

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

News and Notes



David Benton, Chairman
Chris Oliver, Acting Executive Director

605 West 4th Avenue, Ste 306
Anchorage, AK 99501-2252
Phone (907) 271-2809
Fax (907) 271-2817

Volume 5-00

Visit our webpage at www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc

October 2000

Halibut Subsistence

At this meeting, the Council defined subsistence standards for Pacific halibut in waters off Alaska. It adopted a rural community standard for primary eligibility as defined in the Alaska National Interest Land Claims Act and used the State of Alaska BOF findings of halibut customary and traditional use (C&T) which included 116 communities. Under ANILCA, subsistence uses are identified as customary and traditional uses of fish and game by rural Alaska residents, but does not specifically define rural. The State defines a rural area as a community or area of the state in which the non-commercial, C&T use of fish or game for personal or family consumption is a principal characteristic of the economy of the community or area. The Council further included members of 118 Alaska federally recognized Tribes with a finding of C&T use of halibut who: 1) reside in or move to an urban area and will be allowed to return to their area of tribal membership to fish; and/or 2) live in an area that has become or in the future becomes urban and will be allowed to fish in any designated rural area. It added Adak due to the unique circumstances related to its resettlement. The Council has noticed that it will review its decision to include Adak at its December meeting.

Legal gear was defined as set and hand-held gear of not more than 30 hooks, including longline, handline, rod and reel, spear, jigging and hand-troll gear. It added Savoonga and Gambell to the existing coastal western Alaska communities (Area 4E) who already may retain halibut less than 32 inches under the community development quota (CDQ) fishery. Legal-sized halibut caught while commercially fishing statewide must be counted against individual fishing quotas, but not against CDQs. Sale was prohibited, but trade was limited to an annual maximum of \$400 per fisherman. Non-monetary trade was allowed with anyone. Daily limits of 20 halibut per fisherman per day were adopted for most waters, except for Area 4E and the Pribilof Islands (Area 4C) which have no limits. Cooperative agreements between Tribal, the State of Alaska, Federal government and other entities may be developed for harvest monitoring and other management issues.

The Council further requested the Alaska Board of Fisheries to recommend changes to the proposed regulations for gear, daily limits, reporting requirements, C&T designations for Tribes or rural communities, and non-rural area definitions for halibut fishing areas. Its recommendations will be forwarded to the Council by June 2001. The Board recommendations would then proceed through another regulatory amendment and public comment process. All recommendations will be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for approval and implementation. **Attachment 1** is a copy of the Council motion. Staff contact is Jane DiCosimo.

No November Meeting

The Council will not be holding a special November meeting to take actions on Steller sea lion/P.cod measures. Action on that issue will occur at the regularly scheduled December meeting in Anchorage the week of December 4-12. That meeting will likely be extended by a day or two to accommodate that additional agenda item. A specific agenda for the December meeting will be drafted in early November. After the December meeting, we will once again publish a 3-meeting outlook.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

2	Crab Fisheries, GOA Rationalization, Halibut Charter IFQ
3	AFA, Groundfish Specifications
4	Crab Rationalization, Staff Tasking, CDQ allocations, Call for nominations; AP and SSC
5	Steller Sea Lions, P.cod pot split, Meeting dates through 2002
	ATTACHMENT 1: Halibut Subsistence Motion ATTACHMENT 2: Halibut Charter IFQ Motion ATTACHMENT 3: Bering Sea Crab Survey ATTACHMENT 4: Groundfish Specifications

Halibut Charter IFQ

The Council reviewed a preliminary draft of the halibut charter IFQ analysis. The document expands on the discussion paper presented to the SSC in June 2000 and provides a restructured set of alternatives and options, an analytical design that includes a discussion of data limitations, and an outline for the economic analysis (posted on our website www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc under the heading "Halibut Issues").

The Council provided guidance on a number of items flagged by staff, and revised the alternatives accordingly. The Council also revised the timeline for initial review and final action for the February and April meetings, respectively, partly to accommodate inclusion of ADF&G Sportfish Division's corrected estimates for the Statewide Harvest Survey data. (Sportfish Division staff will be presenting the methodology of the correction process at the December meeting.) Additionally, the extended time line would allow inclusion of a supplemental economic analysis being conducted by outside sources.

A proposal by the GCCC to allocate a portion of the charter allocation or combined charter and commercial TAC to 35 Gulf coastal communities is also included as an option in the analysis. While the economic and social consequences of a community QS program will be discussed, the decision point will revolve around the amount of the allocation (1-2½ % of combined TAC). Should the Council choose to award communities with an allocation then a detailed analysis of the program would ensue as part of a trailing amendment. Due to the timing of implementation, the entire program could be implemented simultaneously perhaps as early as 2003.

A current set of the revised issues and options is provided as **Attachment 2** to this newsletter. Staff contact is Jane DiCosimo.

Crab Fisheries

The Crab Plan Team recently assembled a Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) report for king and Tanner crab stocks of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. The SAFE details the current biological and economic status of fisheries, guideline harvest levels (GHL), and background analyses used for different management decisions or changes in harvest strategies. Copies of the SAFE are available from the Council office.

A summary of the 2000 survey results is included as **Attachment 3**. Overall, the status of BSAI crab stocks is poor. Two stocks (Bering Sea C. bairdi, St. Matthew blue king crab) remain below the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) established, and one stock (C. opilio) is just above MSST. One additional stock (Pribilof Islands blue king crab) appears to be approaching MSST, so a rebuilding plan may need to be developed in the coming year. Not all the news is bad, however, as early signs of recruitment were observed for bairdi, opilio, and Bristol Bay red king crab.

The plan team also provided comments on a proposal to reduce opilio bycatch limits in trawl fisheries and prohibit trawling in areas with opilio crab. The Council requested the crab plan team to examine the 2000 bycatch of opilio crab in trawl fisheries within the C. Opilio Bycatch Limitation Zone (COBLZ) and Area 517, and consider possible boundary line changes for the COBLZ relative to previous industry negotiations on opilio bycatch management measures. Staff contact is Dave Witherell.

Gulf of Alaska Rationalization

The Council has renamed, and may reconstitute, the Gulf of Alaska Co-operative Committee as the Gulf of Alaska Rationalization Committee. Nominations for the reconstituted committee are requested by November 8, and should be directed to the Executive Director at the Council offices. *Current members will be considered for reappointment unless we are notified otherwise.*

In June 2000, the Council approved a problem statement that will guide the new committee (see the June 2000 Newsletter). At the committee's last meeting on October 5, it made the following recommendations to the Council. Staff contact is Jane DiCosimo.

