

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council, SSC, and AP members

FROM: Jim H. Branson  
Executive Director

DATE: September 18, 1981

SUBJECT: FY82 Programmatic Research Funding Request and proposed system for solicitation and review for future proposals.

*ACTION REQUIRED*

*Approval of the new system.*

BACKGROUND

The FY82 programmatic funding request is enclosed for information and comment. This package was submitted to NMFS for funding in August [attachment F-4(a)]. At the request of the Finance Committee, the SSC Chairman and staff developed attachment F-4(b), "Process for Identifying and Requesting Funding for Needed Fisheries Research." Review, comment and approval of this system is requested at this meeting.

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

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

ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

Sheraton Hotel

Anchorage, Alaska

September 23, 1981

The Advisory Panel met on Wednesday, September 23, 1981, at the Sheraton Hotel from 9:00 a.m. to 6:15 p.m. The following members were present: Bud Boddy, Al Burch, Larry Cotter, Jesse Foster, Richard Goldsmith, Eric Jordon, Joe Kurtz, Rick Lauber, Ray Lewis, Dan O'Hara, Ken Olsen, Alan Otness, Don Rawlinson, Lewis Schnaper, Jeff Stephan, Tony Vaska, and Chairman Robert Alverson.

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

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert Alverson. The agenda was approved by all Advisory Panel members. Minutes of the July 22, 1981 Advisory Panel meeting were approved as read.

B. SPECIAL REPORTS

B-1 Executive Director's Report. The Executive Director's Report was presented by Clarence Pautzke. Under this agenda item the written statement on amendments to the MFCMA did not contain the proposal to provide voting representation on the Pacific Council. The AP suggests the voting on the Pacific Council by Alaskan representation be provided for in the NPFMC written and oral comments.

B-2 ADF&G Report on Domestic Fisheries. This report was presented by Mark Miller. The AP took no action under this agenda item.

B-3 NMFS Report on Foreign Fisheries. Ron Naab, Phil Chitwood and Ron Berg presented current foreign fishing activity off of Alaska.

B-4 U.S. Coast Guard Report on Enforcement and Surveillance. As no representative from the U.S. Coast Guard was present, no report was made available to the Advisory Panel.

B-5 Update on Joint-Venture Operations. John Schmiedtke from the West German operation off Alaska gave a brief presentation of their operations. He indicated the West German owners were looking for another joint-venture. He indicated that the joint-venture is not economically viable solely on deliveries of pollock. Mr. Schmiedtke proposed a Fee Port in Alaska so that products could be off loaded to avoid transfer at sea. \*

Mr. Schmiedtke went on to indicate because of quality problems, the strengthening of the dollar and other economic considerations, that products from U.S. processors had not been purchased and this was one reason they were seeking to buy products from U.S. catcher vessels.

B-6 AP and SSC Reports on Non-Agenda Items. No action taken.

C. OLD BUSINESS

C-1 Report on Halibut Limited Entry Meeting. This report was presented by Jim Richardson and debated to considerable degree. There was no concensus as to what should be the next step by the Council as it is unclear what the procedure in developing options for limited entry are. No action was taken by the Advisory Panel though concern over the current situation in the industry was expressed by several members.

A Letter from Kim Buchman from Seldovia was read into the record which is attached to the AP minutes.

passed with two in opposition. The opposing view point was that the permits should be denied if the Japanese ships are in fact found guilty or if monetary fines are paid.

D-6 Other New Business As Appropriate

No action taken.

E. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

E-1 Salmon FMP. Steve Davis and Pat Travers presented information concerning the FMP and the recent court decision by Judge Craig.

The following motion was adopted by the AP on a vote of 9 to 5.

"that the AP urge the Council to seek a final legal determination that the salmon fishery in the waters off Alaska is subject to treaty obligations before amending the Alaska troll fishery management plan to meet treaty obligations."

E-2 Herring FMP. There was a motion to allow a high seas harvest of 3,000 to 6,000 metric tons of herring in the Bering Sea. This was defeated by a vote of 10 to 5.

In the event the Council decides to allow this potential surplus, the AP recommends that it not be granted to joint-ventures as several domestic groups, Trident Sea Foods, a shore-based activity in Akutan, Alaska Packers and American Fisheries Products, Ken Peterson and Carl Perovich indicated that they may be interested in taking the herring as a solely domestic activity.

The Advisory Panel heard testimony from the Bering Sea Fishermen representative as well as from Mick Stevens.

C-2 Review of Advisory Panel Subgroup Memberships. Dick Goldsmith was added to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish subcommittee and Larry Cotter to the Inter-Council Salmon subcommittee. Other members of the AP that wish changes on subgroups are instructed to contact the Council staff.

C-3 Other Old Business as Appropriate. No action taken.

D. NEW BUSINESS

No action was taken.

D-1 Election of Council Chairman and Vice-Chairman

No action taken.

D-2 Approve Meeting Schedule for 1982

The Advisory Panel suggests to the Council if it wants a report on existing troll regulations that a meeting in Sitka in September is recommended. If it wishes input on proposed amendments that a March meeting in Sitka is best, but a meeting in Sitka at either time will be good.

D-3 Update Council Subgroups

No action taken.

D-4 Interim Appointments to the Advisory Panel

No action taken.

D-5 Review of Permit Applications

It was moved by the AP that the Council deny the six Japanese vessels their requested permits due to the severity of their offenses. This

E-3 King Crab FMP. The AP adopted the following motion concerning the King Crab FMP.

"Whereas the Alaska Board of Fisheries has provided sufficient conservation and management to the king crab fishery off Alaska and,

whereas an FMP for king crab would impose unnecessary regulatory burdens and increased costs to the industry,

the AP recommends to the Council that action on the proposed King Crab FMP be terminated and a finding be made and communicated to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce that no need for a king crab FMP exists."

This was passed 12 to 4.

#### Majority Viewpoint

Supporting points of the majority position included the following:

1. That the State has operated a successful management regime based on a time-tested and proven philosophy which has provided a climate for the profitable development of a multi-million dollar industry.
2. That the MFCMA does not mandate that the Council establish an FMP for king crab, as is supported by the decision of the Pacific Management Council to not establish an FMP for dungeness crab, shrimp, and herring.
3. That the Alaska Board of Fisheries bears the weight of direct regulatory responsibility for their actions, and is therefore closer to the consequences of their management decisions; the Council, in contrast, cannot regulate and therefore has less control due to their limited advisory capacity.

