

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council and Board Members

FROM: Chris Oliver
NPFMC Deputy Director

DATE: January 20, 1999

SUBJECT: American Fisheries Act (AFA) and Steller sea lion protective measures

Two recent events are occupying the vast majority of the Council's time and energies, as well as that of the groundfish and crab fishing industry and the NMFS. Those are (1) the passage by Congress last fall of SB 1221, or the American Fisheries Act (AFA), and (2) the listing of the Steller sea lion (western populations) as endangered, NMFS' finding of 'jeopardy' relative to the pollock fisheries, and the subsequent consideration of management actions to mitigate that jeopardy finding. These will continue to be the focal issues for the Council over the next several meetings in 1999.

Essentially, the AFA was specific to the BSAI pollock fisheries and it allocated the pollock TAC as follows: CDQ at 10% off the top with the remainder going 50% onshore, 40% offshore, and 10% to the mothership sector. The AFA also specified the vessels and plants eligible to participate in the pollock fisheries, and is in place through 2004. These provisions are not subject to change by the Council, with the exception of possibly altering the CDQ allocation after 2001, subject to findings that the AFA provisions have negatively impacted the CDQ program. Various other provisions are outlined, and are subject to some interpretation and latitude by the Council - these deal with 'sideboard' amendments to mitigate impacts of the AFA on the other, non-pollock fisheries (including processors). We are working hard to meet the AFA deadline to submit (by July) amendments which will keep the AFA eligible vessels from exceeding their 'traditional' harvest levels in other fisheries. Relative to the crab fisheries, these will be considered relative to possible changes to the crab LLP program (mentioned under Tab 4).

Additional details on this issue, and on the Steller sea lion action, are contained in the attached excerpt from our recent newsletter.

American Fisheries Act (AFA)

The Council approved two emergency rules and provided staff guidance on the scope of analysis required for the American Fisheries Act amendments that are scheduled for initial review in April and final review in June. A status report on these analyses will be presented to the Council in February.

First, the Council passed an emergency rule that deals with pollock-to-opilio crab crossover vessels. The motion was, "of those vessels qualified under the American Fisheries Act to participate in the BSAI directed fisheries for opilio crab, only the vessels that landed opilio crab during the directed fishery for that species in 1996 or 1997 may participate in the directed fishery for that species in 1999." This action would reduce the number of vessels eligible for the opilio fishery in 1999 by approximately 30.

The second action was to "request NMFS to implement an emergency rule freezing participation in the pollock and non-pollock fisheries, in the BSAI and GOA, in place for 1999. Each gear type — trawl, trawl catcher processor, longline, longline catcher-processor, pot, pot catcher processor — would be limited to the average harvesting and processing levels achieved (as a proportion of TAC) in each GOA and BSAI non-pollock fishery for the years 1996, 1997, and 1998. Limitations under this emergency rule would not apply to (1) pollock catcher processors eligible to harvest pollock under the AFA in 1999, (2) trawl catcher vessels delivering catch to catcher processors under the AFA, or (3) to CDQ operations." Both of the emergency rules are subject to approval by NMFS. If these emergency rules are adopted, the industry will be noticed through the normal Federal Register process.

The Council took formal action to put the industry on notice that 1999 will not count in determining catch histories as they pertain to developing sideboards to protect non-pollock fisheries.

The third action taken by the Council was to provide staff direction on the analyses to be conducted to implement the AFA. Council recommendations for the 1999 fishery were provided in November. This meeting primarily dealt with requirements under AFA that must be completed by the July 1, 1999 deadline. However, some actions were taken by the Council with the understanding that they will likely not be available in April for initial review due to time constraints. Specific directions given at this meeting were:

INITIATE AN ANALYSIS TO ESTABLISH DURATION FOR GOA TO COINCIDE WITH THE BSAI

An analysis will be initiated to extend the length of the GOA Inshore/Offshore 3 allocation to December 31, 2004. This is the date that the AFA allocations for the BSAI are set to expire.

CATCHER PROCESSOR RESTRICTIONS FOR 2000 AND BEYOND

For the year 2000 and beyond, the Council initiated an analysis for the 20 + 9 vessels listed in the AFA of their bycatch in both the directed pollock and non-pollock fisheries (1995, 96, 97) and associated PSC levels. The catch histories of the 20 listed vessels and the 9 vessels which are removed from the fishery and the catch in the pollock and non-pollock target fisheries will be treated separately. This will allow the Council to include either all catch or only catch in the non-pollock target fisheries (for either the 20 or 29 vessels) in the caps set for 2000 and beyond.

