea-Aleutians region and comparisons to their estimated equilibrium yields for 1985 and total allowable catches set in 1984.

Species	1984 TAC	1985 EY (Part I)	Ecosystem Long-term sustainable catch (Part II)	Recommended 1985 Catch levels
Pollock (Bering Sea)	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,100,000	1,150,000
(Aleutian)	100,000	120,000		100,000
Pacific cod	210,000	178,400	100,000	178,400
Yellowfin sole	230,000	310,000	130,000	244,740
Turbot	59,610	64,200	85,000	59,600
Other flatfish	111,490	150,200	120,000	150,200
Pacific ocean perch	-	(12,760)	12,000	-
(Bering Sea)	1,780	1,360	-	~~1,780~~ 680
(Aleutians)	2,700	11,400	-	3,800
Other rockfish	-	(8,910)	14,100	-
(Bering Sea)	1,550	1,120	-	1,120
(Aleutians)	5,500	7,790	-	5,500
Sablefish	-	(5,960)	9,000	-
(Bering Sea)	3,740	2,600	-	2,600
(Aleutians)	1,600	3,360	-	3,360
Atka mackerel	23,130	37,700	>28,000	37,700
Squid	8,900	10,000	-	10,000
Other groundfish	40,000	51,200	-	51,200
TOTAL	2,000,000	2,149,330	1,800,000	2,000,000

PACIFIC SEAFOOD PROCESSORS' ASSN.
March 5, 1984

PRESENTATION BY JAMES O. CAMPBELL
Chairman, North Pacific Fishery Mgmt. Council

When Alex asked me if I would speak to you today as Chairman of the Council, my first thought was that you would be wondering what a lumber dealer is doing in the fish business. I asked myself that same question five years ago when Elmer Rasmuson recommended I take his place on the Council. As a forestry student, I knew a Pacific Dogwood tree was a cornus nuttallii, but I had no idea there were different species of Tanner crab and that I would be working with new words such as C. bairdi, C. opilio and POP. As in all federal systems, I was introduced to a complete new vocabulary:

TALFF - Total Allowable Level of Foreign Fishing
FRA - Federal Regulatory Analysis
NOPRM - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,

and my favorite, NS, which is the designation of non-significance.

But, as I thought about my remarks today, it occurred to me that we do have a lot in common. As President of a retail building supply firm with sales in Alaska exceeding $170 million, I work every day with return on investment, labor costs, transportation costs and, perhaps most important, monitoring the impact of state and federal influences on my business. Sound familiar?

Today I would like to talk about where I think fishery management is going and why you should be much more involved in it than you have been in the past.

There isn't any question that the harvesting end of the fishing industry, the fishermen themselves, have the greatest influence on management. They are reasonably well organized, they're vocal, they have high visibility, both before the public and in Congress, and most important of all, they participate constantly in the management process whether it's before the Council, the Alaska Board of Fisheries, or lobbying their state and national legislators and fishery administrators. I didn't have to be around the Council process very long to realize why they have as much influence as they do.

Processors, on the other hand, really don't spend very much time working with the Council. We see you occasionally when a specific issue of interest to you comes up and we hear from you when we do something that you don't like. But we seldom have the full benefit of your thinking and advice before we make decisons on matters that, it seems to me, must affect your businesses in some very direct and, frequently, expensive ways.

Short and long term Council goals.

I've been asked to talk about the Council's conceptual plans for both short and long-range management of the various fisheries off Alaska, our approach to the state vs. federal fisheries management problem, and the Council's approach to phase out/phase in of foreign fishing and U.S. industry. I'm going to start with a quick review of the fisheries that the Council is either managing or in the process of developing management plans for and then lay out the Council's short-term and long-term objectives for those fisheries.

While some of the objectives or concepts that I'm going to talk about today have not been clearly stated in our fishery management plans or policy papers, I think I have been on the Council long enough now to have a pretty good understanding of where the Council as a group seems to be going.

