

8/14/85

Gulf of Alaska TAC Concept

EXAMPLE: Determination of TAC for cod.

Source

PT ABC<sub>cod</sub> = 500,000 mt  
PT TAC<sub>sablefish</sub> = 10,000 mt  
PT Expected bycatch rate = 1% (based on foreign, JV,  
survey)  
Council Acceptable bycatch level<sub>sablefish</sub> = 2,000 mt

$$\text{Target Quota}_{\text{cod}} = \frac{2,000}{.01} = 200,000 \text{ mt}_{\text{cod}}$$

---

To rebuild cod population 400,000 mt

To protect sablefish 200,000 mt = TQ<sub>cod</sub>

We would select the TQ<sub>cod</sub> at 200,000 mt since it is the most constraining and by doing so meet both objectives.

---

$$\text{TAC}_{\text{cod}} = \text{TQ}_{\text{cod}} + \text{Incidental Catch}_{\text{cod in other fisheries}} + [\text{Reserve}]$$

Reserve = ? amount of cod that can be released to either

TQ<sub>cod</sub> or IC<sub>cod</sub> as needed.

TAC<sub>cod</sub> + TAC<sub>sablefish</sub> + TAC<sub>pollock</sub> + TAC . . . = Gulf of Alaska OY for a given year.

GULF OF ALASKA GROUND FISH PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals, objectives and issues for the revision of the Gulf of Alaska FMP.

A. Introductory Overview

We have started the process of rewriting the Gulf of Alaska Groundfish Fishery Management Plan. The Plan Team now needs your direction on a number of issues before they can continue the process. In the process of responding to those issues you will be developing specific objectives and goals that must be compatible with the Act and the Comprehensive Goals adopted by the Council last year.

It would probably be useful to once more go over the definitions, in a fisheries context, of the words that we'll be using for the next three days. Semantics seem to be one of the greatest hurdles we have to leap in this game.

GOALS - a declaration of end, purpose or intent. They are subordinate to and supportive of the National Standards and other provisions of the Magnuson Act. Not all goals are necessarily compatible nor can they necessarily be fully attained. They are directions and policy statements that the Council intends to follow and work toward.

The Council adopted comprehensive goals for fishery management off Alaska last year. For your reference they are in Item D under this tab. There are nine of them and the goals you derive for the Gulf groundfish plan should be compatible with all or most of them.

OBJECTIVES - are a detailed, precise statement of purpose sufficiently detailed so as to be measurable. An objective must include at least two of the following elements: a time limit (when it must be accomplished); standard of performance (percentage, amount or dollars); or a criterion of measurement (test, questions, opinion or observation). An objective is subordinate to a goal and narrow in scope. It more specifically provides an attainable, quantifiable and verifiable aim toward which concerted effort is directed.

STRATEGY - a general statement of the approach and/or methods through which problems are to be resolved and objectives achieved.

The Council started developing goals and objectives for the Gulf groundfish plan last winter when they established a workgroup. The workgroup has met three times and has developed 11 goals (Item B) for Council consideration. You will see those and hear about them when Sara Hemphill reports as Chairman of that workgroup.

Our experience in staff and subcommittee meetings on goals is that it is very difficult to start with a blank sheet of paper and draft clearly defined goals and measurable objectives. There is a great tendency to (1) become hopelessly enmeshed in whether something is an objective, a strategy or a measure, and (2) to have so much disagreement on acceptable specific objectives that specificity is traded off for a more comfortable general goal worded so that it means everything to everybody.

The Plan Team has thoroughly studied the existing FMP and developed a series of issue statements (Item C) that, if answered by you, will give them the necessary direction to redraft the plan. In order to stimulate discussion we have attempted to develop some of the questions that we feel should be answered under each of the issues and suggested as examples only some specific measurable objectives under each issue.

We are unsure as to how to structure this discussion, but suggest that the Council settle on a definite program and recognize that it will be difficult to stay on development of goals without straying into objectives and from there to strategies or vice versa. Different arrangements are possible and we can add more discussion questions and suggest more measurable objectives for each issue if needed. The materials that we have prepared are intended only to initiate and stimulate discussion.

