3

DRAFT FOR SECRETARIAL REVIEW

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS

OF FINAL LICENSE LIMITATION ALTERNATIVE FOR THE GROUNDFISH FISHERIES OF THE BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS AND GULF OF ALASKA AND THE KING AND TANNER CRAB FISHERIES OF THE BERING SEA/ALEUTIAN ISLANDS

Prepared by the staff of the
North Pacific Fishery Management Council

May 27, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 MANAGEMENT BACKGROUND 1
1.2 PREVIOUS LICENSE LIMITATION ANALYTICAL DOCUMENTS 4
1.3 FULL LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (ELEMENTS AND OPTIONS) UNDER CONSIDERATION 7
1.3.1 Groundfish License Options - Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment 8
1.3.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses 11
1.3.3 Crab Licenses - Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment 15
1.3.4 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses 18

2.0 THE CURRENT FLEET 21
2.1 GROUNDFISH 21
2.2 GROUNDFISH VESSEL CLASSES 24

2.3 CRAB 27
2.4 CRAB VESSEL CLASSES 29

3.0 COUNCIL APPROVED LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM 32
3.1 VESSEL MORATORIUM vs. LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM 32
3.2 GROUNDFISH LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM - COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 33
3.2.1 Components and Elements Affecting Initial Assignment of Licenses 34
3.2.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses 38
3.2.3 Distribution of Groundfish Licenses and Endorsements 42
3.2.3.1 Vessels Qualifying for Licenses 42
3.2.3.2 Participation History of Vessels Qualifying for Groundfish Licenses 45
3.2.4 Participation History of Vessels Not Qualifying for Groundfish Licenses 50
3.2.4.1 Vessels That Do Not Qualify for Any Groundfish Licenses 50
3.2.4.2 Vessels That Qualify for Endorsements in Only Part of the Areas They Fished 53
3.3 CRAB LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM - COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE . 56
3.3.1 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment 56
3.3.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses 60
3.3.3 Distribution of Licenses and Endorsements 62
3.3.4 Vessels That Did Not Qualify for a Crab License 67
3.3.5 Vessels That Qualify for Both Groundfish and Crab Licenses 71

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT 75
4.1 IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS 75
4.2 OTHER IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT ISSUES 75

4.2.1 Issuing Disputed Licenses 75
4.2.2 Implementation and Enforcement of the Groundfish and Crab CDQ Programs 76
4.2.3 Vessel Characteristics 76

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 77
5.1 SUMMARY OF THE LICENSE PROGRAMS 77
5.2 NEPA REQUIREMENTS 78
5.2.1 Additions to the September 1994 EA/RIR 78
5.2.2 Finding of No Significant Impact 79
5.3 ECONOMIC IMPACTS (E.O. 12866) 80
5.4 REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT CONSIDERATIONS 80
5.4.1 Numbers of Small Entities Affected 81
5.4.2 Magnitude of Impact to Small Entities 82
5.4.3 Finding of No Significant Impact 83
5.5 SECTION 303(B)(6) OF THE MAGNUSON ACT 83
5.6 OTHER ISSUES AND APPLICABLE LAWS 84

6.0 EXAMINATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA (CDQ) ALLOCATIONS . . 87
6.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION 87
6.2 SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL 88
6.2.1 The Preferred Alternative 89
6.3 NEPA CONSIDERATIONS - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES 90
6.4 REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW: ECONOMIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES 91
6.4.1 Community Development Quota (CDQ) Options 91
6.4.1.1 Status Quo Implications 91
6.4.1.2 CDQs as TAC Set Asides 92
6.4.1.3 CDQs as Additional Licenses 93
6.4.1 Administrative, Enforcement, and Monitoring Costs 94
6.5 REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT CONSIDERATIONS 94
6.6 NATIONAL STANDARDS 95
6.7 MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT AND CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVES 95

7.0 LIST OF PREPARERS 98

APPENDICES

I Vessel Participation in the 1988-1993 and 1995 Groundfish and Crab Fisheries
II Vessel Classification Definitions
III Participation in the 1994 Fisheries and License Qualified Vessels by the Owner's County/Borough of Residence
IV Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species 1988 - 1994
V NMFS Implementation Plan For Groundfish and Crab
VI Economic Impacts of the Pollock Community Development Quota Program
VII Community Development Quota (CDQ) and Open Access Pollock Fisheries in the Eastern Bering Sea: A Comparison of Groundfish Utilization and Prohibited Species Bycatch

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Council selected the specific elements that would comprise the groundfish and crab license limitation programs during their June 1995 meeting in Dutch Harbor, Alaska. These elements were selected from lists that had been developed, discussed, and refined over several meetings dating back to early 1993. A complete list of the elements and options used by the Council to select their final programs is provided in the Management Background section of Chapter 1. A "road map" of how the Council arrived at its final decision also is contained in that section and refers to previous analyses, including the baseline License Limitation analysis and previous supplemental analyses. The remainder of this document focuses on the Preferred Alternative selected by the Council.

Chapter 2 focuses on the "current fleet". This analysis will discuss use both the vessels that were issued permits under the Council's vessel moratorium program, and vessels that participated in the crab and/or groundfish fisheries during 1994. Previous analysis used 1993 to define the current fleet, because complete data were not yet available for 1994 and the moratorium had not yet been approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Updating the "current fleet" to be the 1994 vessels provides the reader with information on the most current complete year of data as a reference point from which to compare the projected results of the license program. The moratorium sets the maximum number of vessels ≥ 32' in the BSAI and ≥ 26' in the GOA that can participate in federally managed groundfish and crab fisheries in the EEZ.

Chapter 3 focuses on the actual groundfish and crab license programs chosen by the Council. A discussion is provided of the relationship between the vessel moratorium (in place for 1996) and the license limitation program elements of the program as well as the Council's rationale for selecting those elements are discussed. Finally, tables showing the distribution of licenses and endorsements are presented. They cover a variety of topics such as the number of vessels licensed by county/borough, vessel classes (using the vessel classes from the Social Impact Analysis), and the participation history of qualified and non-qualified vessels.

Chapter 4 is an administrative and enforcement section. Much of this information has been presented in previous supplemental analyses but was much broader and covered many of the alternatives the Council was contemplating at that time. Now that the Council has clearly defined the program, the relevant findings from these previous sections can be pulled forward to provide estimates of the costs and administrative burden of implementing and monitoring the license program, and the associated CDQ allocations.

Chapter 5 provides a brief summary and conclusion of the analyses' major findings, as well as evaluates the program against the original problem statement, NEPA, Executive Order 12866, and the National Standards. Finally, this section discusses how the license program fits into the bigger Comprehensive Rationalization Planning (CRP) picture.

When reading this supplemental analysis the reader should keep in mind that the conclusions and background information provided in the September 1994 EA/RIR and all other supplemental analyses are still valid, unless otherwise revisited herein. This Supplemental analysis does not attempt to revisit all those findings. Instead, we build on the previous analyses by providing additional information, particularly in terms of the projected distribution of licenses in the Council's final program.

1.1 MANAGEMENT BACKGROUND

The September 1994 EA/RIR (baseline analysis) for the proposed License Limitation program contains a full description of the origins of the Council's Comprehensive Rationalization Plan (CRP), a description of the fisheries in question, and the Purpose and Need for Action of the CRP process. That baseline

analysis, and all supplements to that baseline analysis, are submitted as part of this package for Secretarial review.

The proposed License Limitation program represents the foundation of the CRP planning process, which began in 1992 when the Council committed to development of such a program by January of 1996. In 1992, at the time of the original inshore/offshore processing allocations, the Council committed to development of a CRP, which would examine a myriad of management alternatives including Individual Fishing Quotas (IFQs), License Limitation, and other, more traditional management alternatives. The first meeting to specifically discuss CRP was a special meeting held in November 1992, where the Council heard testimony and began discussions to try and narrow the management alternatives to accomplish their goals. By December 1992, the Council had developed a Problem Statement describing the need for and purpose of the CRP initiative. That Problem Statement is reiterated below in its entirety:

Problem Statement

Expansion of the domestic fleet harvesting fish within the EEZ off Alaska, in excess of that needed to harvest the optimum yield efficiently, has made compliance with the Magnuson Act's National Standards and achievement of the Council's comprehensive goals, adopted December 7, 1984, more difficult under current management regimes. In striving to achieve its comprehensive goals, the Council is committed to: "(1) assure the long-term health and productivity of fish stocks, and other living marine resources of the North Pacific and Bering Sea ecosystem, (2) support the stability, economic well-being and diversity of the seafood industry, and provide for the economic and social needs of the communities dependent upon that industry, and (3) efficiently manage the resources within its jurisdiction to reduce bycatch, minimize waste, and improve utilization of fish resources in order to provide the maximum benefit to the present and future generations of fishermen, associated fishing industry sectors, communities, consumers, and the nation as a whole."

The Council's overriding concern is to maintain the health of the marine ecosystem to ensure the long-term conservation and abundance of the groundfish and crab resources. In addition, the Council must address the competing and oftentimes conflicting needs of the domestic fisheries that have developed rapidly under open access, fisheries which have become over-capitalized and mismatched to the finite fishery resources available. Symptomatic of the intense pressures within the over-capitalized groundfish and crab fisheries under the Council jurisdiction off Alaska are the following problems:

1. Harvesting capacity in excess of that required to harvest the available resource.

2. Allocation and preemption conflicts between and within industry sectors, such as with inshore and offshore components.