4. That the Alaska Board of Fisheries and ADF&G have intimate knowledge of the king crab management regime and have management and enforcement machinery, experience, and empirical knowledge which can never be duplicated by the Federal government.
5. That the allegations of regulatory discrimination are unfounded and unsubstantiated.
6. That the allegations of unfair treatment of non-residents in State Courts are unfounded and unsubstantiated.
7. That the increased regulatory requirements of an FMP and the associated processes and procedures would be unnecessarily burdensome to the industry.
8. That an FMP for king crab would increase the monetary costs to the industry which are unnecessary.
9. That an FMP for king crab would increase the costs to the federal government and put further pressure on an already overburdened NMFS staff and budget; and would further divert valuable human and financial resources away from those fisheries which are in true need of conservation and management.

#### Minority Viewpoint

The major objections raised by those opposed to the Advisory Panel's action on the King Crab Plan were:

1. There has been no analysis done to ascertain that Alaska's regulatory system has, in fact, provided "sufficient conservation and management" in the king crab fishery. Nor has there been an analysis to determine that Alaska's management of this

fishery accomplishes the objectives of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MFCMA).

2. Alaska's management system does not meet the objectives and national standards of the MFCMA.
3. By law, the Board of Fisheries must be responsive to the interests of the State and its citizens. In so doing, Alaska's regulatory system has discriminated against non-residents.
4. The MFCMA requires that a fishery management plan be developed for this fishery.
5. Alaska has no authority to regulate non-resident vessels fishing for king crab in the Fishery Conservation Zone.

Other reasons for opposing the majority vote of the Advisory Panel are found in the five sets of written comments on the king crab plan submitted to the Council by the North Pacific Fishing Vessel Owner's Association.

→ On the subject of the proposed NRC contract on king crab, the following action was taken:

Unanimously favored 16 - 1 abstention

"The Council should evaluate if a need for this research really exists, and if so, to distribute an RFP and fund the entire amount if it is established that the study is really needed."

Points supporting this decision included the following:

1. That NMFS and ADF&G already provides the information proposed in the study.



2. That the proposed study was not necessary at this time and could wait until after the statistics of current fishery performance are produced and evaluated this winter.
3. That concern was demonstrated that those proposing to carry out the study have strongly endorsed a management philosophy different from the current philosophy being used.
4. That it was improper to award a contract of this sort without first advertising an RFP.
5. That NMFS biologists could provide the same information if they were so directed and requested.
6. That contributors other than NBA were unidentifiable and/or non-committal.

E-4 Tanner Crab FMP. Steve Davis and Jerry Reeves presented information on amendments to the Secretary of Commerce as well as a forecast of potential harvest levels on opilio and bairdi tanner crab. Jerry Reeves indicated that the preliminary abundance of commercial sized tanner crab for 1982 are about 50% of that available for 1981.

The Advisory Panel suggests due to increasing complaints from the crab fishermen of losing pots in the Pot Sanctuary to foreign trawl activity that the Council coordinate, at the earliest time, a meeting for the Pot Storage Committee to meet with appropriate ADF&G, Coast Guard, NMFS and other appropriate agencies to determine if a different area can be found to store pots. With the increased use of pair trawls by foreign fleets in this area the gear conflict issues are increasing. This was a primary concern expressed to those AP members that were in contact with fishermen participating in the current king crab fishery out of Dutch Harbor and Akutan.

E-5 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP. The AP endorsed the PMT's concept of having one amendment encompassing several parts concerning reorganization;

amendments proposed by ALFA and the Japanese Longline Gilnet Association and changes to reduce the OY of black cod and suggest that it go out for public comment.

E-6 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP.

First Action. The AP requests that the Council send a telegram to the Secretary of Commerce to support immediate adoption of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands FMP.

Second Action. The AP would like to reiterate its support to stand by the NMFS fee schedule in light of the comments in the letter from the Korean Trawler's Association.

Third Action. The AP adopted the Harville draft of September 23, 1981 titled, "Bering Sea/Aleutians Groundfish Amendment: Annex." This was adopted with one opposing vote.

Amendment #3 was unanimously passed with the following two suggested changes.

1. Delete the words "the foreign groundfish fishery and" on Page 3, first paragraph under Establishment of Targets for Prohibited Species Catches.
2. Change the current formula determining allocation of PSC's as follows:

$$PSC_{ij} = \left( \text{Annual Catch Rate} \times \text{Percent Target Reduction}_{ij} \right) \times \text{TALFF}_i + \text{Reserves}_i$$

The annual catch rate would be as follows:

	Halibut	King Crab	Tanner Crab
1977-80			
Average	<u>3,182</u>	<u>916,804</u>	<u>16,003,329</u>
	Current OY	Current OY	Current OY

This change is suggested because the proposed formula does not take into consideration the increase in OY established by the Council in January which ranges from 1,400,000 mt to 2,000,000 mt. These OY ranges are 11% to 62.5% greater than the 1977-80 average used in establishing the base catch rate. As an example for 1982 or 1983 under the proposed formula, incidental catches of prohibited species would increase regardless of the health of those prohibited species.

Example 1.           1981       OY = 2,000,000 mt  
   150,000 DAH  
   1,850,000 TALFF

$$\frac{3,182}{1,258,102} \text{ halibut} \times .90 \times 1,850,000 = 4,210 \text{ mt}$$

The target for 1982 for halibut is 90% of 3,182 mt or 2,863 mt. The proposed formula would result in a 47% over catch of halibut.

Example 2.           1983                2,000,000 OY  
   300,000 DAH  
   1,700,000 TALFF

$$1977-80 \text{ average king crab } \frac{916,804}{1,258,102} \times .90 \times 1,700,000 = 1,114,941$$

The target for king crab is 90% of 916,804 or 825,123. The current formula would result in an increase of 35% above the target level regardless of the current health of the crab resource.

The current formula does not address the needs of the prohibited species resources when OY is increasing and can result in increased catches of prohibited species. The examples above were calculated on the extreme based on OY of 2,000,000 mt.

If you assume an OY of 1,500,000 for 1982 and a domestic harvest of 150,000

OY = 1,500,000  
DAH = 150,000  
TALFF = 1,350,000

you have  $\frac{916,804}{1,258,102} \times .95 \times 1,350,000 = 934,583$

which is still 13% above the target level for king crab.

The proposed new formula will take into account annual changes in the health of the overall groundfish resource, whereas the current formula does not. And if the health of the prohibited species is changed the target figures can be increased or decreased under the annual review section.

F. CONTRACTS, PROPOSALS, AND FINANCIAL REPORTS

The Advisory Panel endorsed the contract study concerning the origin of Salmon of Southeast Alaska streams and river.

The Advisory Panel then passed a motion to adjourn.

Kim.A.Buchman  
p/o Box 224  
Seldovia, Alaska  
99663

September 21, 1981

North Pacific Management Council  
Advisory Panel.