The Council has developed or is in the process of putting the finishing touches to six fishery management plans. Two of those are for crab, king and Tanner; and two for groundfish, in the Bering Sea and in the Gulf of Alaska. The other two are for salmon and herring.

SALMON

The Council's salmon fishery management plan, while it covers all of Alaska, really deals only with the troll fishery off Southeastern Alaska. All FCZ waters are closed to salmon fishing except for the troll fishery conducted east of Cape Suckling off Yakutat and Southeastern Alaska.

The Council's immediate objective for this plan is to get an agreement with Canada covering the chinook resources of common interest to the United States and Canada so that we can get a coastwide rebuilding plan started.

The long-term goal is to rebuild the natural runs to full productivity, preferably within two life cycles, but not more than three. Where it's economically feasible, we hope to be able to augment those stocks through enhancement, whether it be by increased productivity in the streams or by hatcheries.

At a recent meeting of the Council and the Alaska Board of Fisheries we established a range of 243,000-272,000 adult chinook salmon for the 1984 commercial catch with the understanding that we would manage for the low end of the range if the Canadians match this action.

The key to this whole problem is a coastwide management plan and we do not see how we can develop one until we have an agreement between the United States and Canada on the chinook resource.

CRAB

The Council has a fishery management plan in effect for Tanner crab. The king crab plan is presently in Washington waiting to begin Secretarial review. Both are quite different. The Tanner crab plan covers all of Alaska and is based on a system of regulations identical, or at least very similar to, those in effect within the State of Alaska. When a regulation needs to be changed, we have to amend the plan. For reasons I'll talk about later, that system is not working very well.

The king crab plan is a framework plan covering only the Bering Sea which delegates rulemaking to the Alaska Board of Fisheries. The regulations they develop will be reviewed by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Council to insure that they conform to the national standards and other federal regulations and guidelines. We think the framework concept has a great deal of merit. It allows the State to continue management of this resource with some oversight from the federal government and should be more flexible than a full-blown FMP such as that for Tanner crab. However, there is some opposition to the concept.

We've heard doubtful comments from as far away as the East Coast. They think the Council is giving up to much authority. Crab fishermen from outside of Alaska are not enchanted with the concept for much the same reason. Although they seem willing to give it a try, it's obvious they'll be watching it very closely.

Our short-term goal for the crab resource is to rebuild the stocks as rapidly as possible. At the same time, we need to determine what causes these large fluctuations and, having once determined that, whether anything can be done to control it. At the very least, we should be able to predict them better. Incidentally, we have not seen any convincing evidence that the recent declines are related to fishing pressure. This is not to rule it out entirely, of course, but in theory, and as far as we can see, in practice, it was not a significant contributor to the crash.

As a long-term goal, I think we all want to see the crab fishery stabilized as much as possible for optimum production and profit. And this is an area where processors can really help us. The Council has never really heard what you consider the best system of crab management. Do you like the short, intense, almost derby-like seasons? Is there some real benefit to spreading the season over a longer period of time so that your product flow may be less but will last for a longer time? Can you use female crabs? Scientists tell us that it is possible, maybe even wise, to harvest them at times. What really determines good recovery rates? All of these questions (and their answers), though you've undoubtedly thought about them, have never been brought to the Council to aid their deliberations.

HERRING

The Council has been working on a herring fishery management plan for the Bering Sea for almost six years. We've had problems with it and they're not over yet. We hope that we will be able to resolve them this spring so it can be implemented next year. But, considering our past experience, I wouldn't want to make any promises.

The Council set out some very definite priorities and objectives when they first developed this plan. I've seen nothing that indicates they have changed their mind. They gave first priority to providing enough fish for the subsistence fisheries along the Bering Sea coast. While those fisheries are relatively small, averaging about 100 tons a year, there does have to be a reasonably large population of herring to enable the natives to catch that many.