3. Preemption conflicts between gear types.

4. Gear conflicts within fisheries where there is overcrowding of fishing gear due to excessive participation and surplus fishing effort on limited grounds.

5. Dead-loss such as with ghost fishing by lost or discarded gear.

6. Bycatch loss of groundfish, crab, herring, salmon, and other non-target species, including bycatch which is not landed for regulatory reasons.

7. Economic loss and waste associated with discard mortality of target species harvested but not retained for economic reasons.

8. Concerns regarding vessel and crew safety which are often compromised in the race for fish.

9. Economic instability within various sectors of the fishing industry, and in fishing communities caused by short and unpredictable fishing seasons, or preemption which denies access to fisheries resources.

10. Inability to provide for a long-term, stable fisheries based economy in small economically disadvantaged adjacent coastal communities.

11. Reduction in ability to provide a quality product to consumers at a competitive price, and thus maintain the competitiveness of seafood products from the EEZ off Alaska on the world market.

12. Possible impacts on marine mammals and seabirds, and marine habitat.

13. Inability to achieve long-term sustainable economic benefits to the Nation.

14. A complex enforcement regimen for fishermen and management alike which inhibits the achievement of the Council's comprehensive goals.

By early 1993 the Council, with the advice of industry, had determined that some form of limited entry or IFQ system held the most promise to address the problems facing the industry. During 1993, the attention of the Council was devoted to developing and refining the potential elements of an IFQ management alternative for all groundfish and crab fisheries. Although IFQs were generally viewed as the alternative with the most potential for solving the greatest number of problems identified by the industry and the Council, development of the specific elements of an IFQ program proved both contentious and time consuming. Consensus on these specifics did not appear likely in any near term, and without industry consensus, development of this alternative was severely hindered. By September 1993, the Council had placed a simpler License Limitation alternative back on equal footing with the IFQ alternative in terms of staff time devoted to its development. At the January 1994 meeting, with the endorsement of the industry Advisory Panel, the Council voted to move forward with License Limitation as the Preferred Alternative, with further IFQ development as a potential next step in the CRP process. A primary rationale for this decision was to provide a program which brought stability to the industry and defined the field of players for any further CRP management alternatives.

Over the next several meetings the Council and industry worked at refining the potential elements and options for the License Limitation program. A baseline analysis (EA/RIR dated September 18, 1994) was reviewed by the Council at the September 1994 meeting, at which time they further refined the list of specific elements and options for the License Limitation program. Two supplemental analyses (dated November 14, 1994) were developed after the September 1994 meeting which concentrated on (1) specific elements identified by the Council as having particular merit, and (2) a proposal for two categories of licenses, based on separate qualification periods. These were labeled Appendix VII and Appendix VIII to the baseline document and were reviewed by the Council at the December 1994 meeting. At that meeting, the Council added some new alternatives to the package for analysis, and identified, once again, specific elements which were considered most viable, though all elements and options remained in the package for consideration. Additional analysis was requested by the Council, with the intent of a Supplemental analysis being released in February 1995 and a final decision reached in April 1995.

At the same time, other components of the overall analytical package were being finalized, including Community Profiles of over 126 Alaskan and Pacific Northwest coastal communities and a "Sector Description and Preliminary Social Impact Analysis" dated October 21, 1994. The latter document was compiled under contract to the Council by Impact Assessment, Inc., and contained a general assessment of the industry sectors involved in the fisheries and preliminary assessments of the potential social impacts of License Limitation or IFQ programs. In December 1994, the Council requested a follow-up to this study which concentrated on the License Limitation alternatives identified as most viable by the Council at that time. That document titled, "Supplemental Social Impact Assessment," was completed and released on March 1, 1995.

On March 9, 1995, the Council staff's first Supplemental analysis concentrating on specific elements of a License Limitation program was released for public review. The Council reviewed these documents at the April 1995 meeting, and though they did not make a final decision, they again narrowed the alternatives to a few specific program configurations for both groundfish and crab. An additional Supplemental analysis, dated June 2, 1995, was produced by staff which formed the basis for the Council's final decision at the June 1995 meeting.

1.2 PREVIOUS LICENSE LIMITATION ANALYTICAL DOCUMENTS

A list of all previous analyses, the information contained in each, and a specific page guide for the baseline analysis are provided below for reference (all the documents will be included in the Secretarial review package along with this final Supplemental analysis):

1. **Environmental Assessment/Regulatory Impact Review (EA/RIR) dated September 18, 1994.**

pp. 1-4	Management background of CRP and License Limitation development since 1992.
pp. 14-36	Detailed description of current fleet characteristics, based on 1992/1993 activities.
pp. 40-58	Discussion of impacts of not implementing a License Limitation program - the 'No Action' alternative.
pp. 59-79	Review and discussion of other past and existing limited entry programs.
pp. 79-85	General economic impacts expected from License Limitation alternative.
pp. 86-154	Analysis of specific license limitation alternatives for **groundfish** fisheries. Includes analyses of each major component such as 'Nature of Licenses,' 'Qualifying Period,' 'Ownership and Transfer Provisions,' etc. Also contains specific, detailed analyses of selected combinations of elements and options (configurations).
pp. 170-181	Analysis of specific license limitation alternatives for **crab** fisheries. Includes analyses of each major component such as 'Nature of Licenses,' 'Qualifying Period,' 'Ownership and Transfer Provisions,' etc. Also contains specific, detailed analyses of selected combinations of elements and options (configurations).
pp. 182-184	Discussion of CDQ alternatives within the License Limitation program.
pp. 184-185	Discussion of two-tier skipper license proposal (from Skippers for Equitable Access - SEA).
pp. 188-194	Environmental Impact projections (NEPA requirements) and Finding of No Significant Impacts.

pp. 195	General Economic Impacts (Executive Order 12866 findings).
pp. 196-200	Evaluation of proposed alternatives relative to Council Problem Statement.
pp.200-205	Consistency with National Standards and other applicable laws.
Appendix I	License System for Groundfish - provided for reference, this is a previous rendition of the suite of potential elements and options for the license program.
Appendix II	Detailed data on 1991, 1992, and 1993 groundfish and crab fisheries for reference.
Appendix III	An Assessment of Net National Benefits under the groundfish and crab vessel moratorium (for reference).
Appendix IV	Methods of construction and assumptions made in data bases for the analyses.
Appendix V	Analysis of Individual Transferable Pot Quota (ITPQ) option for crab fisheries.
Appendix VI	An analysis of the proposed exclusion of Licenses for the Gulf of Alaska rockfish fisheries.
Groundfish Distributional Table Appendix	Contains detailed distributional outcomes of various combinations of elements and options (configurations) for groundfish (through September 1994).
Crab Distributional Table Appendix	Contains detailed distributional outcomes of various combinations of elements and options (configurations) for crab (through September 1994).

2. **Appendix VII dated November 18, 1994:**

Contains analyses of specific license program configurations, for groundfish and crab, identified by the Council in September 1994.

3. **Appendix VIII dated November 18, 1994:**

Contains analyses of 'A' and 'B' license concept as proposed by Midwater Trawlers Cooperative.

4. **Errata sheet (dated November 14, 1994) noting corrections to baseline EA/RIR.**

5. **Supplemental Analysis of Proposed License Limitation Alternatives for Groundfish and Crab Fisheries off Alaska dated March 9, 1995:**

Contains analyses of specific license program configurations, for groundfish and crab, identified by the Council in December 1994. More specifically, contains the following:

pp. 1	Brief management background and full list of elements and options for groundfish and crab license limitation programs.

pp. 10-21 Detailed description of core configurations for groundfish. Included, for example, are the following major configurations:

Configuration # 1B15411:
* Single class of licenses (no 'B' permits)
* Licenses for fisheries and FMP sub-areas (newly delineated GOA areas)
* Issued to current owners
* Designation of CP/CV and vessel length categories
* Qualifying period of January 1, 1990 to December 31, 1993
* One landing minimum for license
* One landing minimum for endorsement

Configuration # 1B15811:
* Single class of licenses (no 'B' permits)
* Licenses for fisheries and FMP sub-areas (newly delineated GOA areas)
* Issued to current owners
* Designation of CP/CV and vessel length categories
* Qualifying period of January 1, 1988 to June 27, 1992
* One landing minimum for license
* One landing minimum for endorsement

pp. 21-28 Detailed description of core configurations for crab. Included, for example, are the following major configurations:

Configuration # 131431:
* Single class of licenses (no 'B' permits)
* Species/area licenses
* Issued to current owners
* Designations of CP/CV and vessel length categories
* Base qualifying period of June 28, 1989 to June 27, 1992
* No minimum landings requirements

Configuration # 131441:
* Single class of licenses (no 'B' permits)
* Species/area licenses
* Issued to current owners
* Designations of CP/CV and vessel length categories
* Base qualifying period of January 1, 1992 to December 31, 1994
* No minimum landings requirements

pp. 28-33 Discussion of potential License and Endorsement structures - Umbrella concept.

pp. 34-38 Discussion of specific issues still requiring clarification or resolution.

pp. 39 Distributional tables for all potential groundfish configurations (based on highlighted alternatives from December 1994).

pp. 55 Distributional tables for all potential crab configurations (based on highlighted alternatives from December 1994).