Gentlemen,

I would like to state my opposition to Limited Entry in the Halibut Fisheries off the State of Alaska.

Halibut stocks are as strong as ever. There is no need to give the catch to a few.

And if it is difficult for a few to travel 2,000 miles to fish, I would invite them to move up to our fine state and become part of our healthy and diversified fleet.

This fisheries for years has been a place for young men to start in our commercial fisheries.

Our fine system of free enterprise will enable the survival of the fittest and the future evolution of a healthy onshore fisheries.

Let's not cloud the issues with lengthy feasibility studies. We all know the difficulties and injustices left by Limited Entry of Salmon and the continuing battles.

Sincerely yours,

*Kim A. Buchman*

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

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

MINUTES

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Scientific and Statistical Committee

September 22-23, 1981

Anchorage, Alaska

The Scientific and Statistical Committee of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council met in Anchorage on September 22-23, 1981. Members present were:

Donald Rosenberg, Chairman  
Richard Marasco, Vice-Chairman  
Ed Miles  
John Clark  
Al Millikan  
Larry Hreha  
Steve Langdon  
Jack Lechner  
Jim Balsiger (alternate for William Aron)

B-6 SSC Charter

The Charter of the Scientific and Statistical Committee expires on April 13, 1982. The SSC reviewed the current charter for consistence with current activities and policies of the committee. The SSC has no changes to recommend.

E-1 Salmon FMP

The SSC had requested an update on the status of the 1981 Southeast Alaska salmon fishery, the preliminary catch, escapement information and the

management measures employed. The SSC had requested this preliminary information so members would be better prepared to address any proposed amendments at our next two meetings. Due to unexplained reasons the update was not available.

The SSC received a presentation on the recent ruling by Judge Craig and discussed some of the implications that ruling may have on management measures in the future.

We discussed the importance of the upcoming workshop on the WDF salmon model. The SSC requests that the following members be authorized by the Council to attend, at Council expense, the workshop: Bud Burgner, Al Millikan, Don Rosenberg, and Steve Langdon.

#### E-2 Herring FMP

The SSC received a report dated September 1981 from the Herring Plan Maintenance Team on problems encountered and their recommended changes to the FMP. The SSC has agreed that application of the Allowable Incidental Catch (AIC) formula does represent a problem. We are not convinced that the problem is with the formula itself, but note that it could be a misunderstanding on how the formula is to be used. In this light the SSC recommends that Vidar Wespestad be appointed as a scientific advisory to the team and that the team work with him to resolve the problems encountered.

With regard to the specific recommendation of the team, the SSC does not recommend withdrawal the plan from Secretarial review. We do recommend that the team immediately develop an amendment package which addresses the concerns they have expressed. That amendment package should be given full review as some of the proposed changes could represent a change in policy or plan objective.

The SSC did review the requests for an allocation for a high sea fishery and made the following determination:

That in accordance with the procedure outlined in the FMP as modified below, that there is a surplus of herring. Our best estimate is that the surplus ranges from 2,500 mt to 4,800 mt. The SSC would like the Council to note that if an offshore harvest is allowed on this surplus, that in accordance with the plan, the surplus is only available between now and April 1, 1982.

Additionally, the SSC recommends that any high seas fishery include a scientific sampling program which will gather data which will assist in the future management of the herring fishery. Specifically, the SSC makes reference to the proposed research project included in the 1982 Programmatic Research package which deals with the feasibility of using scale analysis to identify Bering Sea herring stocks.

In making the determination of surplus, the SSC requested that the PMT follow the procedure outlined in the plan. The results of that calculation are provided in Attachment 1.

It should be noted that the team and SSC did modify that portion of the calculation which deals with AIC. The PMT used their preferred option 1 from their September team report. The other procedure used simply took the groundfish OY times the currently used incidental rate (0.00125). The PMT value for AIC is 4,293 mt where the other method provides a value of 1,974 mt. The SSC would like to point out incidental catch by the Japanese trawl fishery from 1967 to 1975 is provided in Table 6 (page 29) of the plan and only exceeds a value of 2,300 mt in one year. Additionally, that the quota provided in 1978 was 2,580 mt with a catch of 2,320 mt and the quota in 1979 was 2,413 mt. This is provided in Table 8 (page 45) of the plan. The application of these two AIC values was used by the SSC to provide a range of surplus herring.

The Chairman of the SSC would like to note that the Herring surplus provided in this report are different than those discussed in the SSC meeting. The surplus discussed in the meeting was 3,800 mt to 5,800 mt. Upon finalization of this report the Chairman found an error in the allocation calculation



provided to the SSC by the team. The SSC Chairman has corrected the values to better reflect the application of the modified formula.

### E-3 King Crab FMP

The SSC received a brief report on the status of stocks for the 1981 king crab fishery in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands area.

The SSC reviewed the Draft #11 of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King Crab Fishery Management Plan dated September 22, 1981. The SSC specifically reviewed the section entitled "Determination of Optimum Yield" (Section 4.1) in light of the recent stock assessment results and the action of the Board of Fisheries. The SSC believes that the ABC approach specified for the Bristol Bay management area in the draft plan will be a source of continued contention between the Board of Fisheries and the Council. This contention results from the requirement to set the ABC equal to the maximum catch which still maintains the minimum required spawning stock. We feel that the Board's action indicate that they wish to be more conservative in their approach in establishing an ABC for this management area.

The SSC wishes to once again affirm our support of this procedure of determining ABC for the Bristol Bay management area.

The SSC further feels that this area of contention could be further resolved if the Council discussed with the Board a series of steps on how the Board is to move from ABC to OY.

The SSC has provided the Plan Development Team specific comments which we feel will help clarify the text of the plan. We would like to bring two of these comments to the attention of the Council.

1. On page 8 it is stated that the fishery will be managed to assure a continued source of crab for subsistence. The SSC has recommended that an Appendix be added to the plan which discusses the areas involved and posted food requirements. The SSC was insured that this could be added to the plan.

2. That on page 3 and 30 there is a discrepancy regarding the public meeting to be held in the State of Washington. The Council should instruct the team as to the nature of this meeting. Page 3 specifies that the Board will hold at least one annual shellfish hearing in Seattle, Washington, where page 30 specifies that representatives of the Boards and Council shall hold a public hearing in the State of Washington.

Subject to the above, the SSC recommends that the Council adopt the plan for Secretarial review.

The SSC reviewed the brief study proposal from Natural Resources Consultants entitled "A Review of the Management Process, Strategies and Procedures of the King Crab Fishery." The SSC recognizes the seriousness of the current state of the king crab resource in the Bering Sea. The SSC believes it is premature to undertake any studies at this point regarding the management process, strategies and procedures for the fishery. We recommend that the fishery be closely monitored and at the end of the season the performance of the fishery be compared by the Council with the results of the 1981 survey and resulting management strategies. After that analysis the Council may wish to initiate an appropriate study. The SSC would hope that the study would be initiated in accordance with the proposed Council system for review of research proposals.