I suggest we start with discussion of ISSUE 1 and try to work through each one using the workgroup material, the Comprehensive Goals, and your own knowledge and experience to respond to the questions asked by the Team in each issues worksheet.

I believe it's necessary to point out that there is only limited mention of restricting access or privatizing the resource. While that may sound like an issue, it is probably best to look on it as a strategy to obtain objectives and hence work toward Council-established goals. We think it's evident, however, that attainment of the goals and objectives in at least the socioeconomic/allocative areas will be difficult or impossible without developing some form of ownership or proprietary rights in the resource by individual entities.

Item E in your notebooks is a schedule proposed for processing the goals and objectives into the FMP. In essence, the goals and objectives would be processed on our regular annual management cycle and would be implemented in the plan in late 1986 for the 1987 fishery. There is not much profit in going over the schedule in detail right now; we need first to see just what is going to come out of this meeting.

GOAL/OBJECTIVE

GOAL 1. MINIMIZE THE UNCERTAINTY THAT THE EXISTING MANAGEMENT PROCESS INFLICTS ON THE INDUSTRY.

Strategies:

- (a) Lengthen time frame for application of management schemes from one year to five years.
- (b) Give direction to the plan team to provide appropriate information and explain underlying assumptions.
- (c) Ensure that the public has the opportunity to fully participate in the decision process.

GOAL 2. MAXIMIZE THE SOCIOECONOMIC RETURNS FROM THE GULF OF ALASKA GROUND FISH COMPLEX, AS A WHOLE, RATHER THAN FOCUSING ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC RETURN FROM INDIVIDUAL SPECIES.

Strategies:

- (a) Set an overall OY for the GOA.
- (b) Consider total removals when establishing TACs for individual species such as pollock, sablefish and Pacific cod; and, for complexes such as: flatfish, shelf rockfish, slope rockfish and others.

GOAL 3. ENSURE FLEXIBILITY AND MAINTENANCE OF OPTIONS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR TO MAXIMIZE OPPORTUNITIES AND ADVANTAGES TO THE U.S. COMPONENTS OF THE INDUSTRY WHILE PROTECTING THE VIABILITY OF THE RESOURCE.

Strategies:

- (a) For stocks not in need of rebuilding, determine biological limits for each species or complex that range from the equilibrium yield (EY), which maintains the stocks at the same abundance as in 1985, to a maximum yield that would reduce the biomass to some minimum threshold level. Biologists will identify the EY and minimum biomass that ensures the stocks will not be overfished and state all assumptions underlying the derivation. This minimum biomass will not include a component to allow any regrowth.
- (b) Determination of a particular harvest level within this biological range will be based on consideration of relevant social and economic factors to provide maximum benefit.
- (c) U.S. industry will be surveyed to determine its expectations and plans for the immediate future and historical bycatch needs will be determined.
- (d) If resources are insufficient to meet both target and bycatch expectations/requirements, then evaluation of the alternatives will be made by the economists and biologists.
- (e) These alternatives will be considered in light of public input/testimony and social consideration to arrive at the allocation of resources between user groups. Allocations among respective fisheries will be based on their relative values both long and short term.

GOAL 4. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN FISHERIES AND WASTAGE OF RESOURCES WHILE MAXIMIZING BENEFIT TO THE U.S. (WHEN THERE IS NOT ENOUGH RESOURCE TO MEET DEMANDS OF EXISTING USERS).

Strategies:

- (a) Manage to avoid conflict between fisheries.
- (b) Where conflict is inevitable industry will be required to develop techniques and take measures to maintain bycatch and wastage at an acceptable level.
- (c) Where acceptable levels cannot be maintained the Council will set bycatch limits and standards to minimize wastage and conflicts between fisheries.
- (d) Such decisions will be based on relative (short and long term) socioeconomic benefits to the industry and the U.S. from the competing fisheries. For example:
  - (1) Over next five years U.S. trawl fishery will achieve bycatch levels not to exceed those currently accomplished by the existing foreign fleets.
  - (2) Bycatch level for \_\_\_\_\_ will not exceed \_\_\_\_\_% of bycatch species OY.
  - (3) Halibut, sablefish and Pacific cod will eventually be longline species only. Trawl gear can be used to target other species with a set bycatch level of longline species.