Sub-options:

- a. The caps would close both the pollock and non-pollock groundfish fisheries when reached.

- b. The caps would close only the non-pollock groundfish fisheries when reached (only pelagic pollock fisheries would remain open).

CATCHER VESSEL RESTRICTIONS IN OTHER FISHERIES FOR 2000 AND BEYOND

Crab Sideboards

Initiate analysis of the following options to mitigate impacts of possible spillover effects of AFA on other fisheries:

Options For Section 208 Vessels:

1. No crossover allowed into any crab fisheries.
2. No crossover allowed in the Tanner crab fishery only (opilio and bairdi).
3. No crossovers at the endorsement level.
4. Allow crossovers into red king crab fisheries only (excludes brown and blue king crab).

Sub-options:

- a. Vessels which qualified based on bycatch of bairdi in red king crab would be restricted to bycatch of bairdi in the red king crab fishery (applied to #3 & 4 above).
- b. Only Section 208 catcher vessels that join a co-op (applies to #1-4 above).

Duration of sub-options:

- a. Permanent
 - b. Only for year vessel is involved in co-op.
 - c. Duration of AFA
5. Measures which would restrict pollock co-op vessels to their aggregate traditional harvest including:
 - a. Restriction to the percentage of crab harvest in all species between 1995, 96, and 97.

Groundfish Sideboards

Participation in a co-op is defined as **ANY** use of a vessel's catch history by a co-op, whether by direct harvest, lease, sale, or stacking of quota.

To Whom do Restrictions Apply

Sideboards apply to all Section 208 eligible vessels.

Sub-option: Applies to Section 208 vessels only if they join a co-op.

To What BSAI Non-Pollock Fisheries the Restrictions Should Apply

1. Restrictions should apply to all non-pollock FMP fisheries.

When the CV Restrictions Should Apply

1. Harvest levels should be restricted only during the same time periods as the normal open access pollock fishery
2. At all times during the fishing year

Sub-option: Use 1998 open access season dates by sector as a base reference
Sub-option: Use 1999 sea lion modified season dates.

Nature of CV Restrictions

Option A: Absolute harvest amounts expressed in percentage of TAC in metric tons.

Determination of "Traditional Harvest Level"

1. The definition of "traditional" in non-pollock fisheries will be determined by catch history
 - a. On basis of percentage of groundfish harvest in non-pollock fisheries by species by fishery.
 - b. On basis of percentage of total groundfish harvest by species by fishery.
 - c. On basis of percent of TAC in non-pollock fishery by species by fishery.

Option A: Apply one time frame equally to all groundfish targets

Sub-option 1: Use average catch history in the years 1995, 96, and 97.

Sub-option 2: Use catch history based on years 1992-97.

Sub-option under 1 and 2: Utilize "best 2 years"

Determination of "Aggregate"

Option A: Apply and monitor by the vessel class and sector

Option B: Apply and monitor by individual co-op

Management of Non-Pollock Fisheries

Vessels limited to target fishing for non-pollock species during those times when the open access target fishery for the non-pollock species is open.

1. PSC in non-pollock groundfish caps would apply to all fisheries as true caps (i.e., when reached these vessels would stop fishing for all groundfish species).
2. PSC caps would only close the non-pollock target fisheries.

The VBA Committee will develop options for PSC caps for co-op vessels in non-pollock fisheries.

1. Use VIP rates to determine PSC
2. Use a fraction of the VIP rates to determine PSC.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR POLLOCK INELIGIBLE PROCESSORS

AN ANALYSIS BE INITIATED EXAMINING OPTIONS TO MITIGATE POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACTS FROM AFA ON NON-POLLOCK PROCESSORS INCLUDING:

1. The ability to allow processors not listed in Section 208 to process limited amounts of inshore pollock allocation, including requirement to participate in buyout provisions. Note that NOAA GC has provided an opinion that the Council is restricted under the Act from allowing additional pollock processors except

when the TAC increases by 10 percent over 1997 levels, or one of the processors suffers a total or constructive loss (Section 208(f)(2)).

2. Excessive share caps on processors of 10%, 12%, 15% and 17.5%. The pollock, non-pollock groundfish, and crab fisheries should be examined. A sub-option should also be examined which allows differential caps between pollock and non-pollock processors.
3. Restricting vessels used for processing in the inshore sector to a single geographic location.
4. Measures to restrict pollock processor activity in non-pollock fisheries to no more than historic levels including options using years 1995, 96 and 97.