#### E-5 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP

The SSC was presented on Wednesday a series of proposed amendments to the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish FMP which had been developed by the PMT as a result of a joint meeting on Tuesday of the SSC subcommittee, Council members, AP members and Team members. Neither the SSC subgroup nor the full SSC felt that they had been provided sufficient time to review either the proposed amendments or the scientific documentation. Additionally as of the close of our meeting we had not been provided the full written amendment package and had only received oral presentation by the team as to some of the proposals. The SSC does understand the need for action on important amendments, but is unable under the current procedure to provide even a rough scientific review of what to us seems to be rather critical issues.

In light of the above, the SSC takes the following position with regard to what we understand are the proposed amendments.

1. With regard to a proposed amendment which would address the controlling of the incidental catch of prohibited species the SSC concurs with the general direction presented in the September 22, 1981 draft. The SSC did recommend to the team that Table 1 be expanded to include data on how the reduction was to be apportioned among the three fishing areas and the wording under Section IV, Other, be changed to indicate the need to review the existing management measures in the plan which are directed toward prohibited species. Subject to the above, the SSC recommends that the prohibited species amendment be sent out for public review.

*has been  
p. 50-51*

2. With regard to the proposed sablefish EY/OY reduction, the SSC does not support sending an amendment out for public review. The SSC feels it has not been provided sufficient time to review and support or reject the values that are proposed in the amendment, nor have we had sufficient time to review the supporting documentation. The SSC noted that this amendment is based upon four individual reports, two of which we just reviewed, one of which we only have the tables for, and the fourth which was an oral presentation to the subgroup on Tuesday. Our subgroup noted that there were serious inconsistencies between the reports which were presented. Also the SSC feels that the catch data from the current Japanese longline fishery would be of assistance and that report is not currently available.

3. The SSC understands that the proposed amendments which are provided in letters from Mr. Hastings (undated), Mr. Baker (dated September 4, 1981) and Mr. McGregor (dated September 3, 1981) are also to be included in the amendment package. The SSC takes no position on these proposed amendments. We would like to point out that to our knowledge a position on most of these proposed amendments has not been taken by the team. The SSC is concerned about sending out proposed amendments for public review without some internal review for at least reasonableness.

4. The SSC did not take any position with regard to any other proposed amendments.

The SSC believes that the Council must develop a step by step procedure similar to that developed for programmatic research funds for amendment packages. Sufficient time must be provided to allow the Council staff to develop an amendment package and then for the Council's AP and SSC to review each of the proposed parts.

#### E-6 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP

The SSC reviewed the September 3, 1981 draft of Amendment #3 to the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish FMP. The SSC had extensive discussion with interested parties regarding interpretation of certain sections of the proposed amendment. These discussions dealt primarily with the salmon sections of the amendment. In order to help clarify the issues raised, the SSC recommends the following modifications be made:

1. That Table 1 be modified to separate the chinook from the total salmon PSC. A proposed modified table is provided in Attachment 2. This modification is recommended to insure adherence to the Western Alaska/Japanese Trawling Agreement. This modified table includes new footnotes. Footnote 1 specifies the percentage used in determining the number of total salmon from the agreed upon chinook levels. The Council should note that the SSC is recommending changing the percentage from 93% to 92%. The 93% was based upon the 1979 catch composition. The 92% is based upon the average of 4 years catch composition. The SSC feels this is more appropriate. This value will also need to be corrected on page 6 of the proposed amendment. Footnote 2 clarified how the salmon PSC will be applied. It should be noted that as the amendment is now written the total salmon PSC can not be exceeded but the chinook PSC has a built in 10% roll over.

In preparation of the SSC minutes, a subcommittee of the SSC has found that the roll over is not workable under a binding total PSC

for Total Salmon. The Council may wish to extend the roll over to all salmon to make the proposed amendment workable.

2. That Table 1 be modified to include the 1986 PSC for chinook and total salmon. It should be noted that a third footnote has been added to the table with regard to this addition. This recommended addition is to maintain consistency between the amendment and the agreement.
3. That a footnote be added to page 7 to the statement: "2. changes in stock condition and abundance of target groundfish species." This footnote should read: "In the annual reviews, this factor will not be applied to salmon. However, it will be included in the three-year review which is referenced to in the footnote number 3 to Table 1 on page 5." This addition will again maintain consistency between the amendment and the agreement.
4. That on page 9, that the last sentence before Section F be modified to read: "Groundfish catches during the research, where the catch is retained for commercial purposes will continue to be counted towards the nation's allocations." This is to bring this gear research procedure in line with current practice for approval of research by the NMFS and the intent of the sentence before our modification.

Additionally, it should be noted that it is the intent of the agreement between the principal parties that the roll over procedure start with the 1981 season. The Council should insure that the procedure does start with the 1981 season, regardless of when the amendment is approved.

Subject to the above, the SSC recommends that the proposed amendment be approved by the Council.

The SSC also notes that the amendment calls for clarification from the Council on the issue of a PSC policy for the domestic fishery. This current amendment package does not include a procedure for the domestic fishery.

The SSC recalls that in its report to the Council at the Homer meeting (July 21-22, 1981) the point was made that the purpose of the PSC concept is to control mortality. From this perspective, all predators have to be considered. Consequently, since the Council had instructed the PDT that Amendment #3 would not apply to the domestic fleet, the SSC recommended that different regimes be developed for the foreign and domestic fleets. However, in order for the PMT to develop the latter, the Council must specify both management objectives for the domestic fleet and PSC levels that would apply.

#### F-1 Contracts and RFP's

##### Contract 80-3

The SSC reviewed the draft final report for Contract 80-3: "Seasonal Use and Feeding Habits of Walruses in the Proposed Bristol Bay Clam Fishery Area". The context of the report was compared to the contract work tasks and found to be complete. The SSC finds the report to be well written, and very complete and recommend that the Council accept this report as fulfillment of the contract.

##### RFP 81-2

The SSC reviewed the action by the finance committee at the July Council meeting. The finance committee had recommended that this contract be held in abeyance until alternative methodologies for determining stock origins could be explored. No specific proposals were presented to the SSC. It is our understanding that other methods investigated were excessively expensive.

The SSC therefore recommends that the Council proceed with the funding of the proposal. It was noted that the schedule of work should be adjusted to take into account the delay in funding.