GOAL 5. CONCERNING REBUILDING AND PROTECTION OF STOCKS, MAINTAIN MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY AND OPTIONS BIOLOGICALLY AND COMMERCIALY BOTH SHORT AND LONG TERM.

Objective: Rebuild a depleted stock if future benefits outweigh costs of rebuilding.

Strategy: Depending on relative value of depleted species, set rate of rebuilding by adjusting the bycatch and directed fishing accordingly.

GOAL 6. MAXIMIZE AND DISTRIBUTE THE BENEFITS OF RESOURCE USE TO ENSURE THAT RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR HARVESTING "MAKE THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES."

Management decisions will require balancing considerations within and between subgoals A and B below.

Subgoals:

- (a) Groundfish resources will be managed to: (1) maximize the benefits the nation receives from the use of all, not each individual, species by requiring that the resources are allocated to those who can make the most valuable use of them and that whoever uses the resources does so in the most beneficial way; (2) ensure that a stable environment is created to facilitate orderly operation of the fishery; and (3) avoid the use of management measures that adversely affect the operating efficiency of the fishing industry and reduce its competitiveness in domestic and world markets.
- (b) Consider the costs of disrupting traditional or inhibiting other desirable fisheries by providing relative but not absolute preferred access to the resources.

GOAL 7. THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL WILL DEVELOP MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE GROUND FISH RESOURCES OF THE GULF OF ALASKA WHICH PROVIDE PRIORITY HARVEST OPPORTUNITIES TO FULLY DOMESTIC FISHERY OPERATIONS (U.S. HARVESTING, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING). THESE STRATEGIES WILL INCLUDE (BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO):

- SELECTIVE TIME AND AREA CLOSURES
- SELECTIVE GEAR RESTRICTIONS

GOAL 8. TO THE EXTENT THAT DOMESTIC CAPABILITIES AND MARKET CONDITIONS PERMIT, THE NPFMC INTENDS THAT GULF OF ALASKA GROUND FISH RESOURCES WILL BE FULLY UTILIZED BY FULLY DOMESTIC FISHERY OPERATIONS (U.S. HARVESTING, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING) BY THE YEAR 19\_\_.

GOAL 9. THE NPFMC WILL MANAGE GULF OF ALASKA SABLEFISH, COD AND HALIBUT RESOURCES TO PROMOTE THE ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY OF ADJACENT MARITIME COMMUNITIES THROUGH PRIORITY ALLOCATIONS TO LONGLINE HARVESTERS SUPPLYING PROCESSORS IN THOSE ADJACENT COMMUNITIES; BUT WITH ALLOCATIONS FROM THOSE RESOURCES ADEQUATE TO PERMIT MINIMUM PRACTICABLE BYCATCH ALLOWANCES TO OTHER APPROVED GULF OF ALASKA FISHERIES.

GOAL 10. THE NPFMC WILL SEEK TO DEVELOP EFFORT CONTROL MEASURES FOR FISHERIES OF THE GULF OF ALASKA WHICH ENHANCE FISHERMEN OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM THOSE FISHERIES, AND WHICH EXTEND HARVEST SEASONS FOR BENEFIT TO THE FISHING INDUSTRY AND THE CONSUMER.

GOAL 11. HARVEST LEVELS WILL BE SET BASED ON AN INITIAL DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE EQUILIBRIUM YIELD AND ADJUSTED UP OR DOWN BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE SUSTAINABLE YIELDS THAT CAN BE TAKEN FROM THE CURRENT EXPECTED BIOMASS AND A CONSIDERATION OF RELEVANT SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS, INCLUDING REBUILDING WITH THE INTENT TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM BENEFITS TO THE FISHING INDUSTRY.