The second priority is given to the inshore commercial fishery by U.S. fishermen - their catch in 1983 was 33,987 metric tons. The third priority would be to a U.S. offshore fishery; and then, and last, to a foreign fishery.

If the plan had been in effect these past four years the entire catch, under the system specified in the plan, would have been taken in the inshore roe fishery, with none remaining for an offshore fishery. That's what happened. I only mention it to illustrate the similarity between the Plan's objectives and current management.

We do need to know a great deal more about the composition of the herring resource. Are there are discrete stocks? If there are, do they winter together? Is a winter fishery possible with some assurance that what we now believe are weaker stocks won't be hit too hard?

We need a better way of assessing herring populations. We now depend on spawning area counts. That system leaves something to be desired. Some spawning areas can't be surveyed from the air, bad weather can completely disrupt the process, and, of course, the entire herring population does not come in to spawn.

While I don't expect the Council's objectives for herring management to change, it may be possible to use more of the resource if we have better information on its size.

In the meantime, the inshore roe fishery is productive and probably the best use of this resource.

37C/L

GROUNDFISH

And now we come to the area that has aroused so much interest since the passage of the FCMA--groundfish off Alaska; the only resource complex that's specifically named in the Magnuson Act. The Council's short-range goal, as it has been since 1976, is to replace the foreign fishery on these stocks by a solely U.S. fishery. At the moment that's being done largely through joint ventures.

We all recognize that joint ventures, and I'll use that term for lack of a better one, are an interim process. While we would all much rather see it develop from the very start caught and processed by Americans, it didn't begin that way for a number of reasons. In the meantime it is very difficult to refuse to allow fishermen to sell to a foreign processor if there are no markets for them ashore or if there is still a directed foreign fishery for the same resource.

How we phase out foreign processors and phase in American processors is a difficult question. I'd like to outline the rest of the Council's goals for groundfish before we get into that.

We are actively working on a solution to the problem of prohibited species catches in all fisheries. By prohibited species I mean salmon, halibut and crab caught in other than directed fisheries for those species. It's become more visible as U.S. fishermen increase their groundfish fishery, but it has always been a problem. Halibut are taken in the crab and trawl fisheries, crab have always been taken in trawl fisheries, and salmon are caught by trawlers on occasion.

While I list the resolution of this problem as a short-range goal, I fear that we will be feeling its effects and finding more ramifications of the problem for a long time to come.

Most of the time we are going to have to make trade-offs. What can a fishery take without harming another fishery or another resource? Should these "prohibited species" remain in the same status they now are? That is, should they all be returned to the water whether they're dead or alive? Should some retention be allowed in other than non-target fisheries?

Those are all very difficult questions. They require lengthy analysis and some experience before we can hope to know how to answer them.

In the long-term, as I mentioned before, we want all of this resource handled by the American industry--catching, processing, and sales. As a businessman I don't envy the decisions you will have to make nor would I like to put together a return on investment projection. Once our fishermen have steady markets with foreign processors and assuming both are making money, they're not going to be anxious to change. We can't stop the American fishermen from selling to foreign processors until the American industry is ready to offer him a price that at least equals current market. This is a problem that needs your help in resolving just as we desperately want your help in making some long-range management decisions on how this resource should be managed once it is all American.

It seems to me that groundfish are a completely different category than salmon and the other high-priced species we've been working with. Are you going to be able to tolerate fish derbys for groundfish like we have for halibut and crab? Do your plants need to operate all year? How do you want the product flow to come to them? What is it going to take to put a profit into the groundfish business for the U.S.? We can't answer those questions; you can.

I believe it's possible to manage the groundfish resource as a complex, though perhaps not always as individual species, so that long-range plans and investments can be made to harvest and process them. To do that though, we need to know what you need to make your businesses profitable.