The analysis should consider the following:

1. list the adverse effects that the measures are aimed at protecting,
2. quantify how the measures will protect the non-eligible processor from the adverse effects, and
3. consider whether adverse effects have a high probability of occurring as opposed to being just perceived as a possibility of occurrence.

INITIATE A DATA GATHERING PROGRAM TO IDENTIFY THE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF AFA INFORMATION TRACKED SHOULD EXAMINE STATE AND FEDERAL FISHERIES AND INCLUDE:

ownership patterns
processor activity
product forms
ex-vessel price
employment changes
market share

DISCLOSE CATCH AND BYCATCH INFORMATION BY VESSEL

The Council requests that NMFS and ADF&G initiate development of a discussion paper examining what disclosure of catch and bycatch information §211(d) of the AFA would allow that is currently restricted, any other legal impediments to such disclosure, and how that disclosure may be beneficial in implementing §301(a)(9) and §303(a)(11) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

PREVENT EXCESSIVE HARVEST/PROCESSING SHARES FOR ALL CRAB AND GROUND FISH (AND EXCESSIVE PROCESSING SHARES FOR POLLOCK)

Move forward with an FMP amendment to prevent excessive harvest/processing shares for all crab and groundfish (and excessive processing shares for pollock). The analysis should examine shares of fisheries as defined in the following options:

1. individual crab and groundfish species
2. pollock, non-pollock groundfish, crab.

This analysis likely will not be initiated until sometime after April 1999, though processor caps are included in the suite of potential measures recommended by the Council regarding protection of pollock-ineligible processors.

The Council asked staff to examine the following and report back to the Council:

1. Definitions used in AFA and Magnuson-Stevens for consistency.
2. The ability of pollock processors to expand their operations to other geographic locations, and
3. The ability of pollock processors to transfer their processing privileges.

The Council also tasked development of an amendment for species endorsements under LLP. Both the GOA and BSAI should be included in the analysis. The amendment should be based on the proposal submitted by the Groundfish Forum. This will not be initiated until sometime after April 1999.

RECOMMEND MEASURES TO MITIGATE AFA IMPACTS

Add to staff tasking the framework proposal submitted by Alaska Groundfish Databank for pollock co-ops in the Gulf of Alaska. This task will not be started by staff until the Committee formed to study this issue has completed its work. It is the Council's intent to disband the Western and Central GOA committee and reform it as the GOA Sideboard Committee which will begin consideration of these issues in 1999.

IF NECESSARY, CHANGE CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING SHORESIDE CATCHER VESSEL COOPERATIVES IN SECTION 210(b)(1)

Further address in a discussion paper, options for compensation to inshore catcher vessels with catch history delivering to catcher processors that is no longer available to them under AFA. Additionally, examine inserting a clause replacing language in §210(b)(1) to add an option for determining catch history for catcher vessels on the basis of the best two of three years in 1995, 96, 97.

Preliminary analysis of these AFA related amendments will be reviewed by the Council at the February 1999 meeting in Anchorage. At that time, they will finalize the alternatives and options so that the sideboard amendment packages can be completed for review at the April 1999 meeting. Staff contacts are Darrell Brannan or Chris Oliver.

Steller Sea Lion Action

At this meeting, the Council reviewed the Biological Opinion (Section 7 consultation) from NMFS, which concluded with a 'Jeopardy Finding' relative to the pollock fisheries in both the BSAI and the GOA. In order to allow these fisheries to be prosecuted in 1999, the Council took emergency action to implement measures consistent with NMFS' proposed Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs). The RPAs, in summary, proposed spatial and temporal distribution of the pollock fisheries as well as additional closure areas around specific rookery and haul-out sites used by sea lions. For the BSAI, the Council's actions include: (1) separating the pollock fisheries into four seasons (A1, A2, B, and C seasons), with a limit of 30% of the total TAC coming from any one season; (2) reducing the overall roe season fishery to 40% of the annual total TAC; (3) limiting the overall A season removals from the sea lion critical habitat area/catcher vessel operational area (CH/CVOA) to 62.5% of the total TAC for those seasons; (4) eliminating a directed pollock fishery in the Aleutian Islands subarea; and, (5) expanding closure areas around rookery and haul-out sites.