1. The Council consider eliminating latent licenses in the GOA using a recency requirement as soon as possible.
2. The Council consider developing a rationalization plan for the GOA that will facilitate:
 - a. the continued participation of long time fishermen and processors;
 - b. long-term survival of coastal fishing communities.
3. Committee members will provide proposals by January 15 for review at the next committee meeting to be held at the February Council meeting. The Committee will propose a menu of options for analysis that could be selected for each regulatory area or subareas (i.e., Area 630 may be subdivided into PWS, Kodiak and Cook Inlet areas).

Council Action on the American Fisheries Act

Emergency Rule Implementing the AFA Regulations for 2001: The Council requested that NMFS move forward with the AFA emergency rule to implement measures regulating vessels and plants participating in the 2001 directed BSAI pollock fishery. The emergency rule includes provisions that were in place for the 2000 fishery as well as the following changes recently recommended by the Council:

1. Changing the definition of “qualified catcher vessel” to allow for the retirement of catcher vessels;
2. Revising the formula for calculating inshore cooperative quota to equally distribute unclaimed 1995-97 catch history among the eligible participants, instead of allocating that entire amount to the open access portion of the fishery;
3. Revising the formula for crab processing cap calculations;
4. Revising observer coverage requirements for catcher/processors and motherships; and
5. Revising in-season management for catcher/processor and catcher vessel sideboard closures and rollovers.

BSAI Pollock Processing Excessive Share Caps: The Council recommended an excessive share cap set at 30 percent of the BSAI pollock TAC, with CDQ pollock excluded from the calculation of the cap amount. The processing excessive share cap will employ the same entity definition being used by NMFS to determine harvesting excessive shares (10% limited rule linking companies). This amendment is not part of the emergency rule package, or the 2001 proposed and final rule, and will not be in place until the 2002 fishing seasons.

Groundfish Processing Sideboards: The Council recommended that action on the AFA groundfish processing sideboard analysis be postponed. A discussion of new alternatives to protect non-AFA processors was then scheduled for the February Council meeting. The new alternatives may include a proposal submitted by the Groundfish Forum that would modify the IR/IU requirements for flatfish species. Additional alternatives may also be proposed to the Council for inclusion in the analysis at the February meeting. The new alternatives will be considered along with the processing sideboard analysis presented at this meeting. All of the proposed alternatives may be considered in the context of the bycatch reduction mandates in the Sustainable Fisheries Act.

Inshore Cooperative Regulations: A proposal was presented to the Council requesting that inshore catcher vessels, with the consent of their cooperative, be allowed to lease their BSAI pollock quota to catcher vessels in another cooperative. This issue will be considered at the December meeting, along with other potential AFA adjustments. Should the Council move forward with the proposed amendment at that time, it would not be in place until at least the 2002 fishing season.

Report to Congress

The Council was scheduled to submit a report to Congress on October 1 regarding impacts of the AFA. Staff have been working on a draft report, with the intent of submitting a full report next spring, after we have a year of full AFA implementation to assess. Based on discussions at our October meeting, and recognizing the importance of compiling a comprehensive, quality report, our intent now is to continue working on this report but not submit anything to Congress until next spring. This approach will allow us to carefully consider all aspects of AFA implementation and provide the Council and public a better opportunity for input.

The staff contact for all AFA-related issues is Chris Oliver.

Groundfish Catch Specifications

The preliminary 2001 BSAI and GOA groundfish specifications were approved by the Council and made available for public review and comment. Specifications include acceptable biological catch levels, total allowable catch levels, bycatch limits and apportionments, and halibut discard mortality rates. The proposed preliminary 2001 specifications are essentially the 2000 final specifications, because no additional information on stock status is available at this time. The proposed specifications are listed in the tables included as **Attachment 4**. In November, the groundfish plan teams will review updated stock assessments and prepare the final Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) report. The agenda for the plan team meetings is posted on our website. The final SAFE report will provide scientific background information for the final 2001 specifications which will be on the Council’s December meeting agenda. Staff contact is Dave Witherell.

Crab Rationalization

At this meeting the Council received a report regarding the industry initiatives to facilitate a permit buyback program for the BSAI crab fisheries and development of co-op or IFQ alternatives for rationalizing those fisheries. Potential legislation for a buyback program is pending in Congress and may be resolved shortly. Regarding further measures, the Council voted to formalize the process by establishing a Crab Rationalization Committee, whose first task would be to review the following Draft Problem Statement and formulate specific alternatives and options for Council consideration. The timing of this process could depend somewhat on potential Congressional direction. This issue will be on the Council's December agenda for an update, but it is likely that the Committee would not meet until sometime in December or January and report to the Council at the February 2001 meeting. At that time the Council would provide further direction to the Committee and to staff. Council staff contact for this issue is Chris Oliver.

The Committee will be appointed by Chairman Benton. Nominations for Committee membership should be directed to the Chairman or Executive Director at the Council offices and are due by November 10. The Draft Problem Statement is as follows:

The crab fisheries in the BSAI are fully utilized. Despite amendments to the License Limitation Program and AFA sideboards, capacity in these crab fisheries far exceeds available resources.

The ability for crab harvesters to diversify into other fisheries has been severely curtailed under the LLP program and other management actions designed to bring stability to other gear groups and species.

Many of the concerns identified by the NPFMC in 1992 still exist for the BSAI crab fisheries, including:

1. *Resource problems*
2. *Excess harvesting capacity*
3. *Bycatch mortality and deadloss concerns*
4. *Safety*
5. *Economic stability*

As a necessary step in the continued process of comprehensive rationalization, prompt action is required to protect the crab resource and to promote stability for those dependent on the crab fisheries, which includes harvesters, processors, and coastal communities.

Staff Tasking

Council direction on staff tasking at this time was essentially limited to further development of existing and previously tasked projects. Some actions taken under staff tasking are summarized elsewhere in this newsletter, particularly those associated with the American Fisheries Act (AFA). The Council did vote to include additional alternatives, at the request of the Gulf Coastal Communities Coalition (GCCC), regarding their proposal for community purchase of halibut/sablefish IFQs. However, they did not task staff with any analysis of that proposal, or any other proposals, at this time. That proposal, along with other proposals and potential projects, will be discussed again at the December meeting.

Nominations

Due for AP and SSC

One-year terms of the Council's *Advisory Panel* (AP) and *Scientific and Statistical Committee* (SSC) expire in December. The SSC advises the Council on scientific and other technical matters relating to Council functions and the AP is composed of representatives of the major segments of the fishing industry and other interested parties, including sport fishing and environmental concerns. Members of these panels are expected to attend up to five meetings, three to five days in length, per year.