ISSUES FOR REVISION OF GULF OF ALASKA FMP

- ISSUE 1: MANAGEMENT OF DEPRESSED STOCKS
- ISSUE 2: DECLINING STOCK MANAGEMENT
- ISSUE 3: BYCATCH OF SPECIES NOT MANAGED BY GOA GROUND FISH FMP
- ISSUE 4: BYCATCH OF SPECIES MANAGED WITHIN THE PLAN
- ISSUE 5: ALLOCATIONS BY GEAR GROUPS
- ISSUE 6: GEAR CONFLICTS
- ISSUE 7: PROTECTING ALASKAN MARITIME COMMUNITIES
- ISSUE 8: EFFICIENT DATA COLLECTION FROM U.S. FISHERY
- ISSUE 9: RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT WHILE MINIMIZING CHANGES IN REGULATIONS
- ISSUE 10: SETTING SEASONS

ISSUE 1: MANAGEMENT OF DEPRESSED STOCKS

General Overview: Sablefish, rockfish, Pacific ocean perch, and Atka mackerel are well below MSY levels in the Gulf of Alaska. The Council has set the OY for all those species below equilibrium yield (EY) to start rebuilding them but they have not set rebuilding schedules nor identified the level they want to attain. A rebuilding schedule should be included in the plan through formal amendment and should include checkpoints for progress. It's probably impossible to framework a rebuilding schedule.

Discussion Questions:

1. When should we consider rebuilding stocks, i.e. when is a stock defined as depressed?
2. What factors determine the rate of rebuilding? At what cost to existing fisheries?
3. What level do we rebuild to? When do we stop?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Rebuild sablefish populations to 1970 levels by 1995.
2. Maintain Pacific ocean perch populations at or below 1984 levels permitting a directed fishery at current OY less needed incidental catch in existing trawl and longline fisheries.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 5, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 2, 4
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 4
Committee Recommendations:	2, 5, 6

## ISSUE 2: DECLINING STOCK MANAGEMENT

General Overview: All stocks probably fluctuate naturally, some much more radically than others because of differences in age structure, fecundity, and other factors. Populations on a declining curve may have harvestable surpluses, but EYs are less than zero since zero fishing will not stop that decline. An example in the Gulf of Alaska is Alaska pollock which will decrease in 1986 whether or not they are fished, i.e., equilibrium yield is less than zero. The Council has in this case usually set OY at some amount that recognizes natural mortality will take the fish if fishermen don't, but that does not threaten to push the population below a safe level. They have not developed standards or guidelines for doing so and those would be very useful if they were included as part of the plan. It may be possible to framework such determinations by establishing a base level [minimum acceptable biomass (MAB)] with an exploitation rate based on the lifespan of the species.

Discussion Questions:

1. How do we determine if a stock is just at a low part of its natural abundance cycle as opposed to being depressed?
2. How conservatively shall we manage when stocks are at low points in their natural cycles?
3. Should catches from a declining stock be spread over a number of years or pulse fished and then left unfished until abundance increases again?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Set OY ranges for Alaska pollock when the population is declining to harvest the difference between minimum acceptable biomass and actual biomass on a five-year schedule.
2. Allow for exploitation of pollock to 30% below MSY biomass on declining stocks.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 2, 4
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 2, 4
Committee Recommendations:	5, 11

## ISSUE 3: BYCATCH OF SPECIES NOT MANAGED BY GOA GROUND FISH FMP

General Overview: Some of the thorniest problems confronting groundfish management in the Gulf of Alaska involve species that are not controlled by the groundfish FMP - halibut, salmon, king and Tanner crab. The Council has resolved those problems in the past by setting catch rates, usually based on the amount of groundfish being caught or expected to be caught, for those other species. In doing so they have imposed costs on developing groundfish fisheries and on existing fisheries for salmon, crab, etc. Formal amendment of the plan should establish a policy and set catch rates of incidental species as well as specifying retention or non-retention (prohibited species) of bycatch. If the Council decides that some particular portion of a bycatch species, i.e., crab or halibut, can be dedicated to bycatch it may be necessary to amend the management plans for crab or work out a formal arrangement with the Halibut Commission to provide for that kind of allocation.