6. **Implementation Plan for License Limitation Alternatives dated January 20, 1995:**

This document contains projections of the overall costs for administration, implementation, and enforcement of the proposed license limitation program. Also contains discussion of the differential costs and implementation aspects of various major alternatives within the overall license program.

7. **1994 Community Profiles:**

These documents, covering nine different regions and over 130 communities in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, were released in the fall of 1994. They are generic, baseline reference documents for the license limitation and other Council management programs and contain general information on these coastal communities and specific information relative to their involvement in fisheries off Alaska.

8. **Sector Description and Preliminary Social Impact Assessment dated October 21, 1994:**

This document was prepared under contract to the Council by Impact Assessment, Inc and is a generic, baseline reference document focusing on major industry sectors, their involvement in the fisheries, and the participants in each major sector. This document was prepared as background reference for the overall CRP initiative.

9. **Final Social Impact Assessment (Bridging Document) for License Limitation alternatives for groundfish and crab fisheries dated March 1, 1995:**

This document was also prepared by Impact Assessment, Inc. and is intended to relate the Council staff's distributional analyses (of specific license limitation alternatives) to the baseline social impact documents listed above.

10. **Supplemental Analysis of License Limitation Alternatives dated June 2, 1995:**

Similar in structure to the March 9 Supplemental analysis, this iteration examined specific program configuration identified as most viable by the Council in April 1995. The major difference in this iteration is the focus on a general license with area endorsements (no species endorsements) for groundfish, and species/area licenses for crab. Various landings criteria for area endorsements are evaluated in this document. This Supplemental analysis also contains, as an appendix, an analysis of potential increases in capacity under a License Limitation program. This document also examines the proposal to designate the GOA Southeast Outside management area as non-trawl gear only.

1.3 FULL LIST OF ALTERNATIVES (ELEMENTS AND OPTIONS) UNDER CONSIDERATION

A full list of elements and options that the Council considered during their debates on license limitation is provided below. The components of the alternative selected by the Council in June 1995 to be included in the program are denoted by an arrow in the left hand column. This method of laying out the elements and options was developed by staff so that one option could be selected from each section under the "components and alternative elements affecting initial assignment" to define the initial allocation of licenses.

1.3.1 Groundfish License Options - Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment

License Classes

→ A single class of licenses 1000000
Two license classes with Class B Permits For Participants From 1/1/80 - 12/31/93 2000000
Two license classes with Class B Permits For Participants From 1/1/88 - 12/31/93 3000000

Nature of Licenses

Single license for all species and areas 100000
Licenses for FMP areas (i.e., GOA and BSAI) 200000
Non-severable area endorsements for the following management areas: AI, BS, WG, CG+WY, EY+SO. The endorsement would be contained under one of the following General License Umbrellas: GOA, BSAI, or GOA/BSAI 300000

Licenses for Pollock, P. cod, Flatfish, Rockfish, and Other fisheries 400000
Licenses for Pollock, P. cod, Flatfish, Rockfish, and Other fisheries by FMP areas 500000
Licenses for Pollock, P. cod, Flatfish, Rockfish, and Other fisheries by FMP sub-areas 600000
Licenses for fisheries (see Box 1) by FMP sub-areas 700000
Licenses for fisheries (see Box 1) by the following areas: EG, CG, WG, BSAI 800000
Licenses for fisheries (see Box 2) by FMP sub-areas 900000
Licenses for fisheries (see Box 3) by FMP sub-areas A00000
Licenses for fisheries (see Box 4) by newly configured areas B00000
→ The Groundfish License Program will restrict access to groundfish fisheries in the EEZ off the Coast of Alaska; The License Program does not restrict access to waters of the State of Alaska. The program will issue non-severable area endorsements for the following management areas: AI, BS, WG, CG+WY, EY+SO. The endorsement would be contained under one of the following General License Umbrellas: GOA, BSAI, or GOA/BSAI. Demersal Shelf Rockfish in waters east of 140° W, and fixed-gear sablefish are excluded from the Groundfish License Program. C00000

Box 1	Fisheries Specified Under Options 700000 and 800000
BSAI Fishery Licenses: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Atka Mackerel, Yellowfin Sole, Other Flatfish, Rockfish, Squid (Fixed Gear), Rocksole, Turbots	GOA Fishery Licenses: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Deep Water Flats, Shallow Water Flatfish, Atka Mackerel

Box 2	Fisheries Specified Under Options 900000
BSAI Fishery Licenses: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Atka Mackerel, Yellowfin Sole, Other Flatfish, Rockfish, Squid (Fixed Gear), Rocksole, Turbots	GOA Fishery Licenses: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Deep Water Flats, Shallow Water Flatfish, Atka Mackerel, Flathead Sole, Rockfish
Additionally, BSAI trawl sablefish will be bycatch only for any BSAI licensed vessel and Arrowtooth in any sub-area is open to any vessel holding a sub-area license.	

Box 3	Fisheries Specified Under Options A00000
Fishery Endorsements for BS and AI: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Atka Mackerel, Yellowfin Sole, Other Flatfish, Rockfish, Squid (Fixed Gear), Rocksole, Turbots, Trawl Sablefish	Fishery Endorsements for EG, CG and WG: Pollock, Pacific Cod, Deep Water Flats, Shallow Water Flatfish, Atka Mackerel, Flathead Sole, Rockfish
Additionally, Arrowtooth in any sub-area is open to any vessel holding a sub-area license.	
Note: General licenses would be issued for GOA, BSAI, and GOA/BSAI. In the latter case, BOA and BSAI are not separable. There would be no intermediate license at the sub-area level.	

Box 4	Fisheries Specified Under Options B00000
Target species are defined the same as in Box 3. Areas would be defined as WG, CG+WY, EY+SO in the GOA and AI and BS.	
Note: General licenses would be issued for GOA, BSAI, and GOA/BSAI. In the latter case, GOA and BSAI are not separable. There would be no intermediate license at the sub-area level.	

License Recipients

Current owners 10000
Current owner, then owner at the time of landing, then permit holders (no duplicate) 20000
Current owners, then permit holders (no duplicates) 30000
Current owners, owners at the time of landing, and permit holders (duplicates allowed) 40000
→ Licenses will be issued to current owners (as of 6/17/95) of qualified vessels.[1] (Owners must be "persons eligible to document a fishing vessel" under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C. This date may be subject to modification under certain circumstances involving qualified vessels now operating under foreign flags.) 50000

License Designations

No restrictions 1000
Catcher vessels & Catcher/processors 2000
Vessel length 3000
Inshore & Offshore 4000
Catcher vessels & Catcher/processors and vessel length (<60, 60-124, 125+). 5000
Catcher vessels & Catcher/processors and Inshore & Offshore 6000
Inshore & Offshore and vessel length 7000
Catcher vessels & Catcher/processors, Inshore & Offshore, and vessel length 8000

Same as 5,000 above, adding a gear designation to all Eastern Gulf (EY + SO) endorsements allowing the use of legal fixed gear only, regardless of the gear used to qualify for the endorsement. 9000
→ Licenses and Endorsements will be designated as Catcher Vessel or Catcher Processor and with one of three Vessel Length Classes (<60', ≥60' & <125', ≥125'). In the Eastern Gulf (EY + SO), an additional designation allowing the use of legal fixed gear only will be assigned, regardless of the gear used to qualify for the endorsement. CP/CV designations will be determined based on the activities of the vessel during 1/1/94-6/17/95 or the most recent year of participation during the Endorsement Qualifying Period (EQP). Vessel Length Classes will be based on the length overall of the vessel as of 6/17/95, as long as the vessel conforms with the provisions of the '20% upgrade' and 'Maximum LOA' rules defined in the moratorium[2] A000

---

[1] The language in this section has been changed from the "DRAFT FINAL ACTION" language distributed at the Council meeting on Sunday, June 18, 1995. These changes were made to more accurately reflect the intent of the Council regarding the definition of "current owners," and to ensure consistency regarding the specific dates in the action. All occurrences of the date "6/15/95" have been changed to "6/17/95" in this document to reflect the date of the final Council action. Originally, this section read as follows:

> Licenses will be issued to current owners of vessels. Current Owners are defined as those "persons" eligible to document a fishing vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C.

[2] Maximum LOA (*the "20% rule" from the moratorium regulations*) with respect to a vessel means the greatest LOA of that vessel or its replacement that may qualify it to use a moratorium permit to catch and retain moratorium crab species or conduct directed fishing for moratorium groundfish species during the moratorium, except as provided at § 676.4(d). The maximum LOA of a vessel with moratorium qualification will be determined by the Regional Director as follows:

(1) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is less than 125 ft LOA, the maximum LOA will be equal to 1.2 times the vessel's original qualifying length or 125 ft, which ever is less; and

(2) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is equal to or greater than 125 ft, the maximum LOA will be equal to the vessel's original qualifying length.

Original qualifying length with respect to a vessel means the LOA of the vessel on or before June 24, 1992.