Resumes of persons who wish to be considered for any of these panels, along with a letter of interest or nomination, should be sent to NPFMC, 605 W. 4th Avenue, #306, Anchorage, AK 99501, or faxed to 907-271-2817, by close of business on Friday, November 17, 2000. Appointments will be announced at the end of the Council's meeting December 6-12 at the Hilton Hotel in Anchorage, and will become effective in January 2001. For more information, contact the Council office.

CDQ Allocations

The Council concurred with the State of Alaska's recommended 2001-2002 allocations to six CDQ groups for groundfish, prohibited species, halibut, and crab. These recommendations will now be sent to NMFS for Secretarial review. The Secretary's decision on the CDQ allocations must be published by notice in the Federal Register by January 1, 2001.

The Council also reviewed an analysis to amend the multi-species Community Development Quota (CDQ) program regulations as proposed by the State of Alaska. One proposed change would clarify that State and NMFS oversight applies to the investment decisions made by businesses owned by the CDQ group. A NOAA General Counsel (GC) legal opinion indicated that no clear interpretation emerges from a review and legal analysis of the regulatory language or the history of the development of the CDQ regulations. Therefore, NOAA GC recommended that the Council, the State, CDQ groups, NMFS, and the public review an expanded analysis of the purposes of governmental oversight of CDQ investments with a reasonable range of alternatives to achieve those purposes.

The Council requested that NMFS and ADF&G staff continue to draft recommendations for the oversight responsibilities of the State and NMFS, identifying any inconsistencies or differences of opinion that need to be resolved by the Council. The Council will then decide whether a policy committee is needed to continue review of the CDQ Program and analysis of the State's proposal. The Council will reschedule initial review for February, with final action in April 2001.

Steller Sea Lions

At the September meeting, the Council reviewed an analysis of the Pacific cod fisheries and alternatives to minimize possible competitive interactions with the endangered western population of Steller sea lions. The Council added additional alternatives to be analyzed, and recommended that additional information be examined to evaluate potential for competition. At the October meeting, the Council received a brief status report on the analysis. The Council requested that an additional option for pot limits be added to the analysis. Specifically, pot limits of 75 and 100 pots would be examined for both GOA and BSAI fisheries in nearshore areas of rookeries (3-10 nm) and haulouts (0-10 nm). The Council also requested that the analysis contain information showing where vessels deliver and process Pacific cod, and information showing vessel activities of AFA and non-AFA vessels and other sectors relative to localized removal rates of cod. Final action is scheduled for the December meeting in Anchorage.

In a related issue, the Council requested that a letter be sent to NMFS expressing the Council's support for preparation of a high quality Biological Opinion. It was the sense of the Council that while the October 31 deadline should be met if possible, a delay would be acceptable if necessary to provide a complete Biological Opinion. Lastly, the Council expressed interest in having NMFS, along with ADF&G, develop specific research objectives to evaluate any proposed management measures relative to sea lion recovery. Staff contact is Dave Witherell.

BSAI Pacific Cod Pot Gear Split

The Scientific and Statistical Committee reviewed the analysis for Amendment 68 to the BSAI FMP, which would split the current BSAI Pacific cod TAC allocated to pot gear between pot catcher/processors and catcher vessels. BSAI Amendment 64, recently implemented by final rule and effective on September 1, 2000, split the fixed gear Pacific cod allocation (51% of the TAC) among the fixed gear sectors as follows: 80% to freezer longliners; 0.3% to longline catcher vessels; 1.4% to pot or longline catcher vessels <60' LOA; and 18.3% to pot vessels. Initial review of Amendment 68 has been rescheduled for the February Council meeting, in order to allow the Council time to review and develop a new problem statement in December as recommended by the SSC. Final action is scheduled for April. Staff contact is Nicole Kimball.

Don't Forget to Check the Website

If you haven't visited before, you should check out our website at www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc. In addition to listing the Council members, we also post recent Council actions, agendas, minutes, analyses, schedules, charts and maps, TAC's, ABC's and PSC's (and an acronym listing), and this newsletter. If you are a frequent visitor and are already getting your newsletter and other agenda items from our website, you can be removed from our mailing list for these items and save the postage. Just call and let us know, or e-mail maria.shawback@noaa.gov.

Council Meeting Dates through 2002

	February Week of/ Location	April Week of/ Location	June Week of/ Location	October Week of/ Location	December Week of/ Location
2000					4/Anchorage
2001	5/Anchorage	9/Anchorage	4/Kodiak	1/Seattle	3/Anchorage
2002	4/Anchorage	8/Anchorage	3/Dutch Harbor	Sept 30/ Seattle	2/Anchorage

FINAL CORRECTED VERSION

North Pacific Fishery Management Council Action on Halibut Subsistence Issues October 7, 2000

Adopt an alternative to allow the harvest of halibut for subsistence with the following options:

Option 1: Define subsistence.

Halibut subsistence regulations are needed to allow the continued practice of long-term customary and traditional practices of fishing halibut for food for families in a non-commercial manner for non-economic consumption. Subsistence is defined as the 'non-commercial, long-term, customary and traditional use of halibut.'

Option 2: Define eligibility.

Suboption B: Persons eligible to subsistence fish for halibut are: Alaska rural residents as defined in ANILCA* and identified in the table 5.4 entitled "Alaska Rural Places in Areas with Subsistence Halibut Uses," and will also include other communities for which customary and traditional findings are developed in the future. The list specifically includes the communities of Adak, Diomedea, and Shismaref. This list of eligible rural communities can only be changed by Council action. The Council urges communities seeking eligibility to subsistence fish for halibut to pursue a 'customary and traditional' finding from the appropriate bodies before petitioning the Council.

Other persons eligible to subsistence fish for halibut are:

1. All identified members of Alaska Federally recognized native tribes in rural areas with a finding of customary and traditional use of halibut who move to or have moved to an urban area are allowed to return to their area of tribal membership and exercise their subsistence rights for halibut fishing.
2. All members of Alaska Federally recognized native tribes with a finding of customary and traditional use of halibut that live in an area that has become or in the future becomes urban shall be allowed to exercise their halibut subsistence rights anywhere in a designated rural area within the state of Alaska.

*Under federal law in ANILCA, subsistence uses are identified as customary and traditional uses of fish and game by rural Alaska residents.

Option 3: Define legal gear.

Suboptions A and B. The legal gear for subsistence halibut fishing is set and hand-held gear of not more than 30 hooks, including longline, handline, rod and reel, spear, jigging and hand-troll gear.