Discussion Questions:

1. To what extent should we account for total removal not only by groundfish fisheries but by all fisheries?
2. How do we set PSCs for halibut, salmon and crab?
  - a. Is there a limit to the cost we're willing to impose on the groundfish fisheries to protect species outside the plan and, if so, what do we need to know to answer that question now or in the future? Does it depend on biological status of the PSC stock or more on development needs of the groundfish fishery?
  - b. As an example, in the Kodiak area crab stocks are depressed. Do we constrain the flounder fishery to protect the crab stocks and should we continue to constrain the flounder fishery when the crab stocks are in higher abundance?
3. How do we approach minimizing waste in the fishery? Allow sale of PSC species?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Hold the bycatch of halibut in other groundfish fisheries at a level no higher than the percentage of the halibut OY taken in those fisheries in 1985.
2. Maintain the incidental catch of halibut per ton of groundfish caught at 1985 levels.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2, 5, 6, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 2, 4, 5, 6
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 2, 3, 4
Committee Recommendations:	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7

## ISSUE 4: BYCATCH OF SPECIES MANAGED WITHIN THE PLAN

General Overview: Species within the groundfish complex are caught by different forms of gear and different groups of fishermen. Sablefish are a directed fishery for longliners and an incidental fishery for trawlers. Possibilities for similar division of other species also exist. The Council has resolved this issue in the sablefish fishery by allocation between gear types and has clearly indicated they will do the same for rockfish in some areas if required. Formal amendment of the plan is needed to include such provisions and it is unlikely that they can be frameworked.

Discussion Questions:

1. When the harvest limit is reached for species that have not been allocated to specific gear types (all species except sablefish), should the entire groundfish fishery be closed down or a PSC used?
2. How do we determine what percentage of the optimum yield should be allocated for bycatch purposes?
3. If we use the PSC approach how do we minimize the wastage?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Divide the sablefish OY, 80% to longliners and 20% to trawlers.
2. To promote rebuilding of Pacific ocean perch at the fastest possible level, hold the bycatch of that species to 5% of the POP EY in the trawl fishery, 5% in the longline fishery.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2, 3, 5
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 2, 4, 5, 6
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 2, 3, 4
Committee Recommendations:	1, 2, 4, 6, 7

## ISSUE 5: ALLOCATIONS BY GEAR GROUPS

General Overview: Gear conflicts and overcapitalization either are or are anticipated to be major problems in the Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries. These problems were part of the rationale for Amendment 14 of the Gulf plan: the amendment allocating the sablefish resource to trawlers and longliners and phased out pot fishing. The Council hoped to reduce gear conflicts but recognized that the measure does not address the problem of excess effort. When allocating resources between groups, the Council must identify the criteria used in the process. The Council should make provisions for new gear types in a fishery that allow innovation even though some disruption of other fisheries or resources can be expected. Gillnets for sablefish or Pacific cod are an example.

It is anticipated that any action the Council takes regarding this issue will require a plan amendment.

Discussion Questions:

1. How much should developing fisheries be constrained to protect traditional fisheries?
2. What is meant by "traditional" and "developing" fisheries and which has priority?
3. Should certain species in addition to sablefish be reserved as target fisheries for a specific gear group? Is the only alternative an open, competitive fishery for all gear types?
4. Should technological advances be maximized in the fisheries at the expense of longer seasons and employment?
5. If species are allocated by gear type, what happens when bycatch quotas in the non-directed fisheries are caught? Is the Council willing to close down that directed fishery? For example, in the Council's allocation scheme for Central Gulf sablefish, after pots are phased out, 20% of OY will be for bycatch by trawlers. When trawlers have taken the bycatch, 612 mt at current OY, will the Council and NMFS be willing to close down trawling in the Central Gulf even though there may be more than 100,000 mt of trawl species still unharvested?
6. What criteria should be used to allocate between users: Gear types? Vessel size? History of use? Lack of alternative employment? Others?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Maintain the current catch percentages for each gear group on a species-by-species basis.
2. Allocate to gear types that generate the highest economic profit.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 2, 3, 4
Committee Recommendations:	1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10