#### F-4 Programmatic Research Funding

The SSC reviewed the final programmatic budget request with budget narrative. It was noted that the title of one proposed project had been changed to reflect the actual activities being proposed and the amount

requested reduces from \$301,000 to \$150,000. These changes are based upon information from the proposed contractor, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Additionally, we noted that the project entitled "Economic Studies of the King Crab Fisheries" has been deleted from the list because these proposed activities are being undertaken by the Northwest and Alaska Fishery Center. The "Rapid Response, Unforeseen Data and Analysis Need" project has been increased \$20,000 to take care of the SSC concern of having sufficient funding available to undertake any identified social and economic data collection or analysis.

The SSC recommend approval of the final programmatic budget request.

The SSC reviewed the proposed system for solicitation and review of future requests for research which would require programmatic research funding. The SSC believes that the proposed process will greatly assist in the future development of programmatic research funding and recommends that the Council approve the process as one of its operational procedures.

ATTACHMENT 1

Allocation of Final OY under the Herring FMP

1981 Biomass Estimate

167,600 mt Togiak, Security Cove, Norton Sound, Good News Bay  
+ 3,200 mt Cape Romanzof (estimate)  
+ 3,600 mt Nelson Island (estimate)  
174,400 mt Total

Exploitation Rate

$$\frac{\text{Biomass 1981}}{\text{MSY}} \times .2 = \text{Exploitation Rate}$$

$$\frac{174,400}{240,930} \times .2 = .145$$

ABC

$$\text{Biomass 1981} \times \text{Exploitation Rate} = \text{ABC}$$

$$174,400 \times .145 = 25,288 \text{ mt}$$

AIC

PMT Method (Option 1)

$$\text{OY}_g (1981) \times \text{IR} \times \frac{\text{Biomass 1981}}{\text{Biomass 1980}} = \text{AIC}$$

$$1,579,230 \times 0.00125 \times \frac{174,400}{80,200} = 4,293 \text{ mt}$$

Other Method

$$\text{OY}_g (1981) \times \text{IR} = \text{AIC}$$

$$1,579,230 \times 0.00125 = 1,974 \text{ mt}$$

OY

PMT Method

25,288 mt (ABC)  
- 720 mt (Nelson Island ABC)  
-4,293 mt (AIC)  
20,275 mt (OY)



Other Method

25,288 mt (ABC)  
- 720 mt (Nelson Island ABC)  
-1,974 mt (AIC)  
22,594 mt (OY)

Allocation

PMT Method

20,275 mt (OY)  
-17,650 mt (inshore commercial fishery)  
- 100 mt (subsistence harvest)  
2,525 mt (surplus)

Other Method

22,594 mt (OY)  
-17,650 mt (inshore commercial fishery)  
- 100 mt (subsistence harvest)  
4,844 mt (surplus)

ATTACHMENT 2

TABLE 1 -- Target Reduction Schedule from 1977-80 Base Levels

Year	Metric Tons per mt groundfish		Number of Individuals per mt groundfish		
	Halibut	Chinook	Salmon <sup>2/</sup> Total Salmon <sup>1/</sup>	King Crab	Tanner Crab
<u>Base Catch Rates</u>					
1977-80	<u>3,182</u>	74,400	80,000	<u>916,804</u>	<u>16,003,329</u>
Average	1,258,102			1,258,102	1,258,102
<u>Schedule of Reduction (percent of base catch rates or absolute catch levels)</u>					
(1981)	--	--	--	--	--
(1982)	90%	55,200	60,054	95%	95%
(1983)	80%	45,500	49,457	90%	90%
(1984)	70%	to be determined <sup>3/</sup>		85%	85%
(1985)	60%	to be determined <sup>3/</sup>		80%	80%
(1986)	50%	16,250 <sup>3/</sup>	17,663 <sup>3/</sup>	75%	75%

1/ Total salmon is calculated on the assumption that 92% of incidentally-caught salmon are chinook.

2/ The total salmon will not be exceeded. Further, the chinook shall not exceed the yearly limit subject to the roll over provisions.

3/ A full and complete review of the salmon incidental catch reduction program will be conducted in 1983 to determine what the salmon incidental catch limits should be thereafter. This review will consider the status of the salmon resource, the economic and technological possibility of further incidental catch reductions, and other relevant matters. The review would also consider the economic and technological reasonableness of the goal set out above.

MINUTES  
Permit Review Committee  
September 24, 1981

The Permit Review Committee met at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 24, 1981. Jim Branson, Joe Kurtz, Ron Naab, Jim Brooks, Pat Travers, Chris Dawson, Clarence Pautzke, and Peggy McCalment attended.

The Committee considered the Japanese permit requests for vessels with violations in 1981 as described in item D-5 of the September agenda books. The two Korean vessels listed in D-5 have been found innocent of the charges and released.

The Council's posture has been to make no recommendation for approval or disapproval for cases which have been settled and fines and/or permit sanctions levied.

In December 1980, the Permit Review Committee recommended denial of a 1981 permit to the RYUHO MARU NO. 38, whose case on an October 1980 seizure for mislogging was at that time unsettled. The case remains unsettled, and because the vessel also was seized in December 1979 for mislogging, the Permit Review Committee recommended that no permit be granted until the October 1980 case is settled.

For the four vessels whose cases remain unresolved at this time (DAIRIN MARU NO. 28, YAMASAN MARU NO. 85, YURYO MARU NO. 8, and FUKUI MARU NO. 8) the Permit Review Committee suggested that the Council make no recommendation for approval or disapproval.

The Permit Review Committee recommended approval of a permit for DAIKICHI MARU NO. 38, JA-82-0494.

# North Pacific Fishery Management Council

Clement V. Tillion, Chairman  
Jim H. Branson, Executive Director

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3136DT  
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Suite 32, 333 West 4th Avenue  
Post Office Mall Building



Telephone: (907) 274-4563  
FTS 271-4064

## FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES September 23, 1981

The Finance Committee met in the Council Offices the afternoon of September 23, 1981 with 13 members and staff in attendance.

- I. The draft audit report from Price Waterhouse was reviewed, and the committee recommends acceptance and final payment of this contract upon receipt and approval of the final report by the Executive Director.
  
- II. Contracts and RFP's.
  - A. Approved for final payment Contract 80-3, "Seasonal Use and Feeding Habits of Walruses in the the Proposed Bristol Bay Clam Fishery Area" for \$17,649.40 (Total of contract was \$97,220.00).
  - B. Awarded Contract 81-5, "Determination of Stock Origins of Chinook Salmon Incidentally Caught in Foreign Trawls in the Alaska FCZ" to Fishery Research Institute with the necessary changes in contract for reporting dates due to delay of award of contract. It was also noted this is a two-year contract but will be reviewed after one year, and the second year of funding decision will be made at review time.
  - C. Approved Amendment to Contract 81-4, "Compilation and Evaluation of Data on Feeding Habits and Food Requirements of Marine Mammals in the Bering Sea" with Gordon Swartzman for \$3,100.
  - D. Reviewed Natural Resources Corporation proposal, "A Review of the Management Process, Strategies and Procedures of the King Crab Fishery." Deferred to the full Council.
  