Suboption D. Retention of subsistence halibut less than 32" (shorts) while commercial fishing is allowed only in Regulatory Area 4E (and Savoonga and Gambell). Retention of halibut greater than 32" while commercial fishing is allowed statewide, with retentions reported and counted against an IFQ.

Option 4: Allow the customary and traditional trade of subsistence halibut.

Suboption A. Customary and traditional trade through monetary exchange shall be limited to an annual maximum of \$400. No customary and traditional trade is allowed upon the premises of commercial buying operations. Persons licensed to engage in a fisheries business may not exchange, solicit to exchange, or receive for commercial purposes, subsistence-taken halibut. No exchange of subsistence-caught halibut from a monetary exchange, trade, or barter is allowed to enter commerce at any point.

Suboption B. Customary and traditional trade through non-monetary exchange is allowed with anyone.

Option 5: Define a daily bag limit.

The daily limit for subsistence halibut in rural areas is up to 20 halibut, except there is no limit in 4C and 4E (including Savoonga and Gambell).

Option 6: Cooperative agreements with tribal, State, and Federal governments and other entities may be developed for harvest monitoring, local area planning, and other issues affecting subsistence uses of halibut.

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) requests the Alaska Board of Fisheries (Board) to recommend potential regulatory options in subsistence halibut regulations relating to:

1. Legal gear;
2. Daily limits;
3. Reporting requirements;
4. Customary and traditional use areas of tribes and rural communities; and
5. Non-rural area definitions for halibut fishing areas.

The Council requests that the Board meet on this issue during their normal 2000-2001 cycle and present its recommendations to the Council at the Council's June 2001 meeting.

Table 5.4 (Revised). Alaska Rural Places in Areas with Subsistence Halibut Uses

Sources: Alaska Department of Fish and Game; Alaska Department of Labor

Rural Place*	Organized Entity	Population (1995)	Percent Alaska Native	Number Alaska Natives	Number Non- Natives	Halibut Coastal District	Use Pattern
							1 = regular 2 = periodic 3 = undocumented
District 2C							
Angoon	Municipality	601	82.3%	495	106	2C	1
Coffman Cove	Municipality	254	6.9%	18	236	2C	1
Craig	Municipality	1,946	22.9%	446	1,500	2C	1
Edna Bay	Census Designated Place	79	0.0%	0	79	2C	1
Elfin Cove	Census Designated Place	48	1.8%	1	47	2C	1
Gustavus	Census Designated Place	328	3.9%	13	315	2C	1
Haines	Municipality	1,363	18.1%	247	1,116	2C	1
Hollis	Census Designated Place	106	2.7%	3	103	2C	1
Hoonah	Municipality	903	67.2%	607	296	2C	1
Hydaburg	Municipality	406	89.1%	362	44	2C	1
Hyder	Census Designated Place	138	1.0%	1	137	2C	1
Kake	Municipality	696	73.4%	511	185	2C	1
Kasaan	Municipality	41	53.7%	22	19	2C	1
Klawock	Municipality	759	54.3%	412	347	2C	1
Klukwan	Census Designated Place	165	86.8%	143	22	2C	1
Metlakatla	Census Designated Place	1,540	82.9%	1,277	263	2C	1
Meyers Chuck	Census Designated Place	35	10.8%	4	31	2C	1
Pelican	Municipality	209	29.3%	61	148	2C	1
Petersburg	Municipality	3,374	10.1%	341	3,033	2C	1
Point Baker	Census Designated Place	62	0.0%	0	62	2C	1
Port Alexander	Municipality	98	2.5%	2	96	2C	1
Port Protection	Census Designated Place	64	1.6%	1	63	2C	1
Saxman	Municipality	394	76.9%	303	91	2C	1
Sitka	Municipality	9,194	20.9%	1,922	7,272	2C	1
Skagway	Municipality	811	5.5%	45	766	2C	1
Tenakee Springs	Municipality	107	9.6%	10	97	2C	1
Thorne Bay	Municipality	650	1.2%	8	642	2C	1
Whale Pass	Census Designated Place	92	2.7%	2	90	2C	1
Wrangell	Municipality	2,758	20.0%	552	2,206	2C	1
<i>District 2C Communities</i>		27,221	28.7%	7,806	19,415		
District 3A							
Akhiok	Municipality	80	93.5%	75	5	3A	1
Chenega Bay	Census Designated Place	96	69.2%	66	30	3A	1
Cordova	Municipality	2,568	11.2%	288	2,280	3A	1
Karluk	Census Designated Place	58	91.5%	53	5	3A	1
Kodiak City	Municipality	13,498	10.7%	1,443	12,055	3A	1
Larsen Bay	Municipality	130	84.4%	110	20	3A	1
Nanwalek	Census Designated Place	162	91.1%	148	14	3A	1
Old Harbor	Municipality	310	88.7%	275	35	3A	1
Ouzinkie	Municipality	259	85.2%	221	38	3A	1
Port Graham	Census Designated Place	170	90.4%	154	16	3A	1
Port Lions	Municipality	233	67.6%	158	75	3A	1
Seldovia	Municipality	289	15.2%	44	245	3A	1
Tatitlek	Census Designated Place	124	86.6%	107	17	3A	1
Yakutat	Municipality	801	55.1%	441	360	3A	1
<i>District 3A Communities</i>		18,778	19.1%	3,582	15,196		
District 3B							
Chignik Bay	Municipality	141	45.2%	64	77	3B	1
Chignik Lagoon	Census Designated Place	65	56.6%	37	28	3B	1
Chignik Lake	Census Designated Place	154	91.8%	141	13	3B	1
Cold Bay	Municipality	107	5.4%	6	101	3B	1
False Pass	Municipality	73	76.5%	56	17	3B	1
Ivanof Bay	Census Designated Place	28	94.3%	26	2	3B	1
King Cove	Municipality	716	39.3%	281	435	3B	1
Nelson Lagoon	Census Designated Place	88	80.7%	71	17	3B	1
Perryville	Census Designated Place	104	94.4%	98	6	3B	1
Sand Point	Municipality	844	49.3%	416	428	3B	1
<i>District 3B Communities</i>		2,320	51.6%	1,196	1,124		
Districts 4A-D							
Adak	Census Designated Place	220	65.0%	143	77	4B	3
Akutan	Municipality	436	13.6%	59	377	4A	1
Atka	Municipality	77	92.9%	71	6	4B	1
Gambell	Municipality	628	96.2%	604	24	4D	1
Nikolski	Census Designated Place	27	82.9%	22	5	4A	1
Savoonga	Municipality	604	95.2%	575	29	4D	1
St. George	Municipality	151	94.9%	143	8	4C	1
St. Paul	Municipality	767	66.1%	507	260	4C	1
Unalaska	Municipality	4,083	8.4%	342	3,741	4A	1
<i>Districts 4A-D Communities</i>		6,993	35.3%	2,467	4,526		