## ISSUE 6: GEAR CONFLICTS

General Overview: The Council has resolved gear conflicts in the past with time and area restrictions, examples are the prohibitions on foreign trawling in the three Kodiak Halibut Areas, the Kodiak Gear Area, inside 12 miles, and east of 147°W. The pot/longline sablefish conflict this past year is a prime example of problems that may arise in our own industry. Resolution of gear conflicts will probably always require a formal plan amendment. NMFS disapproved that part of Amendment 8 (November 1980) granting field order authority to the Regional Director to resolve gear conflicts.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does the Council want to specify legal gear types such as longline and trawls and prohibit all other gear types except on an experimental basis?
2. Should gear types be separated using season and area restrictions?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Seek to minimize the potential for gear conflicts by
  - a. allowing only hook and longline and trawls as legal gears;
  - b. setting aside gear-specific sanctuaries; and
  - c. using time/area restrictions to separate gear types.
2. Seek to minimize the potential for gear conflicts by encouraging voluntary arrangements between gear groups.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	5
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	6, 7
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	2
Committee Recommendations:	4, 7

## ISSUE 7: PROTECTING ALASKAN MARITIME COMMUNITIES

General Overview: Fishermen in the Gulf of Alaska are divided into two reasonably distinct geographic areas: those from the Alaskan coastal communities and those from the Pacific Northwest. The State of Alaska is interested in protecting and enhancing the economic health of its smaller coastal communities. Doing so may create costs for fishermen from the Pacific Northwest. The Council must balance the needs and requirements of all groups while ensuring that management measures adhere to national standards and executive orders.

Part of the rationale used by the Council for Amendment 14 was the negative impact on shoreside processors caused by increased pot fishing for sablefish. In this, and other actions which protect Alaskan coastal communities the relative lack of alternative employment in the communities weighs heavily. In any case, the criteria the Council uses in allocating between these two groups must be clearly established and abide by all relevant laws.

It is anticipated that any action taken by the Council in this area will require a plan amendment.

### Discussion Questions:

1. Should the Council enhance the economic viability of Alaskan maritime communities?
2. How is the degree of enhancement measured?
3. Should shoreside processors be protected? If so, how: through time/area closures of foreign processors? Through direct allocations? Through closures to domestic factory trawlers?

### Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Within limits of the law, allow for a certain percentage of area quotas to be harvested by residents of that area.
2. Give time/area preference to local communities' fleets and processors for groundfish resources.

### Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	2, 3, 6, 7
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	1, 2, 3, 4
Committee Recommendations:	4, 9, 10



## ISSUE 8: EFFICIENT DATA COLLECTION FROM U.S. FISHERY

General Overview: The Council has repeatedly emphasized the need for better data on catch of target and non-target species. The need will become greater as effort increases and if allocations are made by gear type. Formal plan amendments have always been required to implement new reporting requirements. This will likely continue because OMB has a major review function in this area. Industry has voluntarily provided data, with joint venture updates and factory trawler catches being good examples. As resource shortages or prohibited species problems arise, voluntary reporting may not work very well. This is definitely not an issue that can be frameworked.

Discussion Questions:

1. What is the most efficient, effective way to gather data on bycatch of prohibited species and total removals from the groundfish complex?
2. Are voluntary measures sufficient?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Attain catch reporting for target and non-target species at the 90% complete level within 14 days of catch.
2. Achieve \_\_\_% observer coverage on domestic vessels within \_\_\_ years.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	1, 2
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 8
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	4
Committee Recommendations:	None

ISSUE 9: RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT WHILE MINIMIZING CHANGES IN REGULATIONS

General Overview: The Council has addressed this issue in both the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries. A prohibited species reduction schedule was approved in 1983 which specified foreign incidental catch rate reductions for salmon, halibut and crab. Last May the Council allocated the sablefish resource in the Gulf to three gear types with pots being phased out over the next three years. Both actions provide the industry with a known target and action parameters over time. While the sablefish decision may result in some short term instability as vessels using pot gear switch to other gear or move to other areas, planning stability through long-term regulations will help the longline and trawl fleets.

Resolution of this issue in the future will likely require formal amendment (either plan or regulatory) if changes involve different allocations. Other measures can be frameworked, particularly adjustments in OYs or seasons.