For the GOA, the Council also created four seasons with limits on the percentage of the TAC which can be taken from any one season, expanded the closure areas around rookery and haul-out sites, and established a 300,000 pound trip limit for pollock in the western and central Gulf areas. The specific motion adopted by the Council, including details related to the above measures, is contained below:

"There is considerable scientific uncertainty regarding the relationships between the pollock fisheries and the Western population of Steller sea lions. This uncertainty lies at the heart of the concerns expressed by the AP and the SSC. The Council recognizes and shares these concerns. This uncertainty has placed the industry at risk, and forced the Council to react to Endangered Species Act concerns in a very compressed time frame and make critical decisions based on incomplete and conflicting data. This is not acceptable.

Nonetheless, as the SSC has noted, the Endangered Species Act involves a fundamental shift in the burden of proof and some basic facts are clear: (1) The Western population of Steller sea lions is greatly reduced; (2) the Western population has been listed as endangered; (3) pollock forms a large part of the contemporary diet of Steller sea lions; and (4) pollock fisheries remove and disperse potential prey. In view of the importance of the pollock fisheries, the Council is compelled to take immediate action to address the Endangered Species Act issues. Therefore, the Council adopts the following measures for emergency action in 1999:

A) Aleutian Islands

Close the Aleutian Islands area to directed pollock fishing.

B) Bering Sea (general rules - Item 7 contains more specific rules for each sector)

1. Establish a quarterly system of seasonal sector allocations (among A1, A2, B, and C seasons). Seasons to start on January 20, February 20, August 1, and September 15, respectively.
 - a) No pollock fishing between November 1 through January 19.
 - b) CH/CVOA = critical habitat/catcher vessel operational area (excluding NW corner)
2. The combined A1+A2 harvest for the non-CDQ fisheries is set at 40% of the annual non-CDQ TAC.
3. Set the A1 and A2 seasonal allocations at 27.5% and 12.5%, respectively, of each sector allocation in the non-CDQ fisheries.
4. No more than 30% of the annual TAC may be harvested in any single season.

5. Five-day closed period between the A1 and A2 seasons.
6. Allow rollover from one season to the next if it doesn't boost the following season's harvest over the 30% of annual TAC seasonal limit.
7. Establish seasonal harvest measures from inside Bering Sea CH/CVOA as follows:

Catcher-processor Sector:

- a) Neither A1 or A2 harvest in CH/CVOA may exceed 40% of the respective A1 or A2 apportionments for the catcher-processor sector.
- b) Prohibited from fishing in CH/CVOA in the B and C seasons.

Catcher Vessels Delivering to Motherships:

- a) Single A season beginning February 1. 50% may come from the CH/CVOA.
- b) B season starting September 1 (no C season). 50% may come from the CH/CVOA.

Inshore Sector:

- a) Of the overall A1/A2 inshore cap, no more than 70% shall come out of the CH/CVOA.
- b) In the B and C seasons fishing in CH/CVOA is limited to 80% of the inshore sector seasonal allocations.
- c) Vessels delivering onshore that are 99 ft LOA or less shall not be excluded from the CH/CVOA during Sept 1 through March 31 during any time that the Bering Sea onshore pollock season is open. The intent would be to close the CH/CVOA to larger boats prior to the sector's CH/CVOA cap being reached leaving sufficient quota remaining within the CH/CVOA to allow smaller boats to fish for the duration of the onshore fishery while others would be fishing outside the CH/CVOA.

CDQ Sector:

- a) Harvests in A1 and A2 seasons, combined, may not exceed 45% of the CDQ allocation. Closed periods do not apply.
 - b) Harvests in B and C seasons to be conducted as under present regulations.
8. Existing stand-down requirements of the A season (relative to non-pollock fisheries) shall be removed.
 9. Exempt Cape Sarichef from sea lion closures.

C. Gulf of Alaska

1. Establish the following seasons and allocations:

<u>Season</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
A	Jan. 20	30%
B	June 1	20%
C	Sept. 1	25%
D	No later than 10/1; no sooner than 5 days after close of C season	25%

- a) Rollover allowed, subject to 30% rule, and November 1st closure still applies.
- Limit the A season harvest from the Shelikof critical foraging area in accordance with the method described in the Final Biological Opinion (p. 122), i.e.: (Shelikof survey estimate/Total GOA survey estimate, multiplied by A season TAC).
 - Pollock Trawl Exclusion Zones:

Adopt the pollock trawl exclusion zones proposed by NMFS in the Biological Opinion with the following exceptions for 1999:

Cape Barnabas; Gull Point; Rugged Island; Point Elrington; Cape Ikolik; Needles; Mitrofanina; and Sea Lion Rocks.