Table 5.4 (Revised). Alaska Rural Places in Areas with Subsistence Halibut Uses

Sources: Alaska Department of Fish and Game; Alaska Department of Labor

Rural Place*	Organized Entity	Population (1995)	Percent Alaska Native	Number Alaska Natives	Number Non- Natives	Halibut Coastal District	Use Pattern
							1 = regular 2 = periodic 3 = undocumented
District 4E							
Chefornak	Municipality	371	97.5%	362	9	4E	1
Mekoryak	Municipality	212	99.4%	211	1	4E	1
Newtok	Census Designated Place	275	93.2%	256	19	4E	1
Nightmute	Municipality	189	95.4%	180	9	4E	1
Toksook Bay	Municipality	485	95.5%	463	22	4E	1
Tununak	Census Designated Place	354	96.2%	341	13	4E	1
Wales	Municipality	173	88.9%	154	19	4E	1
Aleknagik	Municipality	182	83.2%	151	31	4E	2
Clark's Point	Municipality	63	88.3%	56	7	4E	2
Dillingham	Municipality	2,243	55.8%	1,252	991	4E	2
Egegik	Municipality	143	70.5%	101	42	4E	2
King Salmon	Census Designated Place	539	15.5%	84	455	4E	2
Kipnuk	Census Designated Place	544	97.5%	530	14	4E	2
Kongiganak	Census Designated Place	336	97.3%	327	9	4E	2
Levelock	Census Designated Place	116	82.9%	96	20	4E	2
Manokotak	Municipality	402	95.6%	384	18	4E	2
Naknek	Census Designated Place	617	41.0%	253	364	4E	2
Nome	Municipality	3,576	52.1%	1,863	1,713	4E	2
Pilot Point	Municipality	74	84.9%	63	11	4E	2
Port Heiden	Municipality	126	72.3%	91	35	4E	2
South Naknek	Census Designated Place	146	79.4%	116	30	4E	2
Alakanuk	Municipality	604	95.8%	579	25	4E	3
Bethel	Municipality	5,195	63.9%	3,319	1,876	4E	3
Brevig Mission	Municipality	265	92.4%	245	20	4E	3
Chevak	Municipality	682	92.9%	634	48	4E	3
Council	Census Designated Place	8	62.5%	5	3	4E	3
Diomedes (Inalik)	Municipality	154	93.8%	144	10	4E	3
Eek	Municipality	283	95.7%	271	12	4E	3
Elim	Municipality	281	91.7%	258	23	4E	3
Emmonak	Municipality	762	92.1%	702	60	4E	3
Golovin	Municipality	148	92.9%	137	11	4E	3
Goodnews Bay	Municipality	253	95.9%	243	10	4E	3
Hooper Bay	Municipality	996	95.9%	955	41	4E	3
Kotlik	Municipality	543	96.9%	526	17	4E	3
Koyuk	Municipality	258	94.8%	245	13	4E	3
Kwigillingok	Census Designated Place	326	95.0%	310	16	4E	3
Napakiak	Municipality	326	94.3%	308	18	4E	3
Napaskiak	Municipality	404	94.8%	383	21	4E	3
Oscarville	Census Designated Place	42	91.2%	38	4	4E	3
Platinum	Municipality	44	92.2%	41	3	4E	3
Quinhagak	Municipality	549	93.8%	515	34	4E	3
Scammon Bay	Municipality	434	96.5%	419	15	4E	3
Shaktoolik	Municipality	199	94.4%	188	11	4E	3
Sheldon Point	Municipality	131	92.7%	121	10	4E	3
Shishmaref	Municipality	537	94.5%	507	30	4E	3
Solomon	Census Designated Place	6	100.0%	6	0	4E	3
St. Michael	Municipality	332	91.2%	303	29	4E	3
Stebbins	Municipality	475	94.8%	450	25	4E	3
Teller	Municipality	274	91.3%	250	24	4E	3
Togiak	Municipality	700	87.3%	611	89	4E	3
Tuntutuliak	Census Designated Place	340	96.7%	329	11	4E	3
Twin Hills	Census Designated Place	75	92.4%	69	6	4E	3
Ugashik	Census Designated Place	5	85.7%	4	1	4E	3
Unalakleet	Municipality	764	81.8%	625	139	4E	3
White Mountain	Municipality	209	87.8%	184	25	4E	3
<i>District 4E Communities</i>		27,770	76.9%	21,256	6,514		
Total Districts		83,082	43.7%	36,307	46,775		

* Places where subsistence (wild food harvest and use) is a principal characteristic of the community's economy and way of life, as determined by the Alaska Joint Board of Fisheries and Game

Halibut Charter IFQ Issues and Options

ISSUE 1. Initial QS may be based on:

Option 1. 12.68% in Area 2C and 14.94% in Area 3A of combined commercial and charter halibut quota

Option 2. 14.74% in Area 2C and 14.00% in Area 3A of combined commercial and charter halibut quota

Suboption 1: Use the State of Alaska's corrected numbers for the preferred option

Suboption 2: 50% of an individual's QS initial issuance would be fixed and the remaining 50% would float with abundance.

Option 3. Set-aside 1-2 ½% of combined commercial charter TAC for Gulf communities
A. Equal pounds from commercial and charter
B. Proportional amount based on split
C. 100% out of charter

Issue 2. Initial allocation of QS would be issued to U.S. citizens or to U.S. companies on the following basis:

U.S. ownership based on: a) 51% ownership; b) 75% ownership

The analysis should include a discussion regarding the criteria used for IFQ regulations as well as applicability of MARAD regulations

Option 1. Charter vessel owner - person who owns the charterboat and charterboat business

Option 2. Bare vessel lessee - person that leases a vessel and controls its use as a charterboat for this fishery. May operate the vessel or may hire a captain/skipper. Lessee determines when the vessel sails and by whom captained

Documentation will be required to verify that the charterboats controlled by owners or leasees were operated by individuals with appropriate USCG licenses.

The analysis should include an outline of criteria that could be used to determine a bare boat vessel lessee.

ISSUE 3. Qualification Criteria

Initial allocations will be based on an individual's participation and not the vessel's activity. Anyone not meeting the qualification criteria would have to purchase QS or transfer (lease) IFQs to participate in the halibut charter fishery.