Discussion Questions:

1. What types of management problems are most amendable to long-term solutions?
2. Should proposals for new regulations be called for annually?
3. Should our annual cycle be changed to multi-year to encourage stability in regulations?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Establish a three-year management cycle.
2. Establish permanent, separate fishing areas for each gear type.
3. Prohibit all gear not specified in FMP.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	5, 6, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	9
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	None
Committee Recommendations:	1, 3

## ISSUE 10: SETTING SEASONS

General Overview: The setting of fishing seasons in the Alaskan groundfish fisheries did not present a management problem as long as enough fish were available for everyone on a year-round basis. Increasing demand and shorter seasons prompted the Council to adopt an April 1 season opening date for sablefish caught by hook and longline primarily because of weather and safety concerns. As more species become fully-utilized by the domestic fleet the Council will face additional season adjustments. The Plan Team believes these measures can be frameworked thus avoiding the lengthy amendment process. To develop such a framework, bounds on the range of management actions need to be specified with criteria to evaluate proposed changes and needed adjustments.

Discussion Questions:

1. What criteria should be used to determine how seasons should be set for the groundfish fisheries?

Criteria

- |                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| - fish availability              | - type of fishery - surimi vs. roe |
| - fish size and/or quality       | - wastage                          |
| - spawning times                 | - cost to industry                 |
| - coordination w/other fisheries | - enforcement costs and safety     |
| - abundance of bycatch species   | - market requirements              |

2. Should seasons be set to provide the best economic returns?
3. Which criteria have priority?
4. Should Council try to regulate economic efficiency or product quality, or should that be left up to industry?

Examples of Specific Measurable Objectives:

1. Set seasons without annual amendment or emergency action.
2. Keep catch within OY (e.g., salmon management).
3. Establish sablefish seasons for each gear type so that apportionments to individual gear types are not exceeded prior to Nov. 1.
4. Set sablefish seasons to reduce soft flesh by 25% in 1987.
5. Stagger seasons to make fresh product available at least 8 months/year.
6. Stagger individual gear seasons so that no gear can overfish and reduce another gear's apportionment.

Relevant Goals:

National Standards:	2(?), 4, 5, 7
Comprehensive Fishery Management Goals:	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9
Current FMP Goals and Objectives:	3, 4(?)
Committee Recommendations:	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10

8/7/85

COMPREHENSIVE FISHERY MANAGEMENT GOALS

- GOAL 1: CONSERVE AND MANAGE FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE REGION TO ASSURE LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY OF INDIGENOUS MARINE AND ANADROMOUS FISH STOCKS, MAINTENANCE OF HABITAT QUALITY AND QUANTITY, AND FULL CONSIDERATION FOR INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE ECOSYSTEM.
- GOAL 2: ENSURE THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES BENEFIT FROM OPTIMUM UTILIZATION OF THE NATION'S PUBLICLY-OWNED FISHERY RESOURCES.
- GOAL 3: PROMOTE ECONOMIC STABILITY, GROWTH AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN MARITIME COMMUNITIES.
- GOAL 4: ACHIEVE OPTIMUM UTILIZATION BY THE U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY OF FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE FISHERY CONSERVATION ZONE OFF ALASKA.
- GOAL 5: MINIMIZE THE CATCH, MORTALITY, AND WASTE OF NON-TARGET SPECIES, AND REDUCE THE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF ONE FISHERY ON ANOTHER.
- GOAL 6: SUPPORT EFFORTS BY THE U.S. INDUSTRY TO DEVELOP NEW FISHERIES FOR UNDERUTILIZED SPECIES, WHILE MINIMIZING THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON EXISTING U.S. FISHERIES.
- GOAL 7: TO THE EXTENT CONSISTENT WITH OTHER COMPREHENSIVE GOALS PROMOTE THE ECONOMIC HEALTH OF THE DOMESTIC FISHING INDUSTRY: ENCOURAGE THE PROFITABLE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERUTILIZED RESOURCES: DISCOURAGE UNNEEDED INVESTMENTS IN FISHERIES WITH EXCESS HARVESTING CAPACITY.
- GOAL 8: STRENGTHEN FISHERIES RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND ANALYSIS TO ENSURE A SOUND INFORMATION BASE FOR COUNCIL DECISIONS.
- GOAL 9: IMPROVE THE FLEXIBILITY, TIMELINESS AND EFFICIENCY OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES.

