FOREIGN FISHING FEES

"...the fees imposed... shall be at least in an amount sufficient to [return the] cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act..." - Sec. 232(b) AFPA.

What are the costs?

- A. ...including, but not limited to,
 - ...fishery conservation and management
 - ...fisheries Research
 - ...administration, and
 - ...enforcement

Two ways of viewing the problem

(1)

Income out go (Costs)

\$43,058,000 \$53,431,000

RECOMMENDATION:

Outgo = sum of Regional and Center Expenditures + W.O. overhead.

...This should be designated NMFS costs

NMFS is not the only Player

MFCMA Costs:

NMFS \$53,431,000

NOAA 3,610,000

State Department 250,000

U.S.C.G. 70,842,000

TOTAL \$128,133,000

§232(b) continues --

"...During each fiscal year the same ratio as the aggregate quantity of fish harvested by Foreign Fishing Vessels ... bears to ...[Total harvest in the FCZ and Territorial waters]..."

Based on Preliminary Data

FOREIGN		DOMESTIC	
50		50	

The Bottom Line

 $$128,133,000 \times 0.50 = $64,066,000$

This would be Immutable

Now the Extras:

"Sec 10" Surcharge 5,000,000

Est. Observer Fees 14,000,000

\$83,066,000

WOW!

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

This means:

	1979	1980	1981	1982
Au. Fee/Ton	\$10.05	\$11.84	\$22.23	\$57.21
Pollock	6.16	7.70	14.00	44.00
Alaska Flounders	14.25	9.28	10.00	28.00
Pacific Whiting	6.16	6.16	6.00	27.00
Pacific Cod	12.57	14.67	27.00	100.00
Ioligo Squid	32.83	34.76	55.00	135.00

These Species Are Important

Pollock =	70% of Total Foreign Catch
Flounders =	10% of Total Foreign Catch
Pacific Whiting =	4% of Total Foreign Catch
Pacific Cod =	5% of Total Foreign Catch
Toligo =	1% of Total Foreign Catch

Who Pays What?

Japan	\$40.5 Million	61%
Korea	\$ 7.0 Million	11%
Poland	\$ 7.0 Million	11%
Spain	1 Million	2%
Mexico	1 Million	2%
Others	7.6 Million	13%

(7 Countries)

Questions

1. Which method do we use?

Budget side? (\$43,058,000)

Cost Side?

(\$53,451,000)

We Recommend It

What Happens If

"FISH AND 1. They Can't Pay?

CHPS"
POLICY

2. They Only Want The "Good" stuff?

- 3. They Export More Toyotas?
- 4. They Complain To The White House?
- 5. Fish block prices skyrocket?
- 6. Alternative Year Fishery?

We Recommend:

- 1. Prepare ANPR
- 2. Discuss ANPR with OMB, DOC and DOS
- 3. Publish ANPR in Federal Register
- 4. Bilateral Consultations ASAP with:
 - a. Japanese Representative
 - b. Korean Representative
 - c. Polish Representative
 - d. Others
- 5. Hold public hearing

! EQUALLY IMPORTANT!

How Do We Collect It?

We See Three Possible Options

- Continue Present System (Except No Fixed Percentages)
- 2. Pro Rate and Collect From Countries (on Tonnage Basis)
- 3. Phase in Effort-Based System (in conjunction with 1 more year of Present System)

OPTION 1

PRO PRESENT SYSTEM CON

...Familiar

... Easily Understood

...Flexible

...Gives Foreigners Choices Among Species ...Probably Illegal

...Encourages Under Reporting

...May Leave
Some Highly
Predaceous Species
on the Shelf

... May Distort Biomass

...Endless Debates Regarding The Value of Fish

OPTION II

PRO

COUNTRY FEE

- ... Easy to Administer
- ...Encourage Full Biomass Utilization
- ...Reduce or Minimize
 Under-Reporting
 Inducement

CON

- ...not authorized
 in MFCMA
 ..would require
 Foreign Cooperation
- ...Some Countries could not participate
- ...Allocations may not be "Fair"

OPTION III

PRO EFFORT PLAN

 ∞N

...Legally most
Desirable Option

...Encourage Efficiency

...Lead to Biomass Management

... Easy to Administer

...Encourage Full Utilization

...Minimize under-reporting

...New idea
(Difficult to
Communicate)

...May Lead to
Carelessness
(More, not less,
Incidental catch)

...May Favor Big Boats

...Require new
Allocation Procedures

We Recommend

- ...Early Consultations with DOC-OMB-DOS and (Like Tommorrow)
 Congress
- ... Publish ANPR (Recognizing possible Delay Beyond January 1, 1982)
- ... ANPR to contain
- 1. Price List for Species (Effort)
- 2. Hint that Option III might be possible alternative