- Option 1. Initial issuees who carried clients in 1998 and 1999 and who submitted ADF&G logbooks for an active vessel (as received by ADF&G by February 12, 2000)
- Option 2. Initial issuees who carried clients in 1998 or 1999 and who submitted ADF&G logbooks for an active vessel (as received by ADF&G by February 12, 2000)
- Option 3. Initial issuees who carried clients prior to June 24, 1998 and who submitted at least one ADF&G logbook for an active vessel (as received by ADF&G by February 12, 2000)
- Option 4. Initial issuees who carried clients four out of five years between 1995-1999 as evidenced by IPHC, CFEC , and ADF&G business and guide documentation for 1995-99 and submitted logbooks for an active vessel in 1998 and 1999
- Option 5. Initial issuees who carried clients four out of five years between 1995-1999 as evidenced by IPHC, CFEC and ADF&G business and guide documentation for 1995-99 and submitted logbooks for an active vessel for either 1998 or 1999

Active vessel is defined as having turned in one ADF&G logbook page with positive catch or effort. ADF&G Guide and Business registration is required of bare vessel lessees only. Neither CFEC vessel registration nor IPHC licensing would be required of bare vessel lessees.

ISSUE 4. Distribution of QS may be based on:

- Option 1. 70% of 1998 and 1999 logbook average with an additional 10% added for each year of operation 1995-97 (longevity reward). The balance could then be re-issued to the whole group of participants
- Option 2. Modified Kodiak proposal: 5-30% for A, 33% for B, 37-62% for C
 - Part A: each individual gets an equal percentage of the qualified pool as identified by the Council's final action.
 - Part B: each individual's average 98/99 logbook harvest as percentage of overall harvest is multiplied by 33% of the qualified pool.
 - Part C: one point for each year of participation during 1995-99.

Suboption: Base distribution for the preferred option on both total catch retained and caught and released

ISSUE 5. Transferability of QS (permanent) and IFQs (on annual basis [leasing])

- Option 1. Nature of Charter Quota Share:
 - 1. Leasable
 - 2. Non-leasable

Suboption: Allow grandfather provisions to initial recipients to use hired skippers similar to the halibut sablefish IFQ program

- Option 2. Transfer of QS (permanent) and/or IFQs (leasing):

- a) prohibit transfers between charter and commercial sectors
- b) allow transfers between charter and commercial sectors
 - A. 1-yr one way transfer from commercial to charter
 - B. 3-yr one way transfer from commercial to charter
 - C. two-way (between commercial and charter sectors).
 - Suboptions under Options b (1-3):
 - i. Designate QS pool into two classes for transfer from charter to commercial sector: transferable (25%) and non-transferable (75%) pools on an individual's basis.
 - ii. Cap the percentage of annual IFQ transfers (de facto leasing) between sectors not to exceed 25% of total IFQs and a range of 0-10% of IFQs per year from charter to commercial.
 - iii. on percentage of annual QS transfers between sectors not to exceed 25% of total QS and a range of between 0-10% of QS per year from charter to commercial.
 - iv. A range of 0-10% leasing of Charter IFQ to charter from charter for the first 3 years

Option 3. Block restrictions

- a) any initially issued (i.e., unblocked) charter QS once transferred to commercial sector shall be:
 - 1. blocked
 - 2. blocked up to the limits of the commercial sweep-up and block limits
- b) allow splitting of commercial blocks to transfer a smaller piece to the charter sector
- c) allow splitting of commercial blocks once transferred to the charter sector

Option 4. Vessel class restrictions

- a) from A, B, C, and/or D commercial vessel category sizes to charter sector
 - 1) Leasable
 - 2) Non-leasable
- b) from charter to commercial:
 - 1. D category only
 - 2. C and D category only
 - 3. B, C, and D category
- c) initial transfer from undesignated charter to a particular commercial vessel category locks in at that commercial category

Option 5. One transfer of QS/IFQ each year between sectors for each QS holder

Option 6. Minimum size of transfer is range of 20-72 fish

ISSUE 6. To receive halibut QS and IFQ by transfer:

- Option 1. For the charter sector, must be either
- A. a initial charter issuee. or
 - B. qualified as defined by State of Alaska requirements for registered guides or businesses*
 - Suboption: and hold a USCG license.

*this would require a change in the commercial regulations to allow transfer of commercial QS/IFQ to charter operator

Option 2. For the commercial sector, must have a commercial transfer eligibility certificate.

ISSUE 7. Caps

- Option 1. No caps - free transferability
- Option 2. Ownership cap of ¼, ½, and 1% of combined QS units in Area 2C and ¼, ½, and 1% of combined QS units in Area 3A and grandfather initial issues at their initial allocation

Issue 8. Miscellaneous provisions

- Option 2. Maximum line limit of 12 in Area 3A (remains at 6 lines for Area 2C), grandfather initial issues
- Option 3. 10% rollover provision of total IFQs
- Option 4. 10% overage provision of total IFQs to be deducted from next year's IFQs

Issue 9. IFQs associated with the charter quota shares may be issued in:

- Option 1. Pounds
- Option 2. Numbers of fish (based on average weight determined by ADF&G)

Issue 10. Reporting:

- Option 1. Require operator to report landings at conclusion of trip
- Option 2. ADF&G logbook
- Option 3. Expand implementation issues presented in the analysis to look at requiring a reporting station in every city and charter boat location to accurately weigh every halibut caught.

RESULTS OF THE 2000 NMFS BERING SEA CRAB SURVEY, Executive Summary

This document summarizes data presented in the Report to Industry on the 2000 Eastern Bering Sea Trawl Survey. Numbers presented are trawl survey indices of population level and do not necessarily represent absolute abundance. For further information, contact Dr. Bradley Stevens, or Dr. Robert Otto, NMFS, P.O. Box 1638, Kodiak, AK 99615. Phone (907) 487-5961. GHLS (Guideline Harvest Levels) are for the combined open-access and CDQ fisheries.

Red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) Bristol Bay.

Legal males: 8.7 million crabs; 21% decrease.
Pre-recruits: 7.2 million crabs; no change.
Large Females: 17.4 million crabs; 81% decrease.
Outlook: Abundance of mature and legal males has decreased due to mortality and fishery removals. Decreased abundance of mature females allows use of a 10% exploitation rate.
GHL: 8.35 million pounds (3,786.85 metric tons, t). Fishery opens October 15, 2000.

Red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) Pribilofs District.