- Trip limits:

Establish a 300,000 lb trip limit for directed pollock fishing in the W/C GOA.

D. Other Actions

These measures are being adopted as an Emergency Rule in accordance with the MSFCMA. They will be in effect for 180 days. In reviewing the possible extension of these measures for an additional 180 day period, the Council will pay great attention to NMFS' response to the following:

- The Council requests that NMFS, in consultation with the Council, the Marine Mammal Commission, ADF&G, and other relevant management agencies, coordinate an independent scientific review of the biological data, Biological Opinion, and other relevant information relating to factors affecting Steller sea lions and their prey. The purpose of the scientific review is to provide guidance to the Council as it prepares to address the long-term aspects of the Steller sea lion situation through the plan amendment process. The Council requests that the scientific peer review be completed by April 1, 1999.
- The Council requests that NMFS reconstitute the Steller Sea Lion Recovery Team to address concerns such as those expressed by the SSC to ensure that the Council has an appropriate additional source of advice as the Council prepares for long-term treatment of Steller sea lion issues.
- The Council requests that NMFS prepare and submit a budget proposal for the FY 2000 budget for a sustained research program to investigate: the efficacy of the emergency actions adopted by the Council; sea lion dietary and foraging patterns; sea lion/fishery interactions; and current trends in sea lion population dynamics.

4. It is the intent of the Council that the NMFS move as quickly as possible to develop National Standards for Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) so that such systems can be required on fishing vessels engaged in the trawl fisheries of the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska. Furthermore, it is also Council intent that in developing the National Standards that the NMFS consult with affected states, Councils and other federal and enforcement agencies with the intent that the U.S. Coast Guard and other regional enforcement agencies have timely and efficient access to VMS data.

The Council recognizes that these management measures represent an incremental step, and are for 1999 only. To fully comply with both the ESA and MSFCMA requirements, amendments to the BSAI and GOA FMPs will be necessary. Such FMP amendments may need to consider additional measures to satisfy statutory requirements.”

These measures are expected to be implemented by emergency rulemaking for the 1999 fisheries. Follow-up amendments will have to be prepared for the year 2000 and beyond and could include similar, or additional, measures for sea lion protection. The specific 10- and 20-mile closure areas around rookeries and haul-outs will be detailed in the NMFS rulemaking for these actions. Staff contact is David Witherell.

Social and Economic Data Committee
Report to the Council
January 29, 1999

History of the Committee:

The Social and Economic Data Committee was established by the Council in June, 1997. Appointment to the Committee occurred in April, 1998. Appointed to the Committee were:

Dennis Austin (Chair and Council Member)	John Iani (Industry)
Chris Blackburn (Industry) ¹	Seth Macinko (SSC)
Darrell Brannan (Staff)	Richard Marasco (SSC)
Keith Criddle (SSC)	Ed Richardson (Industry) ¹
John Gauvin (Industry) ¹	

The Committee was formed to provide specific recommendations to the Council on improving the social and economic data collection and distribution process. Several workshops and meetings have been held to develop recommendations for the Council to consider. This document will describe the committee's recommendations and proposed follow-up work plan for the committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Regulatory Amendment:

● **The first recommendation from the Committee is that the Council require processors operating in the EEZ off Alaska to complete and submit the Alaska Commercial Operators Annual Report (ACOAR).** Currently processors operating under State jurisdiction are required to complete this form on an annual basis, while some offshore processors file the report voluntarily. As a result of comparisons between the COAR and NMFS Weekly Production Reports made during the analysis of Inshore/Offshore 3, it appears that only about 30% of the offshore pollock production was being reported in ACOAR during 1996. Basing analyses on response rates of that level may lead to inaccurate or misleading results. Requiring this information should improve the ex-vessel and first wholesale price data from the at-sea fleet and provide additional information on production levels. It will also provide data that are comparable to those provided by processors operating onshore or within State waters. Members of the Committee agreed this would be an appropriate and substantial first step in filling existing economic data gaps. **To implement this recommendation will require the concurrence of the State of Alaska.**

¹Member was absent during the January 19-21, 1999 meeting where these recommendations were developed.