We're interested in not just how well the fisherman does. We want all of the communities involved with the fisheries to benefit as much as possible. The Council also has a responsibility to the consumer, a voice unable to speak for itself. We intend to manage the resources for the greatest benefit to the United States--that's not always an easy thing to identify and we can use your help.

One other species that I'd like to mention before we leave this part of my talk is the problem in the halibut fishery. The Council still intends to find some way of changing the present halibut fishery from the frantic derby that it has become to a longer-term, more rational fishery. It should not only supply a better product to the consumer but it should be more profitable to the fisherman and the processor. Exactly how that's going to be done is still up in the air, although it's the opinion of many that some form of limited access is going to be necessary.

HOW THE COUNCIL PROCESS WORKS:

Having told you what the Council has done, what they're working on, and what they hope to do, I'd like to talk about how the process works. I could say, "not very well," and that would be pretty close to the mark. But, I couldn't leave it at that. The mechanical process the Council is forced to use for developing plans, amendments and regulations is slow and cumbersome and not at all suited to managing fisheries. Our problems are compounded by the fact that in many instances we don't know enough about the resource, but our knowledge is increasing quite rapidly and that changes our perceptions of how some resources should be managed.

The Magnuson Act is a reasonably straight forward piece of legislation. If we had only the guidelines in the Act to contend with, it wouldn't be too bad. But there's more to it than that. President Reagan's administration has made it very difficult to promulgate any regulations. While I wholeheartedly agree with what he's trying to do, I think he has overlooked the fact that resource regulations, particularly those that involve a common property resource like fisheries, can't go through the same hoops and hurdles as a pulp mill or the Susitna Dam. We don't have the luxury of time in many cases. While the long development process may not be an overwhelming obstacle to maintaining a conservation program, it does mean that we've got to be far more conservative than we would be otherwise and that we probably miss an awful lot of opportunities to increase our use of the resource.

Our actions must comply with the National Environmental Protection Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Administrative Procedures Act and Executive Order 12291, to name a few. Those acts call for descriptions and analyses of a contemplated action's effects on the environment, on man, on the economy, and require that all of those be done and made available to any interested party with ample time to study them before the Council acts on anything. Most of the Council's actions must then be implemented by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary has 105 days to review and either approve or disapprove the Council's decision. Once that decision has been approved it can then be implemented in another 30 days. The Secretary's review is expected to be made on the basis of the action's conformity with the National Standards and other law. In practice we find that reviewers within National Marine Fisheries Service in Washington frequently try to impose their value judgements on the Council's actions and this has greatly slowed the

review process. The review, of course, doesn't take place just in the National Marine Fisheries Service. Because of the other Acts and Executive Orders I've mentioned, it's also reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Small Business Administration and other layers of the Department of Commerce. All of this may give you some idea of why we have been working on some plans for over five years.

I don't intend to paint an entirely black picture. The Council has accomplished many things since it was formed. We have been able to influence allocations to other nations and the way they do business. The management plans we have developed have brought several species of groundfish back from a depressed state to high abundance. We did get the foreigners out of the crab fishery and we are now moving them out of sablefish and Pacific cod. We have greatly reduced the take of prohibited species in the Bering Sea and are in the process of doing so in the Gulf of Alaska.

You all know that fisheries management in the past has been largely a question of management by instinct. A manager, drawing on information from industry and available scientific work and surveys, and from his own experience, made a lot of decisions without really explaining why he made them. This is not the case anymore. The Council has to carefully appraise all that is known about a fishery, analyze the pros and cons of any given action, and arrive at a solution based on all available information. Obviously, our decisions are not totally objective. The interaction of state and federal requirements, the desires and political strengths of constituent groups, have all influenced decisions just as they always have in the past, but perhaps not nearly to the same extent. As we refine this process, I think it's going to get much better. We will be better equipped to analyze the effect of our actions before we take them and to better define that "greatest overall benefit to the United States" that we are aiming for.