Length overall of a vessel (*from 50 CFR § 672.2 & § 675.2*) means the horizontal distance, rounded to the nearest foot, between the foremost part of the stem and the aftermost part of the stern, excluding bowsprits, rudders, outboard motor brackets, and similar fitting or attachments. (*In instances when the length falls on a ½', the LOA is the nearest even number, e.g., 124'6" is LOA 124', and 125'6" is LOA 126'.*)

For the BSAI and for vessels < 60' (or 125') in the GOA, one landing in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 125' (or 60') in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 9

For the BSAI and for vessels < 60' in the GOA, two landings in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 60' in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 ..... A

For the BSAI and for vessels < 60' in the GOA, four landings in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 60' in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 ..... B

For the BSAI and for vessels < 125' in the GOA, one landing in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 125' in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 C

For the BSAI and for vessels < 125' in the GOA, two landings in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 125' in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 ..... D

For the BSAI and for vessels < 125' in the GOA, four landings in an area during the Endorsement QP. For vessels ≥ 125' in the GOA, one landing in each calendar year in an area during the Endorsement QP. This option is relevant only to QP 900 ..... E

→ Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands:
An endorsement will be issued if a vessel made at least one groundfish landing in an area (BS or AI) during the endorsement period (1/1/92-6/17/95).

Gulf of Alaska:
(1) For all vessels less than 60' in all GOA endorsement areas, an endorsement will be issued if the vessel made at least one landing in the area during the endorsement period (1/1/92-6/17/95).

(2) For the Central Gulf/West Yakutat and Southeast Outside endorsement areas, all vessels ≥ 60' but less than 125', which made at least one landing in an area in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through 6/17/95), **OR** four landings between 1/1/95 and 6/17/95 would receive an endorsement for the area. For all vessels ≥ 125', endorsements will be issued to vessels which made at least one landing in an area in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through 6/17/95).

(3) For the Western Gulf area, all vessels less than 125' which made at least one landing between 1/1/92 and 6/17/95 will receive an endorsement. Vessels which are ≥ 125' must have made at least one landing in the WG in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through 6/17/95) in order to receive an endorsement for the area. ..... F

1.3.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses

Who May Purchase Licenses (Choose 1 option)

→ 1. Licenses could be transferred only to "persons" defined as those eligible to document a fishery vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46 U.S.C. There shall be no leasing of groundfish licenses.
2. Licenses could only be transferred to "persons" with 76% or more U.S. ownership, with "grandfather" rights for license recipients with 75% or less U.S. ownership (Chapter 802, Title 46 U.S.C.).

Vessel/License Linkages (Choose 1 of 2 options)

1. Vessel must be transferred with license.

Qualifying Periods

Jan. 1, 1978 - Dec. 31, 1993 100
Jun. 28, 1989 - Jun. 27, 1992 200
Jun. 28, 1989 - date of final action 300
Jan. 1, 1990 - Dec. 31, 1993 400
The three years prior to the date of final action 500
Jun. 28, 1989 - Jun. 27, 1992 & the three years prior to the date of final action 600
Each of the three calendar years from 1/1/90 - 6/27/92 & the 365 days prior to final action, except for fixed gear P. cod use 6/23/91 - 6/27/92 rather than 1/1/90 - 6/27/92 700

Jan. 1, 1988 - Jun. 27, 1992 800

For General Licenses, the QP is Jan. 1, 1988 - June 27, 1992, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to groundfish from crab under the provisions of the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. For vessels under 60', the general QP is extended through Dec. 31, 1994 for groundfish pot or jig gear — recipients must choose one area if qualified for multiple areas. For Area Endorsements, the QP is Jan. 1, 1992 - Dec. 31, 1994 900

For General Licenses, the QP is Jan. 1, 1988 - June 27, 1992, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to groundfish from crab under the provisions of the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. For vessels under 60', the general QP is extended through Dec. 31, 1994 for groundfish pot or jig gear — recipients must choose one area if qualified for multiple areas. For Area Endorsements, the QP is Jan. 1, 1988 - Dec. 31, 1994 ..... A00

→ For General Licenses, the QP is Jan. 1, 1988 - June 27, 1992, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to groundfish from crab under the provisions of the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. For vessels under 60', the general QP is extended through Dec. 31, 1994 for groundfish pot or jig gear — recipients must choose one area if qualified for multiple areas. For Area Endorsements, the QP is Jan. 1, 1992 - June 17, 1995 ..... B00

The following exemptions are included in the License Limitation program: (1) vessels that were exempted from the proposed moratorium would also be exempt from the license limitation program (26' in the GOA and 32' in the BSAI); and (2) vessels in the BSAI using jig gear that are less than 60' using a maximum of 5 machines, one line per machine, and a maximum of 15 hooks per line. Unlike the moratorium, any 'exempt' vessel which qualifies for a license would receive that license.

Landings Requirements For General License Qualification (Choose 1 of 6 options)

One landing 10
Two landings 20
5,000 pounds 30
10,000 pounds 40
20,000 pounds 50
→ One landing in the General QP, or qualified "moratorium crossover" vessels 60

Landings Requirements for Endorsement Qualification

One landing in the General QP, or qualified "moratorium crossover" vessels. 1
Two landings in an area during the Endorsement QP 2
Three landings in qualifying period 3
Four landings in an area during the Endorsement QP 4
One landing in year prior to council action 5
Two landings in year prior to council action 6
Three landings in year prior to council action 7
Four landings in year prior to council action 8

1.3.3 Crab Licenses - Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment

License Classes (Choose 1 of 3 options)	Numbering Scheme
→ A single class of licenses	100000
Two license classes with Class B Permits for participants from 1/1/80 - 12/31/93	200000
Two license classes with Class B Permits for participants from 1/1/88 - 12/31/93	300000

Nature of Licenses

Single license for all species and areas	10000
Licenses for species (e.g., *C. opilio, C. bairdi*, Red, Blue and Brown King Crab)	20000
General Licenses and endorsements for each species / area combination.	30000
General Licenses and endorsements for each species / area combination, except all Tanner crab (*C. bairdi, C. opilio*, etc.) will be treated as a single species.	40000

→ The Crab License Program restricts access to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab Fisheries in the EEZ. The program does not restrict access within waters of the State of Alaska, nor does it affect crab fisheries which are not managed by the BSAI King and Tanner Crab FMP. The Crab License Program will issue General Licenses and Endorsements for each species/area combination.

The species / area combinations are as follows:

1.	Pribilof red + Pribilof blue king crab	5.	Adak red king crab
2.	C. *opilio* + C. *bairdi*	6.	Bristol Bay red king crab
3.	St. Matthew blue king crab	7.	Dutch Harbor brown king crab
4.	Adak brown king crab	8.	Norton Sound red king crab

The Council also recommends classifying all crab species not included in the endorsement list that are covered under the Crab FMP as "developing fisheries." This list includes but is not limited to: Bering Sea brown king crab, BSAI C. *tanneri*, *Lithodes couesi*, and *C. angulatus*, and Dutch Harbor red king crab. To participate in a developing fishery a person must have a valid federal crab license as defined in this program.

License Recipients

Current owners	1000
Current owners and permit holders	2000

→ Licenses will be issued to current owners (as of 6/17/95) of qualified vessels.[4] (Owners must be "persons eligible to document a fishing vessel" under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C. This date may be subject to modification under certain circumstances involving qualified vessels now operating under foreign flags.)

---

[4] The language in this section has been changed from the "DRAFT FINAL ACTION" language distributed at the Council meeting on Sunday, June 18, 1995. These changes were made to more accurately reflect the intent of the Council regarding the definition of "current owners," and to ensure consistency regarding the specific dates in the action. All occurrences of the date "6/15/95" have been changed to "6/17/95" in this document to reflect the date of the final Council action. Originally, this section read as follows:

> Licenses will be issued to current owners of vessels. Current Owners are defined as those "persons" eligible to document a fishing vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C.

In the Norton Sound King crab summer fishery, "persons" eligible to receive a license include the following:

a) individuals who held State of Alaska Permit for the Norton Sound King Crab summer fishery and who made at least one landing; or

b) current vessel owners (as of 6/17/95) in instances where a vessel was corporate owned, but operated by a skipper who was a temporary contract employee. 3,000

License Designations

No restrictions 100

Catcher vessels & Catcher/processors 200

Vessel length 300

→ Licenses and Endorsements will be designated as Catcher Vessel or Catcher Processor and with one of three Vessel Length Classes (<60', ≥60' & <125', ≥125'). CP/CV designations will be determined based on the activities of the vessel during the most recent year of participation during the Endorsement Qualifying Period(EQP). Vessel Length Classes will be based on the overall length of the vessel as of 6/17/95,[5] as long as the vessel conforms with the provisions of the '20% upgrade' and 'Maximum LOA' rules defined in the moratorium.[6] Owners of vessels which have upgraded beyond the "maximum length" would receive licenses and endorsements, but these licenses and endorsements could not be assigned to the qualifying vessel. Further, for the Norton Sound King crab summer fishery, vessels less than 32' may upgrade beyond 20% but may not exceed 32' unless the 20% upgrade would result in a vessel that exceeds 32'. 400

Qualifying Period

1/1/78 - 12/31/93. 10

6/28/89 - 6/27/92 --- (6/29/80 - 6/25/83 for D.H. Red, 6/29/85 - 6/25/88 for Prib Blue). 20

6/28/89 - 6/27/92 --- (6/29/80 - 6/25/83 for D.H. Red & 6/29/85 - 6/25/88 for Prib. Blue. These two groups must also have made a landing in any federally managed crab fishery between 6/28/89-6/27/92.) For Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab fisheries, and for Prib. Red King Crab, must have made a landing in 1993 or 1994. 30

1/1/92 - 12/31/94 --- (6/29/80 - 6/25/83 for D.H. Red & 6/29/85 - 6/25/1988 for Prib. Blue. These two groups must also have made a landing in any federally managed crab fishery between 1/1/92-12/31/94.) For Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab fisheries, and for Prib. Red King Crab, must have made a landing in 1993 or 1994. 40

---

[5] This date is consistent with the date used to determine length classes in the Groundfish License Limitation Program. If different dates were used in the two programs, the possibility of having a single vessel with two different length class designations arises.