Other Recommendations:

● **Recommend that the Alaska Fisheries Information Network (AKFIN) Steering Committee determine the feasibility of updating the ACOAR and modifying the information collected on fish tickets.** Members of the Committee felt that it was appropriate to explore the option of updating/improving the ACOAR, but realized that the AKFIN Steering Committee may be better suited to determine if alterations to the form are reasonable. This is due to the makeup of the two committees. The AKFIN Steering Committee is comprised of more individuals that deal with the ACOAR on a regular basis and therefore may be in a better position to recommend and facilitate changes.

Discussions were also held regarding the feasibility of modifying fish tickets to collect economic data. One suggestion was that the price field be made mandatory and that the reporting of post-season price adjustments be required. Again, it was the feeling of the Committee that determining whether those changes are practicable would require input from people not in attendance. AKFIN was again suggested as the group that may be in a better position to help the Committee answer those questions.

Based on these findings the Committee requests that the Council send a letter to the AKFIN Steering Committee Chair requesting that these items be placed on the agenda for the April 29-30, 1999 AKFIN Steering Committee meeting, and that the AKFIN Committee coordinate with the Council's Committee on their findings.

● **Statement of Council Support for Data Collection Initiatives and Industry Compliance.** No action would be required by the Council under this heading beyond their continued public support of these data collection, management, and distribution efforts. The committee felt that Council's support of these initiatives will be crucial to their success as well as the industry's understanding of the importance of these efforts. A more specific focus of support which the Committee discussed was to request/support line item funding for an expanded role of AKFIN, or development of an 'EFIN' (Economics Fisheries Information Network), as a central entity for collection and management of economic data on fisheries off Alaska. This could dovetail with current efforts relative to West Coast fisheries (see Attachment 1).

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Discussions:

Develop an Atlas of the Fisheries. To fulfill the direction of the Council, the goal of the Committee is to develop a current picture of the industry from a social and economic perspective, and then identify and routinely collect indexes of social and economic data that will allow the Council and others to detect change as a result of Council action and other variables and ultimately, develop the ability to predict and evaluate potential change as a result of proposed Council actions. During Committee discussions, this vision has evolved into the idea of an "Atlas of the Fisheries in the North Pacific". This Atlas would focus on the social and economic aspects of the fleet.

The Atlas could contain information broken into separate volumes. For example, one volume might contain information focused on communities as well as the traditional sectors such as catcher vessels, catcher/processor vessels, "motherships" and onshore processing plants. The community volume of the report could provide a detailed discussion of each community history in a particular fishery. In addition, aggregated data on the number of residents that own fishing vessels (commercial and/or charter), landings made in that community, fish tax revenues received by the community, etc. might be separate chapters in the Atlas or aggregated by each community. As envisioned, the Community Volume of the Atlas would not contain large amounts of tabular data. Instead, highly aggregated data would be provided to show relative position, but the document would rely heavily

on prose to convey the flavor of the community, fleet, or individuals. Other volumes which may be produced would focus on the fleet or the individual people in the fishery. The intent would be to try and capture the seasonal round of activities, and therefore discern a community's relative place in the fisheries. A critical decision point would be how many (and which) communities to include in such an Atlas, recalling that our 1994 Community Profiles (Faces of the Fisheries) covered 126 communities in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

As an initial conceptional outline, the Committee developed a set of data elements for various sectors of the industry. Each of the lists that were developed are presented in Attachment 2. Although lacking in detail at this moment, the lists are very broad in scope and thus, they should probably be characterized as "wish lists". Currently, the outline only represents the kinds of data the Committee thought would be of value. Discussions with industry and Committee members are anticipated to refine this outline.

Once the Atlas establishes the current status quo picture of the industry, indexes would be identified to measure change in this status. These indexes of social and economic data would annually be gathered as a routine management activity. It is very likely that some of these data elements are already being gathered while some are not. How the new data elements might be gathered, e.g. incorporated into current ongoing data gathering exercises or development of new data gathering formats, will be one of the subjects of discussion between the Committee and the AKFIN Steering Committee members.

Schedule of Further Committee Activities:

The draft outline of the "Atlas of the Fisheries in the North Pacific" would be refined through additional workshops with industry at both of the April and June Council meetings. Inter-action with AKFIN Steering Committee would begin at their April 29-30 meeting. Subsequent follow-up meetings would occur between the June and October Council meetings. A Social and Economic Committee Report would be made at the October Council meeting which would include any additional recommendations of the Committee.