I still hope that we can increase the flexibility and speed of our decision-making process. We may need some legislative relief and we're going to have to convince everyone within the Executive branch of government that the Councils are here to stay. Management should be done by the people of the region who have a direct interest in the resource and are familiar with the requirements and needs of the industry, the people, and the nation in that region.

Finally, I'd like to talk for a moment about the relationships between the Council, the federal government and the state governments. The Council has a majority of Alaskans as voting members. Five of its 11 members are appointed from nominees submitted by the Governor of Alaska. In addition, the Commissioner of the Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game is a voting member. From outside Alaska, we have two members appointed from nominees selected by the Governor of Washington, and the Commissioners of Fisheries for the states of Oregon and Washington. The eleventh, and presumably neutral, voting member is the Regional Director for the National Marine Fisheries Service in Alaska.

The Council itself is somewhat outside either the state or the federal process. Although we're funded by a federal grant, our staff is hired and fired by us. We are, of course, bound by federal law, but we spend as much time, or more, arguing with the feds as we do with the state. Not that we don't argue with the state frequently enough. Senator Magnuson, when he spoke before the first Council members in September of 1976, called the Councils a "new form of government." He was very close on the mark.

I'm sure that there are many times when the feds look at the Council as a damned nuisance, but on reflection, I think that the cooler heads realize that

the Councils serve a very necessary role. They are the direct contact with the resource and the industry, the forum for getting public input that was not available within the federal system. We draw a lot of fire that they would take if the Councils didn't exist.

The state, equally, frequently thinks of the Council as a pain in the neck. We don't always agree with them and there are times when we cramp their style. On the other hand, I know that they would rather be dealing with and through the Council than they would directly with the federal system if we did not exist.

There has been another spin-off that I don't think was expected when the Councils were created. We have become the best forum for the very diverse groups involved in fisheries that we've ever had in the United States. Between the Council, its Scientific and Statistical Committee and its Advisory Panel, we get a group of people together every two months from virtually every area and interest in the fishery. Scientists from the state, the federal system, from universities, Advisory Panel members from diverse fisheries and regions, labor respresentatives, recreational fishermen, administrators and, yes, even a few processors. But not nearly enough processors. Being able to talk regularly with all of these people has enabled us to do a great deal in terms of coordination of projects and programs; it decreases costs and improves productivity. It's a marvelous system for communication.

I'd like to end this talk with another plea for your active participation in the management process and with the Council. I think there's a number of different ways you can do that. Work with us directly through your Director, or put together a resource management subcommittee that we can work with. We need to hear from more than one part of this industry.

Thank You.

9-21 Version

1984 Industry Survey Summaries and Projected Catches
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	Initial Survey DAP	Initial Survey JVP	March Survey DAP	March Survey JVP	Projected Catches DAP[1/]	Projected Catches JVP[2/]
Pollock	Bering Sea....	18,200	253,000	6,734	295,530	3,000	260,000
	Aleutians.....	500	3,000	0	2,500	300	10,000
Yellowfin sole	.....	1,360	36,500	907	26,454	200	36,000
Turbots	.....	20	100	0	1,200	0	300
Other flatfishes	.....	1,360	22,000	907	11,200	100	22,000
Pacific cod	.....	104,400	27,200	63,329	42,115	60,000	40,000
Pacific ocean perch	Bering Sea....	550	150	1,360	1,240	1,360	150
	Aleutians.....	550	1,745	0	3,380	100	450
Other rockfish	Bering Sea....	50	20	0	1,900	50	20
	Aleutians.....	50	4,000	0	1,400	5	50
Sablefish	Bering Sea....	2,540	100	2,313	175	1,000	100
	Aleutians.....	50	100	0	280	50	300
Atka mackerel	.....	230	19,430	0	20,200	0	36,500
Squid	.....	20	20	0	20	0	30
Other species	.....	3,000	2,000	0	2,000	1,000	2,800
TOTALS		132,880	369,365	75,550	409,594	67,165	408,700