Legal males: 1.2 million crabs; no change.
Pre-recruits: 0.4 million crabs; 43% decrease.
Large Females: 0.6 million crabs; 81% decrease.
Outlook: Crabs are highly concentrated, and index has very low precision. Females are poorly estimated. Data indicate a long term population decline. Red king crabs in the Pribilof Islands and usually harvested incidental to blue king crabs.
GHL: Fishery will not open in 2000.

Pribilof Islands blue king crab (*P. platypus*) Pribilof District.

Legal males: 0.5 million crabs; 11% increase.
Pre-recruits: 0.2 million crabs; no change.
Large Females: 1.4 million crabs; 44% decrease.
Outlook: Population is low and trends are not easily detectable.
GHL: Fishery will not open in 2000.

St. Matthew blue king crab (*P. platypus*) Northern District.

Legal males: 0.8 million crabs; 31% increase.
Pre-recruits: 0.3 million crabs; 40% increase.
Large Females: Not well estimated.
Outlook: Population has declined steeply since 1998. Abundance estimates are affected by the portion of the stock occupying untrawlable grounds.
GHL: Fishery will not open in 2000.

Tanner crab (*Chionoecetes bairdi*) Eastern District.

Legal males: 4.9 million crabs; 147% increase.
Pre-recruits: 18.1 million crabs; 24% increase.
Large Females: 13.7 million crabs; 15% decrease.
Outlook: Population increasing slightly due to recent recruitment.
GHL: Fishery has been closed since 1997, and will not open in 2000.

Snow crab (*C. opilio*) All districts combined.

Large males: 76.1 million crabs; 20% decrease.
Small males: 1036 million crabs; 100% increase.
Large Females: 1481 million crabs; 212% increase.
Outlook: Population is undergoing recruitment of crab into smaller size groups, which may produce increases in large males in several years.
GHL: 27.3 million pounds (12,380.95 t). Fishery is current scheduled to open January 15, 2001.

Hair crab (*Erimacrus isenbeckii*)

Total males: 4.7 million crabs; 26% increase.
Large Females: Not well estimated.
Outlook: Population has been declining for several years but recruitment trends are unclear.
GHL: The GHL has not yet been decided. The fishery will open 10 days following the closure of the Bristol Bay red king crab fishery.

Table 1. Groundfish harvest specifications for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area. For the year 2000 these data include: OFLs, ABC, TAC specifications; Proposed 2001 TAC specifications are identical to final 2000 TACs. 2001 Interim specifications are derived from the proposed specifications using the regulatory formula (proposed TAC x .85 x .25) with exceptions for pollock, sablefish, and Atka mackerel. All values are in metric tons.

Species	2000 Specifications and Proposed and Interim 2001 Specifications				
	Area	OFL	ABC	2000 TAC and proposed 2001 TAC	2001 Interim Specifications
Pollock (1)	Bering Sea (BS)	1,680,000	1,139,000	1,139,000	389,538
	Aleutian Is. (AI)	31,700	23,800	2,000	800
	Bogoslof	30,400	22,300	1,000	400
Pacific cod (2)	BSAI	240,000	193,000	193,000	41,013
Sablefish (3)	BS	1,750	1,470	1,470	156
	AI	3,090	2,430	2,430	129
Atka mackerel (4)	Total	119,000	70,800	70,800	30,019
	Western AI		29,700	29,700	12,622
	Central AI		24,700	24,700	10,497
	Eastern AI/BS		16,400	16,400	6,900
Yellowfin sole	BSAI	226,000	191,000	123,262	26,193
Rock sole	BSAI	273,000	230,000	134,760	28,637
Greenland turbot	Total	42,000	9,300	9,300	1,976
	BS			6,231	1,324
	AI			3,069	652
Arrowtooth flounder	BSAI	160,000	131,000	131,000	27,838
Flathead sole	BSAI	90,000	73,500	52,652	11,189
Other flatfish	BSAI	141,000	117,000	83,813	17,811
Pacific ocean perch	BS	3,100	2,600	2,600	553
	AI Total	14,400	12,300	12,300	2,614
	Western AI		5,670	5,670	1,205
	Central AI		3,510	3,510	746
	Eastern AI		3,120	3,120	663
Other red rockfish	BS	259	194	194	41
Sharpchin/Northern	AI	6,870	5,150	5,150	1,094
Shortraker/Rougheye	AI Total	1,180	885	885	188
Other rockfish	BS	492	369	369	79
	AI	913	685	685	146
Squid	BSAI	2,620	1,970	1,970	419
Other species	BSAI	71,500	31,360	31,360	6,664
	Total	3,139,274	2,260,113	2,000,000	587,497
Excessive harvesting share limit 170,442 mt pollock.					
(1) interim pollock see subtable 1a. for apportionments					
(2) Pacific cod see subtable 1b. for apportionments					
(3) Sablefish see subtable 1c. for apportionments					
(4) Atka mackerel see subtable 1d. for apportionments					

Table 1a. Apportionments of pollock interim TACs

Pollock	2001 Proposed TAC	2001 Interim TAC	2001 Interim CDQ
BS Total	1,139,000	389,538	45,560
Inshore BS (50%)		194,769	
Offshore C/P BS (40%)		155,815	
Mothership BS (10%)		38,954	
CDQ	113,900		45,560
Incidental Catch BS	51,255	51,255	
AI Incidental Catch	2,000	800	
Bogoslof Incidental	1,000	400	
Interim TAC algorithm is CDQ allocated 40% of 10%; then incidental catch allocated 5%. Remainder is initial TAC. Processing sectors 40% of initial, then divided 50%, 40%, 10%, respectively for interim.			

Table 1b. Apportionments of Pacific cod interim TACs

Pacific cod	2001 Proposed TAC	2001 Interim TAC	2001 Interim CDQ
BSAI Total	193,000	41,013	3,619
BSAI non-CDQ			
Fixed gear (51%)		20,917	
Trawl(47%)		19,276	
Jig(2%)		820	
CDQ			3,619
Interim TAC algorithm is 15% to reserves and remainder is initial TAC. CDQ is 50% of reserve and 25% for interim. Gear sectors 25% of Initial, then 51%, 47%, 2% respectively for interim.			

Table 1c. Apportionments of sablefish interim TACs

Sablefish	2001 Proposed TAC	2001 Interim TAC	2001 Interim CDQ
BS total	1,470	156	14
Trawl (25%)	735	156	14
Fixed (75%)	N/A	N/A	N/A
AI total	2,430	129	11
Trawl (25%)	607	129	11
Fixed (75%)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Interim TAC algorithm is 15% to reserves and remainder is initial TAC. Gear sectors 50% of Initial, then 25%, 75% respectively. Fixed gear closed during interim. 50% of reserve is CDQ with same gear sector split percentages and 50% for interim.