- III. Reviewed the FY82 Programmatic Funding Request submitted to NMFS by the Council.
  
- IV. Approved the proposed Process for Identifying and Requesting Funding for needed Fisheries Research as presented, with the addition to item 2 and 4 of the Advisory Panel in the review process.

V. The FY82 Grant has a provision stating all Council travelers are to be limited to amounts provided for similar travel by Federal employees. This Council has been on actual subsistence expenses since it was chartered. (Chapter 1, Part 8 of the NOAA Travel Handbook, "Reimbursement of Actual Subsistence Expenses 1-8.2 Authorized Reimbursement within Conterminous U.S.")

A. For travel involving unusual circumstances, the statutory maximum daily rate is \$75.00.

B. Travel outside Conterminous U.S. involving unusual circumstances, the authorized statutory maximum daily rate is \$33.00 per day plus the maximum per diem allowance for that city.

When a traveler is not in a high cost area, the daily rate shall not exceed \$50.00.

VI. The Finance Committee reviewed the FY81 Administrative Grant and was informed that about \$35,000 will be returned to NOAA when the grant is closed.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
FY 1982 PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET REQUEST

SUMMARY\*

A.	Rapid Response to Unforeseen Data and Analyses Needs (Attachment 1-A)	\$100,000
B.	Analysis of Southeastern Alaska Troll Data (Attachment 1-B)	40,000
C.	Fishery Management Plan Development (Attachment 1-C)	80,000
D.	Feasibility of Using Scale Analysis to Identify Bering Sea Herring Stocks (Attachment 1-D)	60,000
E.	Tanner Crab Workshop (Attachment 1-E)	2,000
F.	High Seas Tagging of Salmon (Attachment 1-F)	60,000
G.	Analysis of Southeastern Salmon Scale Patterns (Attachment 1-G)	25,000
H.	Evaluation of Halibut Mortality in Commercial Crab Pots (Attachment 1-H)	50,000
I.	Marine Mammal Data Needs (Attachment 1-I)	60,000
J.	Halibut Limited Entry Study (Attachment 1-J)	100,000
K.	An Economic Profile of the Southeast Alaska Salmon Industry (Attachment 1-K)	10,000
L.	Trawl Logbook Program (Attachment 1-L)	<u>150,000</u>
	TOTAL REQUESTED	<u>\$737,000</u>

\* Not in priority order.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
FY 1982 PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET REQUEST

SUMMARY\*

A.	Rapid Response to Unforeseen Data and Analyses Needs (Attachment 1-A)	\$100,000
B.	Analysis of Southeastern Alaska Troll Data (Attachment 1-B)	40,000
C.	Fishery Management Plan Development (Attachment 1-C)	80,000
D.	Feasibility of Using Scale Analysis to Identify Bering Sea Herring Stocks (Attachment 1-D)	60,000
E.	Tanner Crab Workshop (Attachment 1-E)	2,000
F.	High Seas Tagging of Salmon (Attachment 1-F)	60,000
G.	Analysis of Southeastern Salmon Scale Patterns (Attachment 1-G)	25,000
H.	Evaluation of Halibut Mortality in Commercial Crab Pots (Attachment 1-H)	50,000
I.	Marine Mammal Data Needs (Attachment 1-I)	60,000
J.	Halibut Limited Entry Study (Attachment 1-J)	100,000
K.	An Economic Profile of the Southeast Alaska Salmon Industry (Attachment 1-K)	10,000
L.	Trawl Logbook Program (Attachment 1-L)	<u>150,000</u>
	TOTAL REQUESTED	<u>\$737,000</u>

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

RAPID/RESPONSE TO UNFORESEEN DATA AND ANALYSES NEEDS

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council must develop and maintain plans for the management and utilization of fisheries resources in the Fishery Conservation Zone off Alaska. Currently plans are either being developed or have already been implemented for six fisheries: troll salmon, herring, king crab, Tanner crab, Bering Sea/Aleutian groundfish, and Gulf of Alaska groundfish. Decisions required by these plans must be based on the best scientific information available. Due to unexpected changes in the resource or the fisheries, unanticipated requirements arise for new types of information. Funds requested under this program will be used to respond rapidly to these unforeseen data and analyses needs.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

Funds requested under this project will be used to respond to immediate data collection and analysis needs of the Council during the 1982 fiscal year. Work statements and budgets for individual tasks to be undertaken under this project will be developed for Council approval. Copies of individual task work statements and budgets will be forwarded to the Grant Officer for review.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

To be determined.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$100,000 requested.



NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

ANALYSIS OF SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA TROLL DATA

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has developed and must maintain a fishery management plan for the Southeast Alaska troll salmon fishery. The troll salmon fishery harvests not only local stocks, but also intercepts salmon originating in a region from southern Oregon to the Gulf of Alaska. There is a need to understand these interceptions for the forthcoming U.S./Canada salmon interception agreements and to help the rebuilding of southeast Alaskan stocks and other depressed stocks including those originating in the Columbia River. It may be possible to manage the fishery using time and area closures to control the interception rates of Alaskan, Canadian, and Oregon/Washington chinook and coho stocks. Such closures must be based on up-to-date stock distribution and harvest data. This project will analyze the most recent tag recovery data available and determine its applicability to southeast Alaska salmon management.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

The most current data (from the 1980 troll fishery) will be used to determine the feasibility of using time/area closures to control interceptions of chinook and coho stocks from different areas of origin. As a follow-up to recommendations from a previous Council research project completed in May 1981, 1980 troll landing documents, vessel registry files, micro-wire tag recoveries, and troll logbook data will be statistically analyzed to generate catch and effort information. This data will be compared to and combined with earlier data and may serve as basis for time/area closure management decisions.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

Alaska Department of Fish and Game has the fisheries data files and biometricians necessary to complete this task.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$40,000 requested.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council is responsible for the management of fishery resources in the Fishery Conservation Zone off Alaska. Currently plans are either being developed or have already been implemented for six fisheries: troll salmon, herring, king crab, tanner crab, Bering Sea/Aleutian Island groundfish, and Gulf of Alaska groundfish. Fisheries management is coordinated directly with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game which also serves as a major holder and collector of fisheries data. The objective of this project is defray travel, and clerical support, supplies and computer time for personnel in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game who help write the Council's fishery management plans and amendments and coordinate Council and State fisheries management activities.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