1/ DAP based on catches through July 1984
2/ JVP based on catches through September 8, 1984

9-21 Version

1984 Industry Survey Summaries and Projected Catches
Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	Initial Survey DAP	Initial Survey JVP	March Survey DAP	March Survey JVP	Projected Catches DAP[1/]	Projected Catches JVP[2/]
Pollock	Western	230	300	0	5,306	10	-
	Central	5,380	210,000	2,545	185,000	600	190,000
	Eastern	300	0	317	0	0	0
	Total	5,910	210,300	2,862	190,306	610	190,000
Pacific cod	Western	500	250	45	8,423	45	150
	Central	11,700	14,600	11,709	7,991	6,000	4,000
	Eastern	120	0	476	0	50	0
	Total	12,320	14,850	12,230	16,414	6,095	4,150
Flounders	Western	0	10	0	5,802	10	200
	Central	100	8,620	3,311	4,381	500	3,000
	Eastern	300	0	1,361	0	300	0
	Total	400	8,630	4,672	10,183	810	3,200
Pacific Ocean perch	Western	0	1,770	1,100	5,010	1,000	1,200
	Central	620	2,000	1,143	1,625	1,000	600
	Eastern	460	0	1,281	0	0	0
	Total	1,000	3,770	3,524	6,635	2,000	1,800
Other rockfish	Total	395	500	2,649	1,301	1,000	400
Sablefish	Western	100	200	227	329	356	200
	Central	1,360	290	2,701	290	2,896	180
	Eastern[3/]	3,629	0	3,769	0	4,260	0
	Total	5,089	490	6,697	619	7,512	380
Atka mackerel	Western	400	400	0	2,200	0	400
	Central	0	1,500	0	501	0	50
	Eastern	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	400	1,900	0	2,701	0	450
Squid	Total	100	10	100	10	100	10
Thornyhead rockfish	Total	150	50	0	50	40	10
Other species	Total	100	400	0	1,000	150	1,400
TOTALS		24,899	241,200	32,734	229,219	18,317	201,800

1/ DAP based on catches through July, 1984 (except Sablefish through September 29, 1984)
2/ JVP based on catches through September 8, 1984
3/ SE outside and West Yakutat only

24 SEPT 84

1985

BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS GROUNDFISH

SPECIES	TAC	DAP	JVP	DAH	TALFF	RESERVE
					0	
POLLOCK/BS	1150000	6826	274500	281326	696174	
POLLOCK/AL	100000	0	2875	2875	82125	
POP/BS	680	4360	1010	5370	-4792	
POP/AI	3800	0	2310	2310	920	
ROCKFISH/BS	1120	600	10	610	342	
ROCKFISH/AI	5500	0	535	535	4140	
SABLEFISH/BS	2600	1979	10	1989	221	
SABLEFISH/AI	3360	0	417	417	2439	
P.COD	178400	62940	18150	81090	70550	
Y.F.SOLE	244740	3076	57000	60076	147953	
TURBOTS	59600	0	2000	2000	48660	
FLATFISH	150200	907	21824	22731	104939	
ATKAMACKEREL	37700	0	56360	56360	-24315	
SQUID	10000	0	0	0	8500	
OTHERSPECIES	51200	0	600	600	42920	
TOTAL	1998900	80688	437601	518289	1180776	300000

DAP
Initial 1985 Industry Survey Summary
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	1985 Returns (#)[1/]	1984 Returns (#)[2/]	Total (#)
Pollock	Bering Sea	1,361 (1)	5,465 (4)	6,826 (5)
	Aleutians	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Yellowfin Sole	.....	2,169 (2)	907 (1)	3,076 (3)
Turbots	.....	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Other Flatfishes	.....	0 (0)	907 (1)	907 (1)
Pacific Cod	.....	16,228 (3)	46,712 (5)	62,940 (8)
Pacific Ocean Perch	Bering Sea	3,000 (1)	1,360 (1)	4,360 (2)
	Aleutians	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Other Rockfish	Bering Sea	600 (1)	0 (0)	600 (1)
	Aleutians	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sablefish	Bering Sea	800 (1)	1,179 (3)	1,979 (4)
	Aleutians	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Atka Mackerel	.....	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Squid	.....	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Other Species	.....	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Total		24,158 (5)	56,530 (5)	80,688 (10)