[6] Maximum LOA (*the "20% rule" from the moratorium regulations*) with respect to a vessel means the greatest LOA of that vessel or its replacement that may qualify it to use a moratorium permit to catch and retain moratorium crab species or conduct directed fishing for moratorium groundfish species during the moratorium, except as provided at § 676.4(d). The maximum LOA of a vessel with moratorium qualification will be determined by the Regional Director as follows:

(1) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is less than 125 ft LOA, the maximum LOA will be equal to 1.2 times the vessel's original qualifying length or 125 ft, which ever is less; and

(2) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is equal to or greater than 125 ft, the maximum LOA will be equal to the vessel's original qualifying length.

Original qualifying length with respect to a vessel means the LOA of the vessel on or before June 24, 1992.

Length overall of a vessel (*from 50 CFR § 672.2 & § 675.2*) means the horizontal distance, rounded to the nearest foot, between the foremost part of the stem and the aftermost part of the stern, excluding bowsprits, rudders, outboard motor brackets, and similar fitting or attachments. (*In instances when the length falls on a ½', the LOA is the nearest even number, e.g., 124'6" is LOA 124', and 125'6" is LOA 126'.*)

1/1/88 - 6/27/92 50

A General License Qualifying Period (GQP) of 1/1/88 - 6/27/92, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to crab from groundfish under the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. Vessels meeting these requirements would receive endorsements based on landings in the primary Endorsement Qualifying Period (EQP) of 1/1/92 - 12/31/94. Additional endorsement periods between 6/29/80 - 6/25/83 for will be used for Dutch Harbor Red King Crab, and 6/29/85 - 6/25/1988 for Pribilof Blue King Crab. To receive endorsements for either of the latter two species, a vessel must also have made a landing in any federally managed crab fishery during the primary EQP above, as well as in the GQP. Participants in the Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab fisheries, and Pribilof Red King Crab fisheries will be exempt from the requirements of the GQP, and must have made landings between 1/1/93 - 12/31/94.

If option 10,000 is chosen, then a single license for all species and areas will be given to those vessels that made qualifying landings in the both the GQP (1/1/88 - 6/27/92) and in the EQP (1/1/92 - 12/31/94), with the exception of Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab summer fishery and Pribilof Red King Crab fisheries. Vessels participating in these fisheries will be exempt from requirements of the GQP, and must have made landings between 1/1/93 - 12/31/94 60

A General License Qualifying Period (GQP) of 1/1/88 - 6/27/92, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to crab from groundfish under the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. Vessels meeting these requirements would receive endorsements based on landings in the primary Endorsement Qualifying Period (EQP) of 6/28/89 - 6/27/92. Additional endorsement periods between 6/29/80 - 6/25/83 will be used for Dutch Harbor Red King Crab, and 6/29/85 - 6/25/1988 for Pribilof Blue King Crab. To receive endorsements for either of the latter two species, a vessel must also have made a landing in any federally managed crab fishery during the primary EQP above, as well as in the GQP. A single endorsement qualifying period between 1/1/93 - 12/31/94 will be in effect for Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab fisheries, and for Pribilof Red King Crab. Participants in these last three fisheries will be exempt from the requirements of the GQP.

If option 10,000 is chosen, then a single license for all species and areas will be given to those vessels that made qualifying landings in the both the GQP (1/1/88 - 6/27/92) and in the EQP (6/28/89 - 6/127/92), with the exception of Norton Sound Red and Blue King Crab and Pribilof Red King Crab fisheries. Vessels participating in these fisheries will be exempt from requirements of the GQP, and must have made landings between 1/1/93 - 12/31/94 70

→ For General Licenses, the Qualifying Period (QP) is 1/1/88 - 6/27/92, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to crab from groundfish (by 12/31/94) under the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. Vessels meeting these requirements would receive endorsements based on landings in the Endorsement Qualifying Period (EQP) of 1/1/92 - 12/31/94, except Bristol Bay red king crab which will use 1/1/91-12/31/94 as the endorsement qualifying period. (Vessels in the Norton Sound King Crab fisheries, and Pribilof King Crab fisheries will be exempt from the requirements of the GQP, and must have made landings between 1/1/93 - 12/31/94)[7] 80

Minimum landings

No minimum 1

1 landing for Red & Blue King, 3 landings for Brown King, *C. opilio*, & *C. bairdi* 2

3 landings of King or Tanner crab from federally managed fisheries during the qualifying period 3

[7] The Council passed an amendment in this section stating that a vessel which qualifies for a Norton Sound King Crab endorsement, would not be issued other endorsements. The Council's intent is that a vessel not be allowed to participate in both the Norton Sound fishery and another BSAI crab fishery in the same year. The Council's intent is best implemented by maintaining the current super-exclusive registration for the Norton Sound fishery, and allowing persons to receive any and all endorsements for which the vessel qualifies.

→ 2 Severe penalties may be invoked for failure to comply with conditions of the license.

→ 3 Licenses may be suspended or revoked for serious and/or multiple violations. (The Council recommends NMFS consult with the Coalition for Stability in Marine Financing regarding license revocation concerns.)

→ 4 Implement a Skipper Reporting System which requires groundfish license holders to report skipper names, address, and service records to NMFS.

→ 5 An analysis of the impact of various rent collection levels and mechanisms, and enforcement and program implementation costs is required.

→ 6 Vessels targeting non-groundfish species (salmon, crab, etc.) that are currently allowed to land incidentally taken groundfish without a groundfish permit, will be allowed to continue to land bycatch amounts. Additionally, vessels participating in the Sablefish and Halibut IFQ program would continue to be able to land bycatch amounts of groundfish as specified in regulations governing that program.

→ 7 Vessels which qualified for the NPFMC license limitation program that have been lost or destroyed are still eligible to receive earned licenses and endorsements, subject to rules and conditions outlined in this program.

→ 8 Vessels which qualify under the moratorium and were lost, damaged, or otherwise out of the fishery due to factors beyond the control of the owner and which were replaced or otherwise reentered the fisheries in accordance with the moratorium rules and which made a landing in a fishery any time between the time the vessel left the fishery and 6/17/95, will be qualified for a general license and endorsement for that area.

→ 9 Vessels which receive an "empty umbrella" because they qualified under the GQP in one FMP and made landings during the EQP in the other FMP, would be issued endorsements and a general license for the FMP area and FMP subareas for which they meet the Endorsement Landings Requirements.

→ 10 The CDQ vessel exemption included in the Moratorium will continue under the Groundfish License Limitation Program. This exemption allows vessels <125' obtained under an approved CDQ plan to participate in both CDQ and non-CDQ fisheries. If the vessel is sold to an interest outside the CDQ plan, the vessel will no longer be exempt from the requirements of the license program.

→ 11 Each element and component of the Groundfish and Crab license limitation program as described in this action are integral to the overall program. No component or element of the program should be regarded as severable by the Secretary of Commerce.

→ 12 Buy-back or Retirement programs for vessels or licenses will not be implemented at this time.

→ 13 The Two-Tiered Skipper License Program will not be implemented at this time. Future analysis of a license program for skippers, based on the amended program outlined by SEA, will be set on its own time line.

→ 14 Community Development Licenses will not be a part of the Community Development Program.

→ 15 The Council will consider options to compensate vessel owners who qualified for Southeast Outside endorsements using trawl gear, if and when individual quota programs are studied.

→ 16 The option to allow vessels which are designated as catcher vessels to add limited amounts of processing capability will not be allowed under this action. This option will be further analyzed when the Council addresses "Full Utilization."

→ 17 A sunset date on the Groundfish License Program will not be set at this time.

3. No more than 2 area licenses (endorsements) may be used on a vessel in a given year.
4. No more than 3 area licenses (endorsements) may be used on a vessel in a given year.
5. No more than 4 area licenses (endorsements) may be used on a vessel in a given year.
6. No more than 5 area licenses (endorsements) may be used on a vessel in a given year.

Vessel Designation Limits (Choose 1 of 2 options)

1 A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations (i.e., both as a CV and as a CP or as both inshore and offshore) under the use restriction component will be able to participate under any designation for which it qualifies. Vessel designations will be based on **activities** during most recent year of participation, through 1994.

2. A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations under the use restriction component must choose a single designation.

→ 3. A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations (i.e., both as a CV and as a CP) under the use restriction component will be able to participate under any designation for which it qualifies. CV/CP designations will be based on **activities** during 1/1/94-6/17/95 or the most recent year of participation during the EQP. If a vessel qualifies as a CP only it may select a one-time (permanent) conversion to a CV, though a CP may operate in either mode. If a vessel qualifies as a CV only, it is restricted to operate as a CV.