Personnel whose travel and clerical support covered by this contract will help in the development, writing, and subsequent revisions of the Council's fishery management plans.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. (sole source)

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$80,000 requested.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

FEASIBILITY OF USING SCALE ANALYSIS TO  
IDENTIFY BERING SEA HERRING STOCKS

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has developed a fishery management plan for the Bering Sea herring fishery. This fishery on the high seas harvests over-wintering, mixed or unknown herring stocks. This harvest of unknown severity on certain stock components may reduce some stocks to insignificant levels. This project will evaluate the feasibility of using scale analysis to provide information on the identity of herring stocks at specific locations and times. This will enable the design of management strategies to harvest individual stocks at optimal levels and to prevent overharvest of any individual stock in a directed high seas herring fishery or as incidental catch in the groundfish trawl fishery.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

Herring will be collected at several locations in western Alaska during spawning season. These samples will be weighed, measured and sexed, preferred scales will be collected, and maturity stage will be noted. Scale characteristics will be digitized and analyzed to determine their feasibility for separating stocks. The contractor will recommend to the Council the best way of utilizing scale pattern analysis in management decisions.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

RFP.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$60,000 requested.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

TANNER CRAB WORKSHOP

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has developed and must maintain a fishery management plan for Tanner crab off Alaska. Researchers at the University of Alaska, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the National Marine Fisheries Service desire a meeting which will provide a forum where existing information relative to the biology and management of the two species of Tanner crab can be discussed. Special emphasis will be placed on identifying future research needs in support of the management programs. This budget request will contribute the North Pacific Fishery Management Council's share of the joint sponsorship of this conference.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

A conference on Tanner crab will be hosted in Anchorage. It will be jointly sponsored by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, National Marine Fisheries Service, and University of Alaska. Participants will be invited from the U.S., Canada and Japan.

The conference is scheduled for Spring 1982.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

University of Alaska Sea Grant Program will be the coordinating agency.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$2,000 requested to assist in covering the cost of foreign participants.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

HIGH SEAS TAGGING OF SALMON

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council is responsible for managing the troll salmon fishery in the Fishery Conservation Zone off Southeast Alaska. The Council, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the National Marine Fisheries Service have expressed concern over the status of the chinook stocks contributing to the troll fishery. To properly evaluate management options it is necessary to have reasonable estimates of stock contributions to this mixed stock fishery. The objective of this project is to determine the origin of the major chinook stocks contributing to the Alaskan troll fishery using tagging methods.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

A repetition of previous offshore tagging studies will be conducted to verify and update stock distribution and contribution data. Approximately 1,000 chinook salmon will be tagged and released in the FCZ each year for three years. These fish will be sampled for scales and other data will be recorded. Tags recovered will be used to estimate stock contributions and interception rates for chinooks originating in various areas. The contractor will analyze these data in a manner that can be compared to other stock distribution studies.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

RFP.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$60,000 requested. Funding for 2nd and 3rd year will be sought from other agencies.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

ANALYSIS OF SOUTHEASTERN SALMON SCALE PATTERNS

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council is responsible for managing the troll salmon fishery in the Fishery Conservation Zone off Southeast Alaska. The Council, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the National Marine Fisheries Service have expressed concern over the status of the chinook stocks which contribute to this troll fishery. To properly evaluate management options it is necessary to have information on various stock contributions to this mixed stock fishery. Under a current North Pacific Fishery Management Council contract to the University of Washington, the feasibility of using scale analysis to separate stocks in the Gulf of Alaska is being evaluated. The evaluation will be completed by May 1982. Should that technique be determined as feasible on Gulf of Alaska chinook salmon this project will allow for the establishment of standard samples and other analysis of the scales collected under the project entitled, "High Seas Tagging of Salmon."

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

"Standard" samples of known origin will be compiled from coastwide scale collections relative to major stocks of chinook salmon. These "standard" samples will be used to evaluate the scales sampled under the project entitled "High Seas Tagging of Salmon" to estimate the stock contributions and interception rates for chinooks in the Southeast Alaska troll fishery. These contributors and rates will then be compared to those developed under the High Seas tagging project.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

RFP.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$25,000 requested. Funding for 2nd and 3rd year analysis will be sought from other agencies.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

EVALUATION OF HALIBUT MORTALITY IN COMMERCIAL CRAB POTS

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has management responsibilities for the king and Tanner crab fisheries in the Fishery Conservation Zone of Alaska. Also, a goal of the Council's Groundfish plans is to rebuild the halibut stocks. Incidental catch of halibut in commercial crab pots is known to occur, but there is limited information on the magnitude of the catch. This project will provide data on the incidental take of halibut by commercial crab pots.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

An observer program will be developed based on optimal sampling of the king and Tanner crab fleets. Data will be collected on the incidence of capture and mortality of halibut in commercial crab pots. The data collected will be summarized and analyzed to give interception rates for the entire crab fleet by area and by crab species using harvest ticket and observer data. The estimated interception rate will be used to evaluate the magnitude of the incidental catch and the potential costs and savings regarding possible regulations to reduce it.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

Alaska Department of Fish and Game has the expertise and equipment necessary to perform this project.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

Two-year duration; \$50,000 requested (an additional \$50,000 is being requested from the International Pacific Halibut Commission).

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

MARINE MAMMAL DATA NEEDS

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council manages the groundfish fisheries in the Fishery Conservation Zone off Alaska. These foreign and domestic fisheries have great potential to directly or indirectly affect marine mammal populations. A study currently funded by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game will summarize all available information on marine mammal populations in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands areas with special emphasis on the use of such data in ecosystems models. The study also will specify critical data gaps. This project will allow the Council to respond to the needs to provide support analysis of identified collections and other data gathering activities which the Council determines are necessary to provide data to the ecosystems models for the Bering Sea.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

Detailed work statements in priority order are to be developed by the contractor under the current Council contract. These work statements and priorities will be reviewed by the Council. Those recommended for support will be forwarded to the Grants Officer for review before contracts are negotiated.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

RFP.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$60,000 requested.



NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

HALIBUT LIMITED ENTRY STUDY

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has considered the issue of a limited entry scheme in the halibut fishery for several years. The need for some action is apparent from the rapid growth in the fishing fleet since 1975. The amount of effort expended in the fishery results in extremely short open seasons, with attendant economic and biological problems.