1/ Companies returning surveys as of September 21, 1984

2/ 1984 survey return from companies which have not yet returned 1985 surveys.

DAP

Initial 1985 Industry Survey Summary
Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	1985 Returns (#)[1]	1984 Returns (#)[2]	Total (#)
Pollock	Western	0	-	0
	Central	2,023	-	2,023
	Eastern	5	-	5 (3)
	Total	2,028 (3)	-	2,028
Pacific Cod	Western	600	-	600
	Central	8,691	-	8,691
	Eastern	120	-	120
	Total	9,411 (20)	-	9,411 (20)
Flounders	Western	400	-	400
	Central	1,486	-	1,486
	Eastern	227	-	227
	Total	2,113 (6)	-	2,113 (6)
Pacific Ocean Perch	Western	3,000	-	3,000
	Central	6,683	-	6,683
	Eastern	136	-	136
	Total	9,819 (8)	-	9,819 (8)
Other Rockfish	Total	2,947 (24)	-	2,947 (24)
Sablefish	Western	1,752	0	1,752
	Central	5,406	629	6,035
	Eastern	1,578	1,438	3,016
	Total	8,736 (26)	2,067 (6)	10,803 (32)
Atka Mackerel	Western	0	-	0
	Central	0	-	0
	Eastern	0	-	0
	Total	0 (0)	-	0 (0)
Squid	Total	0	-	0
Thornyhead Rockfish	Total	0	-	0
Other Species	Total	62 (8)	-	62 (8)
TOTALS		35,116 (42)	2,067 (6)	37,183 (48)

1/ Companies returning 1985 surveys as of September 21, 1984

2/ 1984 Survey returns from companies which have not yet returned 1985 surveys.

JVP

Initial 1985 Industry Survey Summary
Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	1985 Returns (No.)
Pollock	Bering Sea	274,500 (11)
	Aleutians	2,875 (4)
Yellowfin Sole	.....	57,000 (5)
Turbots	.....	2,000 (3)
Other Flatfishes	.....	21,824 (5)
Pacific Cod	.....	18,150 (8)
Pacific Ocean Perch	Bering Sea	1,010 (2)
	Aleutians	2,310 (3)
Other Rockfish	Bering Sea	10 (1)
	Aleutians	535 (2)
Sablefish	Bering Sea	10 (1)
	Aleutians	417 (3)
Atka Mackerel	.....	56,360 (7)
Squid	.....	0 (0)
Other Species	.....	600 (5)
TOTAL		437,601 (12)

JVP

Initial 1985 Industry Survey Summary
Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery

Species	Areas	1985 Returns (No.)
Pollock	Western/	185,100 (9)
	Central	0
	Eastern	0
	Total	185,100
Pacific Cod	Western	5,965
	Central	8,200
	Eastern	0
	Total	14,165 (5)
Flounders	Western	800
	Central	1,800
	Eastern	0
	Total	2,600 (3)
Pacific Ocean Perch	Western	6,951
	Central	500
	Eastern	0
	Total	6,951 (5)
Other Rockfish	Total	1,765 (5)
Sablefish	Western	114
	Central	290
	Eastern	0
	Total	404 (6)
Atka Mackerel	Western	3,400 (4)
	Central	500 (1)
	Eastern	0
	Total	3,900
Squid	Total	0 (0)
Thornyhead Rockfish	Total	0 (0)
Other Species	Total	605 (5)
TOTALS		214,990 (11)