Alaska Fisheries Science Center's 1999 Cost, Earnings and Employment Survey. The Committee spent considerable time discussing the collection of cost data. A report by the NMFS' Alaska Fisheries Science Center staff on their progress to develop survey instruments to collect cost data on the pollock and H&G fleets during 1999 was presented. It is expected that mailings of this survey will occur in early spring. Preliminary reports indicate that the AFSC's project seems to represent a great stride forward in the collection of cost data. However, that effort is not expected to collect all of the information that would be needed to answer questions often posed by the Council or SSC. Equally important is that this survey will not be conducted each year and thus the ability to routinely detect change will not be addressed. The experience gained from this survey, however, will be very helpful to the Committee in developing further social and economic data gathering recommendations for the Council's consideration.

Special Note to the Council:

● Information is not currently collected on people (crew members) that work in the federally managed fisheries off Alaska. The State of Alaska has a crew license, but the information collected does not allow people to be grouped into the fisheries in which they participate. While the Committee was unable to determine the best mechanism for collecting this information, it did agree the information will need to be collected if a basic social and economic data is to be gathered. Obtaining this information will be a major new initiative by the EEZ managers. The Committee discussed at least three potential methods for gathering this information. It was felt that these ideas needed more thought before they could be recommended to the Council for implementation. Included in this discussion was how important the Council felt this information would be in future management actions. The Committee felt that identifying crew members should serve as a starting place, since once the crew are identified they could be contacted later to obtain additional information. **Unless directed otherwise by the**

Council, it is expected that the October report of the Committee will recommend Council action to implement this initiative.

The methods currently being discussed by the Committee are:

1) Create a short survey that must be completed at the time a crew license is issued. This may require the Council to implement a crew license for persons working in federal fisheries, or it may be possible to use the State crew license. Information that could be required when they apply for their license might include SSN, fisheries participated in the previous year, the number of days they spent in each fishery, and the vessels they fished on as crew.

2) Create a crew log book that identifies information like SSN, vessel fished, dates fished, fishticket numbers the vessel filed while on board, position(s) held, etc.

3) Capturing crew information on harvest records (to be discussed with AKFIN Steering Committee).

ATTACHMENT 1

THIS WILL BE THE BUDGET REQUEST FROM PSMFC. THEY HOPE TO HAVE A FINAL VERSION BY EARLY THIS WEEK.

ATTACHMENT 2

ONSHORE SECTOR (PLANT CHARACTERIZATION)

physical location

summary description of physical characterization of plant

known plant IDs

round tons/day processing capacity

species and product forms:
product quantity and value
sales by product form

product markets

Ownership:
company name
parent firm/associated firms

Associated fleet
vessel ID
plant ownership interest

CDQ relationships

Co-op relationships

Employment (by plant):
numbers of employees and hours by species/fishery by broad job category
employee ID
payroll by species/fishery

Ex-vessel price

Post-season price adjustment

Tax payments by type/collecting entity

Processing Costs (see page 16 of NMFS document)
environmental compliance

Expenditures by port

MOTHERSHIP CHARACTERIZATION

Homeport

Main Moorage
Off-load Locations (ports/at-sea)

summary description of physical characteristics:

LOA, beam, draft
registered tonnage
H.P.
Storage capacity and type
Daily processing capacity by product type
Fuel capacity and consumption: Processing, running, idle
at-sea scales

Survey value: fair market, replacement values (incl. processing equipment)
survey date

Known Vessel IDs

Fisheries participated in by mgmt. Area
Year of first participation in N. Pacific

Permits held

Species and product forms
product quantity and value
sales by product form

Product markets

Over-the-side purchases:
quantity and value by species
Vessels purchased from

Revenues from other activities:
e.g., tendering, research contracts

Ownership:

Owner ID#
Owner and/or company name
partners/shareholders
managing entity
parent firm/associated firms

Membership in bargaining associations

CDQ relationships

Co-op relationships

Employment:

numbers of employees
employee IDs by fishery by employment type
skipper ID

Post-season price adjustment if any

Tax payments by type/collecting entity

Operating Costs:

CDQ royalties
Wages and payroll taxes - separate for hourly and/or crew shared and salaried employees
Fuel, lube and oil
Fish taxes
Observer fees
Employee recruitment and transportation
Processing chemicals and product additives
Packaging materials
Insurance - P & I
Insurance - Hull, War, Breach, and Loss
Repairs and maintenance
Northbound freight
Communications
Galley Expenses
Sales commissions
General and administrative
All other expenses, not including interest, depreciation or income tax

Debt service:

If owned, total principal and interest payments and depreciation expenses associated with vessel. If chartered, total annual charter payments for vessel and total principle and interest expenses associated with equipment on the vessel.