Buy-back/Retirement Program (Choose 1 of 3 options)

→ 1. No buy-back/retirement program.
2. Fractional license system. (Fractional licenses may be issued to vessel owners at the time of landing and/or permit holders.)
3. Industry Funded Buy-back Program with right of first refusal on all transfers of licenses.

Two-Tiered Skipper License Program (Choose 1 of 2 options)

→ 1* Do not implement a Two-Tiered Skipper License Program. The Council recommends that this program should be deleted from the license limitation package at this time. Future analysis of a license limitation program for skippers, based on the amended program outlined by SEA, will be set on its own time line.
2. Implement a Two-Tiered Skipper License Program.

Community Development Quotas

1. No CDQ allocations
2. 3% of any or all groundfish TACs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
3. 7.5% of any or all groundfish TACs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
4. 10% of any or all groundfish TACs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
5. 15% of any or all groundfish TACs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.

→ 6. 7.5% of all BSAI groundfish TACs not already covered by a CDQ program, and a pro-rata share of PSC will be allocated to CDQ Communities as defined in the current CDQ program, with the addition of Akutan. PSC will be allocated "off the top" before the trawl/non-trawl split. The Groundfish CDQ program will be patterned after current CDQ program but will not contain a sunset provision.

Community Development Licenses

→ 1. No Community Development Licenses.
2. Grant an additional 3% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
3. Grant an additional 7.5% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
4. Grant an additional 10% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
5. Grant an additional 15% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.

Other Provisions

→ 1 Licenses represent a use privilege. The Council may convert the license program to an IFQ program or otherwise alter or rescind the program without compensation to license holders.

→ 2. Licenses may be transferred without a vessel, i.e., licenses may be applied to vessels other than the one to which the license initially was issued, subject to license designations, and the "20% rule" and "maximum LOA" in the moratorium regulations, and the "no leasing" restriction. Licenses may be applied to vessels shorter than the "maximum LOA" regardless of vessel class designations, i.e. "downgrades" in vessel classes are allowed.

Options Regarding the Separability of Species and/or Area Designations (Choose 1 of 3 options)

1. Area designations are not separable, and shall remain as a single license with those initial designations.
2. Species and/or Area designations shall be treated as separable licenses and may be transferred as such.
3. Species and/or Area designations shall be regarded as separable endorsements which require the owner to also own a general license before use or purchase.

→ 4. Area endorsements are not separable, and shall remain as a single "package," which includes the assigned CV/CP and vessel length class designations. Crab and groundfish licenses that are initially issued to a person (as defined under "License Recipients") are not separable and shall remain as a block for a period of three years. After which time, the Council may review whether or not the groundfish and crab licenses should remain non-severable. Groundfish Licenses obtained after the initial allocation will not be combined with any other licenses owned by the person, and will remain a separate license.

Vessel Replacement and Upgrades (Choose 1 of 4 options)

1. No restrictions on vessel replacement or upgrades, except that the vessel must meet the "Use Restrictions" (License Designations) defined by the initial allocation.
2. Vessel may not be replaced or upgraded.
3. Vessel may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% Rule defined in the moratorium proposed rule.
4 Catcher-Vessels would be allowed to upgrade to enable a limited amount of processing at sea. The limit would be set at one level within the range from 5 mt to 18 mt (round weight) per day.

→ 5. Vessels may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% Rule as defined in the moratorium proposed rule. If a vessel upgrades under the "20% rule" to a length which falls into a higher vessel length designation after 6/17/95, then the vessel owner would receive the license and endorsements, but could not use them on that vessel.[3]

License Ownership Caps (Choose 1 of 7 options)

1. No limit on the number of licenses or endorsements which may be owned by a "person."
2 No more than 5 general licenses per person with grandfather provisions.
3. No more than 10 area licenses per person with grandfather provisions.
4. No more than 15 area licenses per person with grandfather provisions.
5. No more than 5 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.
6. No more than 10 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.
7. No more than 15 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.

→ 8. No more than 10 general licenses per person with grandfather provisions to those persons who exceed this limit in the initial allocation. The intent of the Council is that this limit is applied to the "person" as defined under "License Recipients," and is not interpreted to apply to individual owners within corporations or partnerships.

Vessel License Use Caps (Choose 1 of 6 options)

→ 1. No limit on the number of licenses (or endorsements) which may be used on a vessel.
2. No more than 1 area license (endorsement) may be used on a vessel in a given year.

---

[3] This is an issue for vessels which have an original qualifying length >50' LOA but less than 60' LOA, or vessels which have an original qualifying length greater than 103' LOA but less than 125'. If these vessels upgrade to the full extent allowed by the "20% rule" after 6/17/95, they will have exceeded the length allowed by the vessel length class designations.

→ To receive a Red or Blue King crab species/area endorsement a vessel must have made at least one landing in a Red or Blue King crab fishery in the endorsement list above during the EQP. To receive a Brown King crab species/area endorsement, a vessel must have made at least three landings in the Brown King crab fishery during the Endorsement Qualifying Period (EQP) of 1/1/92 to 12/31/94. To receive a combined *C. opilio/ C. bairdi* crab species/area endorsement, a vessel must have made at least three landings in the *C. opilio/ C. bairdi* crab fisheries during the EQP. 4

1.3.4 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses

Who May Purchase Licenses

→ 1. Licenses could be transferred only to "persons" defined as those eligible to document a fishery vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46 U.S.C. There shall be no leasing of crab licenses.
2. Licenses could be transferred to "persons" with 76% or more U.S. ownership, with "grandfather" rights for license recipients with 75% or less U.S. ownership (Chapter 802, Title 46 U.S.C.).
3. Licenses are non-transferable.

Vessel/License Linkages

1. Vessel must be transferred with license.
2 Licenses may be transferred without a vessel, i.e., licenses may be applied to vessels other than the one to which the license initially was issued. License transfers are subject to the 20% Rule defined in the moratorium and the vessel class designations selected.
→ 3. Licenses may be transferred without a vessel, i.e., licenses may be applied to vessels other than the one to which the license initially was issued, subject to license designations, and the "20% rule" and "maximum LOA" in the moratorium regulations, and the "no leasing" restriction. Licenses may be applied to vessels shorter than the "maximum LOA" regardless of vessel class designations, i.e., "downgrades" in vessel classes are allowed.

Options Regarding the Separability of Species and/or Area Designations

1 Species/area endorsements are not separable, and shall remain as a single "block" or "package."
2. Species or Area designations shall be treated as separable licenses and may be transferred as such.
3 Species/area endorsements shall be regarded as separable with the requirement that the new owner also own a general crab license before use.
→ 4. Species/area endorsements are not separable, and shall remain as a single "package," which includes the assigned CV/CP and vessel length class designations. Crab and groundfish licenses that are initially issued to a person (as defined under "License Recipients") are not separable and shall remain as a block for a period of three years, after which time the Council may review whether or not the groundfish and crab licenses should remain non-severable. Crab Licenses obtained after the initial allocation will not be combined with any other licenses owned by the person, and will remain a separate license.

Vessel Replacement and Upgrades

1. No restrictions on vessel replacement or upgrades, except that the vessel must meet the "License Designations" defined by the initial allocation.
2. Vessel may not be replaced or upgraded.
3. Vessels may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% Rule defined in the moratorium proposed rule.
→ 4. Vessels may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% Rule as defined in the moratorium proposed rule. If a vessel upgrades under the "20% rule" to a length which

falls into a higher vessel length designation after 6/17/95, then the vessel owner would receive the license and endorsements, but could not use them on that vessel.[8]

License Ownership Caps

1. No limit on the number of licenses or endorsements which may be owned by a "person."
2. No more than five general licenses per person, with grandfather provisions to those persons who exceed this limit in the initial allocation. The intent of the Council is that this limit is applied to the "person" as defined under "License Recipients," and is not interpreted to apply to individual owners within corporations or partnerships.
3. No more than 10 area licenses per person with grandfather provisions.
4. No more than 15 area licenses per person with grandfather provisions.
5. No more than 5 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.
6. No more than 10 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.
7. No more than 15 fishery/area endorsements per person with grandfather provisions.

Vessel License Use Caps

There is no limit on the number of licenses (or endorsements) which may be used on a vessel.

Vessel Designation Limits

A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations (i.e., both as a CV and as a CP) under the use restriction component will be able to participate under any designation for which it qualifies. Vessel designations will be based on **activities** during 1/1/94 - 12/31/94 or the most recent year of participation during the EQP. If a vessel qualifies as a CP only, it may select a one-time (permanent) conversion to a CV, though a CP may operate in either mode. If a vessel qualifies as a CV only, it is restricted to operate as a CV.

Buy-back/Retirement Program

1. No buy-back/retirement program.
2. Fractional license system. (Fractional licenses may be issued to permit holders.)
3. Industry Funded Buy-back Program with right of first refusal on all transfers of licenses.

Two-Tiered Skipper License Program

1 Do not implement a Two-Tiered Skipper License Program. The Council recommends that this program should be deleted from the license limitation package at this time. Future analysis of a license limitation program for skippers, based on the amended program outlined by SEA, will be set on its own time line. The Council would prefer that this time line parallel license limitation.