CURRENT FMP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The management plan is designed to meet the requirements of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 and its National Standards by achieving the following objectives:

1. Promote conservation while providing for the optimal yield from the Gulf of Alaska groundfish resource in terms of: providing the greatest overall benefit to the nation with particular reference to food production and recreational opportunities; avoiding irreversible or long-term adverse effects on fishery resources and the marine environment; and insuring availability of a multiplicity of options with respect to the future uses of these resources.
2. Promote, where possible, efficient use of the fishery resources but not solely for economic purposes.
3. Promote fair and equitable allocation of identified available resources in a manner such that no particular group acquires an excessive share of the privileges.
4. Base the plan on the best scientific information available.

SUBCOMMITTEE GOALS

- GOAL 1: Minimize the uncertainty that the existing management process inflicts on the industry.
- GOAL 2: Maximize the socioeconomic returns from the Gulf of Alaska groundfish complex, as a whole, rather than focusing on the socioeconomic return from individual species.
- GOAL 3: Ensure flexibility and maintenance of options throughout the year to maximize opportunities and advantages to the U.S. components of the industry while protecting the viability of the resource.
- GOAL 4: Minimize conflicts between fisheries and wastage of resources while maximizing benefit to the U.S. (when there is not enough resource to meet demands of existing users).
- GOAL 5: Concerning rebuilding and protection of stocks, maintain maximum flexibility and options biologically and commercially both short and long term.
- GOAL 6: Maximize and distribute the benefits of resource use to ensure that resources available for harvesting "make the highest possible contribution to the economic and social development of the people of the United States."
- GOAL 7: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council will develop management strategies for the groundfish resources of the Gulf of Alaska which provide priority harvest opportunities to fully domestic fishery operations (U.S. harvesting, processing, and marketing). These strategies will include (but are not limited to):
- selective time and area closures
  - selective gear restrictions.
- GOAL 8: To the extent that domestic capabilities and market conditions permit, the NPFMC intends that Gulf of Alaska groundfish resources will be fully utilized by fully domestic fishery operations (U.S. harvesting, processing, and marketing) by the year 19\_\_.
- GOAL 9. The NPFMC will manage Gulf of Alaska sablefish, cod and halibut resources to promote the economic self-sufficiency of adjacent maritime communities through priority allocations to longline harvesters supplying processors in those adjacent communities; but with allocations from those resources adequate to permit minimum practicable bycatch allowances to other approved Gulf of Alaska fisheries.
- GOAL 10. The NPFMC will seek to develop effort control measures for fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska which enhance fishermen opportunities to maximize economic benefits from those fisheries, and which extend harvest seasons for benefit to the fishing industry and the consumer.
- GOAL 11. Harvest levels will be set based on an initial determination of Average Equilibrium Yield and adjusted up or down based on an analysis of the sustainable yields that can be taken from the current expected biomass and a consideration of relevant social and economic factors, including rebuilding with the intent to provide maximum benefits to the fishing industry.

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

(Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act: Section 301a)

Any fishery management plan prepared, and any regulation promulgated to implement any such plan, pursuant to the Magnuson Act must be consistent with the following national standards for fishery conservation and management:

- (1) Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery.
- (2) Conservation and management measures shall be based upon the best scientific information available.
- (3) To the extent practicable, an individual stock of fish shall be managed as a unit throughout its range, and interrelated stocks of fish shall be managed as a unit or in close coordination.
- (4) Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states. If it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various United States fishermen, such allocation shall be (a) fair and equitable to all such fishermen; (b) reasonably calculated to promote conservation; and (c) carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.
- (5) Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, promote efficiency in the utilization of fishery resources; except that no such measures shall have economic allocation as its sole purpose.
- (6) Conservation and management measures shall take into account and allow for variations among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fishery resources, and catches.
- (7) Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, minimize costs and avoid unnecessary duplication.

DRAFT SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1985-86

August 12-14	Council Goals/Objectives Meeting
September 5-6	WG reworks objectives
September 25-27	Council approves for public review
October-November	Public review
December	Subcommittee screens public comments
January 12-16	Council initial adoption for insertion into framework plan
February-March	Socioeconomic and Environmental Analysis
March 19-21	Council review draft RIR/IRFA
April	Public review
June 22-26	Council final adoption
November	Implement in FMP