Table 1d. Apportionments of Atka mackerel interim TACs

Atka mackerel	2001 Proposed TAC	2001 Interim TAC	2001 Interim CDQ
Total AI	70,800	30,019	1,327
Western AI	29,700	12,622	557
Central	24,700	10,497	463
Eastern AI & BS subarea	16,400	6,900	307
Jig		35	
Other gear		6,865	

Interim TAC algorithm is 15% to reserves and remainder is initial TAC. Area allocations then 50% of Initial. In Eastern AI, jig gear allocated 1% of initial and 25% for interim. 50% of reserve is CDQ with 25% for interim.

Table 2. Groundfish harvest specifications for the Gulf of Alaska management area. For the year 2000 these data include: OFLs, ABCs, TAC specifications; Proposed 2001 TACs are identical to final 2000 specifications. 2001 Interim specifications are derived from the proposed specifications using the regulatory formula (proposed TAC x .85 x .25). All values are in metric tons.

Species	2000 Specifications and Proposed and Interim 2001 Specifications				
	Area	OFL	ABC	2000 TAC and proposed 2001 TAC	2001 Interim Specifications
Pollock	W (610)			32,340	7,498
	C (620)			13,372	546
	C (630)			24,501	5,325
	Shelikof (1)			20,987	13,992
	WYK (640)		2,340	2,340	585
	subtotal	130,760	93,540	93,540	27,946
	SEO(650)	8,610	6,460	6,460	1,615
	Total	139,370	100,000	100,000	29,561
Pacific Cod	W		27,500	20,625	4,125
	C		43,550	34,080	6,816
	E		5,350	4,010	802
	Total	102,000	76,400	58,715	11,743
Flatfish, Deep Wat	W		280	280	70
	C		2,710	2,710	678
	WYK		1,240	1,240	310
	SEO		1,070	1,070	268
	Total	6,980	5,300	5,300	1,326
Rex Sole	W		1,230	1,230	308
	C		5,660	5,660	1,415
	WYK		1,540	1,540	385
	SEO		1,010	1,010	252
	Total	12,300	9,440	9,440	2,360
Flatfish, Shal water	W		19,510	4,500	1,125
	C		16,400	12,950	3,237
	WYK		790	790	198
	SEO		1,160	1,160	290
	Total	45,330	37,860	19,400	4,850
Flathead Sole	W		8,490	2,000	500
	C		15,720	5,000	1,250
	WYK		1,440	1,440	360
	SEO		620	620	155
	Total	34,210	26,270	9,060	2,265
Arrowtooth	W		16,160	5,000	1,250
	C		97,710	25,000	6,250
	WYK		23,770	2,500	625
	SEO		7,720	2,500	625
	Total	173,910	145,360	35,000	8,750
Sablefish (Trawl only)	W Total		1,840	1,840	92
	C Total		5,730	5,730	286
	WYK Total		2,207	2,207	72

(Table 2, Continued)

Species	2000 Specifications and Proposed and Interim 2001 Specifications				
	Area	OFL	ABC	2000 TAC and proposed 2001 TAC	2001 Interim Specifications
Sablefish	Total	16,660	13,330	13,330	450
Rockfish, Other	W		20	20	5
Slope	C		740	740	185
	WYK		250	250	62
	SEO		3,890	3,890	972
	Total	6,390	4,900	4,900	1,224
Rockfish, Northern	W		630	630	158
	C		4,490	4,490	1,122
	E		na	na	na
	Total	7,510	5,120	5,120	1,280
POP	W	1,460	1,240	1,240	310
	C	10,930	9,240	9,240	2,310
	WYK		840	840	210
	SEO		1,700	1,700	425
	E subtotal	3,000			
	Total	15,390	13,020	13,020	3,255
Shortraker/Rough	W		210	210	52
	C		930	930	232
	E		590	590	148
	Total	2,510	1,730	1,730	432
Rockfish, Pel Shelf	W		550	550	138
	C		4,080	4,080	1,020
	WYK		580	580	145
	SEO		770	770	192
	Total	9,040	5,980	5,980	1,495
Rockfish, DemShlf	SEO	420	340	340	85
Atka Mackerel	Gulfwide	6,200	600	600	150
Thornyhead	W		430	430	108
	C		990	990	248
	E		940	940	235
	Total	2,820	2,360	2,360	591
Other Species	Gulfwide		NA	14,215	3,554
GULF OF ALASKA	TOTAL	581,040	448,010	298,510	73,371

(1) Shelikof pollock fishery exists only during A and B seasons; interim Shelikof TAC is first seasonal allowance. The pollock catch limit for the Shelikof Strait conservation zone is determined by calculating the ratio of the most recent estimate of pollock biomass in Shelikof Strait (489,900mt) divided by the most recent estimate of total pollock biomass in the GOA (958,000 mt). This ratio is then multiplied by the pollock TAC in the A season for the combined Western and Central areas of the GOA (27,360 mt). The remainder of the combined W/C TAC in the A season is apportioned among Regulatory Areas 610, 620, and 630 outside the Shelikof Strait based on the distribution of pollock outside the Shelikof Strait; 56.09%, 4.08%, and 39.83% respectively.

Table 3. Prohibited species bycatch allowances for the BSAI trawl and non-trawl fisheries. 2001 Interim allowances are 25% of these amounts.

	Prohibited Species and Zone					
	Halibut mortality (mt) BSAI	Herring (mt) BSAI	Red King Crab (animals) Zone 1	<i>C. opilio</i> (animals) COBLZ	<i>C. bairdi</i> (animals)	
					Zone 1	Zone 2
Trawl Fisheries						
Yellowfin sole	886	169	11,655	2,876,579	288,750	1,514,683
Rocksole/other.flat/fla	779	24	42,090	869,934	309,326	504,894
Turbot/sablefish/arrow		11		41,043		
Rockfish	69	9		41,043		10,024
Pacific cod	1,434	24	11,656	123,529	154,856	275,758
Pollock/Atka/other	232	1,616	1,660	71,622	14,818	25,641
RKC savings subarea			22,665			
Total Trawl PSC	3,400	1,853	89,725	4,023,750	767,750	2,331,000
Non-Trawl Fisheries						
Pacific cod	748					
Other non-trawl	84					
Groundfish pot&jig	exempt					
Sablefish hook-and-line	exempt					
Total Non-Trawl	833					
PSQ Reserve	343		7,275	326,250	62,250	189,000
Grand Total	4,675	1,853	97,000	4,350,000	830,000	2,520,000