

# North Pacific Fishery Management Council

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

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



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

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

Certified By: *Paul H. Branson*

Date: 10/7/81

## 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 Weststad be appointed as a scientific advisor 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 of 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 seas 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

We discussed the importance of the upcoming workshop on the WFF salmon model. The SSC requests that the following members be nominated by the Council to attend, at Council expense, the workshop: Bob Langman, Al Williams, Dan Rosenberg, and Steve Hayden.

E-2 Hearing WFF

The SSC received a report dated September 1981 from the Hearing WFF Reference Team on problems encountered and their recommended changes to the WFF. The SSC has agreed that application of the Alaska Individual 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 misinterpretation of how the formula is to be used. In this regard, the SSC recommends that WFF be appointed as a scientific advisor to the team and that the team work with him to resolve the problem encountered.

With regard to the specific recommendation of the team, the SSC does not recommend withdrawal of 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 soon as the proposed changes could represent a change in policy or plan objective.

The SSC did review the request for an allocation for high seas fishery and made the following determination:

That in accordance with the procedure outlined in the WFF as modified below, that there is a surplus of harvesting. Our best estimate is that the surplus ranges from 2,500 mt to 4,000 mt. The SSC would like the Council to note that as a surplus because it allows 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 hearing 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 acoustic surveys to identify hearing sea herring stocks.

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

It should be noted that the team and SSC did modify the portion of the calculation which deals with AIC. The WFF used their preferred option I from their September team report. The other procedure used simply took the production of AIC as currently used (0.00125). The WFF value for AIC as 4,200 mt where the other method provides a value of 1,200 mt. The SSC would like to point out incidental catch by the Japanese trawl fishery from 1975 to 1977 is provided in Table 6 (page 27) of the plan and only exceeds a value of 1,200 mt in one year. Additionally, that the data provided in 1978 was 1,280 mt with a catch of 2,300 mt and the data 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 past food requirements. The SSC was ensured 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 Board 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.
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 ensure 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 four 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 cannot 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. The SSC understands that the proposed amendments which are provided in Annexure 1 to the Report (dated 12/12/2011) and in Annexure 2 to the Report (dated 12/12/2011) and in Annexure 3 to the Report (dated 12/12/2011) are also to be included in the amendment package. The SSC takes no position on these proposed amendments. It would like to point out that to our knowledge a position on most of these proposed amendments has not been taken by the Council. The SSC is concerned about sending out proposed amendments for public review without some internal review for consistency.

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 amendments.

5. Having Reviewed the Proposed Amendments

The SSC reviewed the 2011 list of amendments to the Pacific Ocean/Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (POIFA). The SSC has extensive discussions with interested parties regarding implementation of certain sections of the proposed amendments. These discussions have primarily been with the Council 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 tables from the rest of Annexure 1. A proposed modified table is provided in Annexure 2. This modification is recommended to ensure consistency in the POIFA/Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement. This modified table includes new footnotes. Footnote 1 specifies the percentage used in determining the number of total salmon from the agreed upon shares. The Council should note that the SSC is recommending changing the percentage from 92% to 93%. The SSC was based upon the 1972 catch composition. The SSC feels this is more appropriate. This value will also need to be corrected on page 6 of the proposed amendments. Footnote 2 clarified how the salmon SSC will be applied. It should be noted that as the amendment is now written the total salmon SSC cannot be exceeded but the amount SSC has a further 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 catch SSC 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 1988 SSC for salmon and total salmon. It should be noted that a third footnote has been added to the table with regard to this addition. This recommendation 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 ensure 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 Fisheries 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	3,182	74,400	80,000	916,804	16,003,329
Average	1,258,102			1,258,102	1,258,102
<u>Schedule of Reduction</u> (percent of base catch rates or absolute catch levels)					
(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.