A Council workgroup has recommended a program to mitigate the problems mentioned above. Before deciding upon this approach to halibut limited entry or some other limited entry program, the Council needs to evaluate the long-term costs and benefits to the user groups and the resource of implementing such a program.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

The long-term costs and benefits of several alternative limited entry programs will be evaluated. The results of this study will allow the North Pacific Fishery Management Council to make an informal decision on the implementation of a limited entry program. Successful implementation of a limited entry program would allow greater overall returns to the fishery than the present unregulated situation.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

RFP.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$100,000 requested.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

AN ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE SOUTHEAST ALASKA SALMON INDUSTRY

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has developed and must maintain a fishery management plan for the Southeast Alaska troll salmon fishery. The development of regulations each year requires in part a Regulatory Impact Analysis whenever significant economic or socioeconomic dislocations are associated with a federal action. These analyses require substantial information concerning the human environment associated with a particular fishery and that fishery's likely response to a proposed federal regulatory change. Such data are critically needed and this project provides one approach to satisfying this need.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

This project will develop and analyze the data necessary to describe the harvesting and processing sectors of the Southeast Alaska salmon industry, the communities involved, costs and earnings of the major participants, dependence on salmon fishing or processing by area and community, and the structure of the processing industry in Southeast Alaska. The study will also document employment patterns for the harvesting and processing sectors and develop a computer model to simulate changes in Southeast Alaska communities which result from fishery management decisions.

This project is jointly being undertaken by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, the University of Alaska Sea Grant Program, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Alaska Limited Entry Commission and the National Marine Fisheries Service. The majority of the costs of this research project are covered by the respective agencies.

This project will cover some of the primary data collection and analysis.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

University of Alaska Sea Grant Program.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$10,000 requested.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET NARRATIVE  
FY 1982

TRAWL LOGBOOK PROGRAM

I. OBJECTIVE AND NEED

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council has developed and must maintain fishery management plans for the groundfish fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island areas. Although groundfish research has been conducted historically in these areas, very little information is available on the developing domestic groundfish fishery. The domestic fishery, including trawlers fishing for joint-ventures and those that fish for U.S. processors, must be monitored to obtain biological and effort data for areas not traditionally fished by foreign fishermen. These catch and effort data can be used to measure changes in relative fish stock abundance and thus provide needed management information. This project, supported by fishermen, will collect these critical data using fishermen's logbooks while providing the fishermen with a standardized record of their own groundfish catches.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

An accepted standardized logbook will be developed and distributed to the trawl fishermen. Port samplers will be hired to collect copies of the logbook and interview the vessel captains to ensure accuracy of data. The data will be analyzed and summarized by a microcomputer to provide timely in-season catch reports. At season's end, summaries will be sent to each participating vessel so the fishermen can analyze their fishing performance. The logbook data will be analyzed and made available to the Council for their use in developing management strategies. Unaggregated data will remain confidential.

III. POSSIBLE CONTRACTOR

Alaska Department of Fish and Game has the expertise and facilities to efficiently perform this project. They have made a commitment to fund and continue this program after this first year.

IV. PROJECT DURATION AND BUDGET

One year; \$150,000 requested.

PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING AND REQUESTING FUNDING  
FOR NEEDED FISHERIES RESEARCH

In July the North Pacific Fishery Management Council's Finance Committee identified a need to establish a common format for proposals submitted for Council programmatic research funding. There is also a need to systematically capture research ideas on paper as they arise from those people working closely with Alaska's fisheries and the management plans.

The process proposed has seven basic steps leading from the initial identification of research needs to the final submission of a package of research proposals to NMFS for funding:

1. Identification of Research Needs. This is up to those working most closely with the fisheries, such as PDT or PMT members, agency and industry scientists, SSC members, etc. An initial step would be for each of the Council staff's plan coordinators to carefully examine each FMP with the appropriate PMT/PDT for research needs. These needs and others as they are identified would be submitted to the Council in a common format suggested in attachment 1, "Description of Research Proposals". This will be a continuous process proceeding throughout the year.
2. Preliminary Screening by SSC. The research proposals will be screened on an individual basis by the SSC. This could be scheduled for any SSC meeting, though it would be desirable to have this stage of the process completed by March to allow for adequate agency review.
3. Agency Review. Proposals approved by the SSC will be sent to NMFS, ADF&G and other affected agencies for review. The review would be designed to identify alternative funding sources, any ongoing or anticipated programs that may duplicate the proposed research, and solicit suggestions on the proposal.
4. Final Review by SSC. In April of each year the SSC will review all proposals processed to date for which no alternate funding has been found and recommend priorities to the Council. Any revisions would be done in the next 30 days.
5. Review by Finance Committee. In May or June the Finance Committee could review and recommend the final prioritized research proposals to the Council.
6. Review by Council. The package of research proposals and recommendations by the Finance Committee would be reviewed and approved by the full Council in May or June.
7. Submission to NMFS. The prioritized proposals would be summarized using the format in attachment 2 and submitted to NMFS by mid-July for next fiscal year's funds.

The above process should identify and handle most research and information needs. Each year the Council will request funds for rapid responses to unforeseen needs that, if granted, should take care of most emergency requirements. If not, the above steps can be accelerated to request funding for specific projects.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANGEMENT COUNCIL

Description of Research Needs

The format below is to be used for the identification of research needs to be considered for funding by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. Research supported by the Council in general must meet the following guidelines:

1. research must pertain to a Council FMP;
2. research must be short-termed (about 2 years); and
3. funding for the project cannot be obtained elsewhere.

Research needs submitted using this format will be screened by the Council's SSC, provided an agency review and reviewed and approved by the Council for final recommendation to the National Marine Fisheries Service for funding.

SHORT TITLE:

RELEVANT FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN(S):

(Identify the fishery management plan(s) which the information and analysis performed under the proposed research will apply. Research may apply to more than one plan, for example, as in a logbook data gathering program or in the development of a data analysis/retrieval system.)

OBJECTIVES AND NEED:

(Identify the exact objective of the proposed research and the expected deliverables. Provide a description of why the research is needed and what the deliverables are going to be used for.)

EXPECTED BENEFITS:

(What are the expected benefits of the research, in dollars if appropriate or in social and political terms. Benefits should be described both in the short and long-term.)

WORK TO BE PERFORMED:

(Narrative: the author's ideas on means of accomplishing the research, sources of information or background reports and, if appropriate, identification of possible contractor.)

URGENCY AND DURATION:

(How soon is information needed? Can the research be postponed until regular agency budgeting can handle funding? Is this just start-up funding? If it is, who can be expected to continue project? What is the expected duration of the project? Does it need to be done during a specific time of year?)

BUDGET ESTIMATE:

(Salaries, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, other, indirect cost charges, etc., total costs)

DATE AND ORIGINATOR OF PROPOSAL:

(Name, agency or affiliation, phone number, date of original or revised proposal)

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Programmatic Budget Narrative

FY\_\_

Short Title

- I. Objective and Need
- II. Statement of Work
- III. Possible Contractor (sole source or open bid)
- IV. Project Duration and Budget