Expenditures by port

CATCHER-PROCESSOR CHARACTERIZATION

Homeport

Main Moorage

Off-load Locations (ports/at-sea)

summary description of physical characteristics:

LOA, beam, draft

registered tonnage

H.P.

Storage capacity and type

Daily processing capacity by product type

Fuel capacity and consumption: fishing, running, processing, idle

gear(s) used

at-sea scales

Survey value: fair market, replacement values (incl. processing equipment)

survey date

Known Vessel IDs

Fisheries participated in by gear type and mgmt. Area

Year of first participation in N. Pacific

Permits held

Species and product forms

product quantity and value

sales by product form

Product markets

Over-the-side purchases:

quantity and value by species

Vessels purchased from

Deliveries as a catcher-vessel:

quantity and price by species

ports and plants delivered to

Revenues from other activities:

e.g., tendering, research contracts

Ownership:

Owner ID#

Owner and/or company name

partners/shareholders

managing entity

parent firm/associated firms

Membership in bargaining associations

CDQ relationships

Co-op relationships

Employment:

numbers of employees

employee IDs by fishery by employment type

skipper ID

Post-season price adjustment if any

Tax payments by type/collecting entity

Operating Costs (same as noted for Mothership Characterization)

Debt service (same as noted for Mothership Characterization)

Expenditures by port

CATCHER-VESSEL CHARACTERIZATION

Homeport

Main Moorage

Delivery Locations (ports/at-sea)

summary description of physical characteristics:

LOA, beam, draft

registered tonnage

H.P.

Hold capacity and type

Fuel capacity and consumption: fishing, running, idle
gear(s) used

Survey value: fair market, replacement values

survey date

Known Vessel IDs

Fisheries participated in by gear type and mgmt. Area

Year of first participation in N. Pacific

Permits held

Price and quantity by species and landed form

Revenues from other activities:

e.g., tendering, research contracts

Ownership:

Owner ID#

Owner and/or company name

partners/shareholders

managing entity

parent firm/associated firms

Plants delivered to

Membership in bargaining association

CDQ relationships

Co-op relationships

Employment:

numbers of employees

employee IDs by fishery

skipper ID

Post-season price adjustment

Tax payments by type/collecting entity

Operating Costs:

- Crew wages and payroll taxes
- Fuel, lube and oil
- Galley expenses
- Bait
- Water and waste disposal
- Fish Taxes
- Observer fees
- Insurance - P & I
- Insurance - Hull, War, Breach, and Loss
- Employee recruitment and transportation
- Vessel repair and maintenance
- Gear loss and maintenance
- Wheelhouse expenses
- Northbound freight
- License or permit fees
- Communications
- Crew medical & Deductibles
- Loading/unloading
- General and administration
- All other expenses, not including interest, depreciation or income tax

Debt service:

- If owned, total principal and interest payments and total depreciation expenses associated with vessel
- If chartered/leased, total annual payment associated with this vessel

Expenditures by port

COMMUNITIES CHARACTERIZATION

Historical/General Profile:

Location, history, culture/language, economy, transportation, climate

Population Data:

Total Population
Non-Native Population
Percent Native
Ethnic Composition
Male/female pop.
Median Age
Housing Units
Owner occupied
Vacant Housing
Ave. Persons per House
Median Income
Cost of living index
Cost of labor index
Median Home Value
Median Rent Paid
Single Family Units
Below Poverty Level
Education Profiles
Single women raising families
[transient measure??]

Facilities and Utilities

Employment:

Breakdown by Class, Industry, and Occupation

Well-Being Indices:

Drug and Alcohol Dependence and Abuse

Fisheries-Related Data (commercial and charter as relevant):

Vessels homeported (name and ID)
Resident moorage vessels
Frequent transient vessels (name and ID)
Participation Patterns of Associated Vessels
Local employment on-board vessels
Number of residents who own vessels

Locally owned vessels and processors
permits held by residents
Local Processors (name and ID)
total pounds landed by species
Employment at processors (total and local)
Number and range of fisheries service businesses
Employment in service businesses
subsistence activity
CDQ membership

Municipal Finances:

Total All Revenues
Local Fish Tax Revenues by fishery
State shared fish tax revenues by fishery