2. Implement a Two-Tiered Skipper License Program.

Community Development Quotas

1. No CDQ allocations
2. 3% of any or all GHLs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
3. 7.5% of any or all GHLs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
4. 10% of any or all GHLs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
5. 15% of any or all GHLs for CDQs patterned after current program w/o sunset provision.
6. For those BSAI Crab species for which there is an assigned Guideline Harvest Level, 7.5% of the GHL shall be allocated to CDQ communities, as defined in the current CDQ program, with the addition of Akutan. The Crab CDQ Program shall be patterned after current CDQ program but will not contain a sunset provision.

---

[8] This is an issue for vessels which have an original qualifying length >50' LOA but less than 60' LOA, or vessels which have an original qualifying length greater than 103' LOA but less than 125'. If these vessels upgrade to the full extent allowed by the "20% rule" after 6/17/95, they will have exceeded the length allowed by the vessel class designations.

Community Development Licenses

→ 1. No Community Development Licenses.
2. Grant an additional 3% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
3. Grant an additional 7.5% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
4. Grant an additional 10% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.
5. Grant an additional 15% non-transferable licenses to CDQs communities.

Other Provisions

→ 1 Licenses represent a use privilege. The Council may convert the license program to an IFQ program or otherwise alter or rescind the program without compensation to license holders.

→ 2 Severe penalties may be invoked for failure to comply with conditions of the license.

→ 3 Licenses may be suspended or revoked for serious and/or multiple violations. (The Council recommends NMFS consult with the Coalition for Stability in Marine Financing regarding license revocation concerns.)

→ 4 Implement a Skipper Reporting System which requires crab license holders to report skipper names, address, and service records to NMFS.

→ 5 An analysis of the impact of various rent collection levels and mechanisms, and enforcement and program implementation costs is required.

→ 6 No future super-exclusive areas will be proposed (this option is only an expression of Council intent).

→ 7 Vessels which qualified for the NPFMC license limitation program that have been lost or destroyed are still eligible to receive earned licenses and endorsements, subject to rules and conditions outlined in this program.

→ 8 Vessels which qualify under the moratorium and were lost, damaged, or otherwise out of the fishery due to factors beyond the control of the owner, and which were replaced or otherwise reentered the fisheries in accordance with the moratorium rules and which made a landing in a fishery any time between the time the vessel left the fishery and June 17, 1995 (the date of final Council action on the license program), will be qualified for a general license and endorsement for that fishery.

→ 9 The CDQ vessel exemption included in the Moratorium, will continue under the Crab License Limitation Program. This exemption allows vessels <125' obtained under an approved CDQ plan to participate in both CDQ and non-CDQ fisheries. If the vessel is sold to an interest outside the CDQ plan, the vessel will no longer be exempt from the requirements of the license program.

→ 10 Each element and component of the Groundfish and Crab License Limitation Program as described in this action are integral to the overall program. No component or element of the program should be regarded as severable by the Secretary of Commerce.

→ 11 An Individual Transferable Pot Quota (ITPQ) System will not be implemented at this time.

→ 12 Buy-back or Retirement programs for vessels or licenses will not be implemented at this time.

→ 13 The Two-Tiered Skipper License Program will not be implemented at this time. Future analysis of a license program for skippers, based on the amended program outlined by SEA, will be set on its own time line.

→ 14 Community Development Licenses will not be a part of the Community Development Program.

→ 15 A sunset date on the Crab License Program will not be set at this time

2.0 THE CURRENT FLEET

Throughout the development of the license limitation program Council staff has included information on the "current fleet" in the various analyses. This information was presented for the years prior to 1994 in the September 18, 1994 EA/RIR. Subsequent supplemental analyses have used either 1993 or 1994 data. This is the first iteration that uses 1994 data for both groundfish and crab. Information has been aggregated for the 1994 fleet in the same way it is aggregated in Chapter 3 for the licensed fleet, so that comparisons can be drawn and possible impacts inferred. In addition, the SSC, at their June 1995 meeting, advised staff that:

> "The appropriate basis of comparison for measuring relative fleet size effects is not clear. The document uses a 1993 snapshot as a measure of current participation (the license limitation document presented at the June 1995 SSC meeting). A single year may be an inappropriate measure of current participation patterns if annual participation patterns vary. If the moratorium is approved by the Secretary, the de facto current fleet size is established and should be used when considering relative fleet size (as opposed to the 1993 snapshot)."

Because the SSC stated that the appropriate basis of comparison for measuring the relative fleet size effects is not clear, this document will compare the Council's approved license program to both the 1994 fleet and the current moratorium qualified fleet. The moratorium fleet provides a bound on the maximum number of vessels that can fish groundfish in federal waters (noting that vessels < 32' in the BSAI, and < 26' in the GOA are exempt under the moratorium). The 1994 fleet summaries report the actual number of vessels that participated in the fisheries that calendar year. Appendix I provides tables which report the number of vessels that participated the groundfish fisheries during the 1988-1993 and 1995 calendar years. Similar tables are also included for vessels reporting crab landings during those years.

2.1 GROUNDFISH

A license limitation program is used to limit the size or growth of a fleet that is operating in a fishery. To determine the effectiveness of a limited entry program, policy makers first need to identify the magnitude of the problem. This often involves determining the size and attributes of the fleet before the license program is implemented. This information can then be compared to the fleet that will be licensed to determine potential changes in the fishery.

This document will use both the 1994 fishery and the moratorium as proxies for the "current fleet". Vessels that participated in 1994 and those that qualified for the moratorium will be summarized by the vessel owner's state of residence, vessel length, and catcher vessel/catcher processor designations. A similar table will be presented in chapter 3 for vessels qualifying under the license program. Comparing these tables will provide information on the number of vessels that participated in the fishery during 1994, the number of vessels that qualified for the groundfish moratorium, and those that would be qualified to fish if the license program is implemented. Armed with that information it is possible to estimate, at least in the short run, the impact on season lengths. Though these estimates may only be directional, they at least provide some feel for the impacts the program would have initially. Other tables presented in this section show the number of vessels that would be licensed by the owner's county/borough of residence and the participation history of vessels, in terms of pounds of fish landed by vessel class. The same vessel classes will be used in this document that Impact Assessment, Inc. used in their Social Impact Analysis dated March 1, 1995.

Table 2.1 shows the number of vessels that fished groundfish in 1994 by the vessel owner's state of residence, the vessel's length, and the vessel's catcher vessel/catcher processor designation. Table 2.2 shows the same information for moratorium qualified vessels. The vessel information is based on the license program's definitions. So, any vessel that changed its operation in 1995 would be classified in its new mode. For example, a vessel that operated as a catcher vessel in 1994 and as a catcher/processor in 1995 would be classified as a

Table 2.1 Vessels That Fished Groundfish During 1994

	Alaska									Other								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Other
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	4	3	0	7	1	3	7	11	18	7	21	14	42	2	16	45	63	105
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	45	24	1	70	1	6	12	19	89	16	86	23	125	2	31	64	97	222
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	534	81	0	615	3	6	7	16	631	122	78	10	210	1	24	24	49	259
SEO (Vessels Fished)	484	19	0	503	1	2	2	5	508	79	13	0	92	1	10	10	21	113
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	86	15	2	103	1	3	8	12	115	17	45	12	74	1	16	16	33	107
TOTAL SUBAREAS FISHED	1,153	142	3	1,298	7	20	36	63	1,361	241	243	59	543	7	97	159	263	806
BSAI/GOA Vessels	36	22	1	59	2	6	10	18	77	17	60	15	92	1	27	34	62	154
BSAI Only Vessels	11	2	0	13	0	0	2	2	15	1	31	8	40	1	5	31	37	77
GOA Only Vessels	966	83	1	1,050	1	1	0	2	1,052	173	45	1	219	0	1	0	1	220
TOTAL VESSELS	1,013	107	2	1,122	3	7	12	22	1,144	191	136	24	351	2	33	65	100	451

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	11	24	14	49	3	19	52	74	123
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	61	110	24	195	3	37	76	116	311
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	656	159	10	825	4	30	31	65	890
SEO (Vessels Fished)	563	32	0	595	2	12	12	26	621
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	103	60	14	177	2	19	24	45	222
TOTAL SUBAREAS FISHED	1,394	385	62	1,841	14	117	195	326	2,167
BSAI/GOA Vessels	53	82	16	151	3	33	44	80	231
BSAI Only Vessels	12	33	8	53	1	5	33	39	92
GOA Only Vessels	1,139	128	2	1,269	1	2	0	3	1,272
TOTAL VESSELS	1,204	243	26	1,473	5	40	77	122	1,595

catcher/processor in the 1994 data. This scheme will classify a vessel the same in the 1994 participation table, the moratorium qualified table, and the table of license qualified vessels.

Table 2.2. Vessels That Qualified to Fish Groundfish Under the Moratorium (RAM Dataset on NMFS Home Page as of 6/17/96)

Vessel Qualified to Fish These Moratorium Species	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska Total	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Other Total
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total		<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Groundfish	1,702	81	-	1,783	2	5	6	13	1,796	475	130	16	621	1	20	56	77	698
Groundfish and Crab	257	125	8	390	-	1	-	1	391	46	198	69	313	1	12	42	55	368
Total Vessels	1,959	206	8	2,173	2	6	6	14	2,187	521	328	85	934	2	32	98	132	1,066

Vessel Qualified to Fish These Moratorium Species	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Groundfish	2,177	211	16	2,404	3	25	62	90	2,494
Groundfish and Crab	303	323	77	703	1	13	42	56	759
Total Vessels	2,480	534	93	3,107	4	38	104	146	3,253

The license limitation program data base indicated that 1,595 vessels reported groundfish catches during 1994. Catcher vessels accounted for over 92% (1,473) of these vessels. The remaining 122 vessels were catcher processors. Most of the catcher vessels (86%) fished only the GOA. These vessels tended to be < 60' LOA. Eighty of the catcher processors fished in both the BSAI and GOA, 39 fished the BSAI only, and 3 fished the GOA only. This distribution of the areas fished based on the vessel's size indicates that small vessels tend to fish only the GOA. Larger vessels, on the other hand, fish the BSAI or the BSAI in conjunction with the GOA.

Alaskans owned 1,144 (71%) of the vessels that reported catch in 1994. The remaining 451 vessels were owned by U.S. citizens that live in other states. When the ownership discussions are limited to vessels ≥60' LOA, the percentages are reversed. Almost 67% of this portion of the fleet is owned by "persons" living in other states. Vessels less than 60' LOA made up almost 76% of the North Pacific groundfish fleet in 1994. Vessels in the 60-125' LOA class are the next largest segment of the fleet. Vessels in this length class accounted for almost 18% of the groundfish fleet and largest vessel class made up the remaining 6%. This distribution is not an indication of the catching power of each segment of the fleet. Section 2.1.2 will provide more information on the distribution of various classes of vessels.

The 1,209 vessels < 60' LOA fished a total of 1,408 FMP subareas in 1994. This means that on average each vessel fished in less than 1.2 FMP subareas. The average vessel 60-125' LOA fished just under 1.8 FMP subareas. Finally, vessels ≥125' LOA fished an average of almost 2.5 FMP subareas. As expected, this information shows that large vessels are more mobile and tend to rely on several areas when fishing. Small vessels seem to be better equipped to make a living fishing in only one area. However, small vessels may diversify in other ways. For example, these vessels may troll or seine salmon, or fish for sablefish/halibut under the IFQ program, as well as fish groundfish.

The vessels that qualified to fish under the moratorium are presented in Table 2.2. These numbers are based on the RAM data set available to the general public on the NMFS Alaska Region Home Page. The Home Page can be found on the Internet at the following address:

http://wwwfak.afsc.noaa.gov/akr-home.htm.

A total of 3,253 vessels were listed in this data set as qualifying to fish groundfish under the moratorium. Just under 77% of these vessels qualified to fish only groundfish. The remaining 23% qualified to fish both groundfish and crab.

Alaskan residents owned 2,187 (67%) of moratorium qualified vessels. Residents of other states owned the remaining 1,066 vessels. Alaskan residents typically owned small catcher vessels (<60' LOA). Almost 90% of the qualified Alaskan owned vessels were in that category. Of the remaining vessels, 206 were catcher vessels between 60 and 125' LOA, eight were catcher vessels ≥125' LOA, and 14 were catcher processors. Residents of other states also typically owned small catcher vessels. However, their fleet was more evenly distributed between large and small vessels. Small (<60') catcher vessels comprised about 49% of their moratorium qualified fleet. Medium size catcher vessels accounted for about 31% of the other state's fleet, and large catcher vessels (≥125' LOA) about 8%. The catcher processor vessels comprised just over 12% of the other state's fleet. About 75% of the other state's catcher processors were ≥125' LOA.

2.2 GROUNDFISH VESSEL CLASSES

Council staff has grouped vessels into classes based on a vessel's size, designation (catcher vessel or catcher processor), and gear type. Impact Assessment, Inc. used these vessel classes in their description of the fleet for the March 1, 1995 Social Impact analysis. A complete list of the vessel class definitions is presented in Appendix II. These vessel classes will be used to report the 1994 groundfish catch within species groups. A list of the species included in each of the groups is given below.

Species Group	Species Included in the Group
Pollock	Pollock
Pacific cod	Pacific Cod
Rockfish	Pacific Ocean Perch, Thornyheads, Other Red Rockfish, Pelagic Rockfish, Northern, Sharpchin, Shortraker, Rougheye, and Other Rockfish
Flatfish	Rock Sole, Yellowfin Sole, Flathead Sole, Deep Water Flats, Shallow Water Flats, Rex Sole, Greenland Turbot, Arrowtooth, and Other Flatfish
Other Groundfish	Atka Mackerel, Sablefish, Squid, and All Other Species

Table 2.3 lists the catch history and number of vessels within a class that fished during 1994. In terms of the number of vessels participating in the fishery, seine vessels that also used pot gear (SEN/PH2) and small longline vessels (LH2) accounted for the largest portion of the fleet. These two vessel classes represented over 44% of the vessels that fished groundfish. While these two classes account for a large number of the vessels they did not account for an equally large percentage of the total catch. During 1994 over 2.0 million metric tons of groundfish was reported as being caught from the North Pacific. The two vessel classes harvested only about 7,500 mt, or less than 1% of the total reported catch. The TP1 vessel class (trawler processor 1) represented only 24 (1.5%) of the vessels that fished. However, this class of vessels accounted for 685,000 mt of reported groundfish catch. This equates to almost 30% of the 1994 catch. It is clear that this fleet of large trawl catcher processors possesses a significant portion of the fleet's catching power.

The ability of the small vessel to harvest fish is somewhat understated in this discussion. Many of the vessels in the small longline or seine classes depend on other fisheries to help sustain their viability. These vessels may also fish halibut, black cod, herring, or salmon during the year. Harvest of those species is not included here. Some of these vessels may actually rely more on these fisheries to earn most of their income. Should each of these vessels begin fishing groundfish full time, they could have fairly large increases in output. A discussion of these potential increases in groundfish harvests is presented in Appendix 1 of the June 2, 1995 Supplemental Analysis.

Appendix III of this document contains additional information on the groundfish vessels that participated in the 1994 fishery. Breakdowns by the vessel owner's county/borough of residence and the areas they fished are included. This information will be especially useful when comparing similar tables for the vessels that qualify for the license program. Making these comparisons will show how the local distribution of licenses might change if the license program is implemented.

Table 2.4 reports the distribution of moratorium qualified vessels by vessels class. The same classes are used for the moratorium qualified vessels as were used for the 1994 fleet, and will be used for the license qualified vessels in Chapter 3. Because the moratorium qualification period was January 1, 1988 through February 9, 1992 with an extended qualifying period for vessels that crossed over from crab to groundfish after the base qualifying period ended, the pounds of catch by each class are not reported in this table. This table only reports the number of vessels by class that qualify for a groundfish only or groundfish and crab moratorium permit.

We reported earlier that most of the vessels qualifying for the moratorium were small catcher vessels. These vessels are generally longliners, seiners, or gillnet boats. The vessel class information indicates that this is the case. The LH2 class (longliners <58' LOA) had the most vessels (734). Seine vessels were divided into four groups Chignik seiners (CSEN*), Seiners that also used pot gear (SEN/PH2), seiners that also used trawl gear (SEN/TH4), and seiners that used other gear (SEN*). Combined, these four seine classes accounted for 1,174 of the moratorium qualified vessels.

Table 2.3 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1994

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1994					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	3	11	315	3,712	4	102	4,147
CSEN*	8	0	6	173	0	2	189
DRG	5	44	16	435	46	4	550
GL1*	163	14	30	575	0	146	928
GL2*	79	7	11	156	0	43	296
LH1	53	352	788	3,331	66	139	4,729
LH2	324	95	3	849	0	191	1,462
LP1	38	306	14,201	68,052	2,706	381	85,684
MSC	30	162	4	144	1	14	355
PCP1	4	4	345	3,518	13	5	3,889
PH1	3	0	0	903	0	0	906
PH1*	2	0	0	1,361	6	0	1,369
PH2	17	0	5	1,069	0	4	1,095
PH2*	62	37	45	9,191	1	34	9,370
SEN*	120	18	21	556	1	109	825
SEN/PH2	382	28	59	5,753	20	251	6,493
SEN/TH4	93	549	53	15,563	10,029	37	26,324
TH1	15	6,871	509	5,638	149,625	61	162,719
TH1*	6	743	22	1,043	50,514	6	52,334
TH2	10	2,566	360	6,991	59,863	22	69,812
TH2*	44	9,528	741	22,615	216,668	132	249,728
TH3	14	1,471	245	8,440	18,752	23	28,945
TH3*	50	6,659	606	11,955	49,633	330	69,233
TP1	24	38,580	14,102	15,748	615,853	753	685,060
TP2	13	37,699	16,736	16,845	148,733	7,164	227,190
TP3	18	111,450	76,574	22,369	36,966	19,570	266,947
TP3*	15	31,768	15,419	17,613	12,524	3,950	81,289
Total	1,595	248,962	141,216	244,598	1,372,024	33,473	2,041,868

Any class with an asterisk at the end means those vessels used more gear types than is indicated in the name. For example, a PH2 may have used pot gear to harvest crab and trawl gear for groundfish.

Trawl catcher processors were classified as Surimi processors (TP1), fillet processors (TP2), and H&G processors (TP3 and TP3*). There were a total of 75 vessels in these classes. Longline and pot vessels accounted for the remaining catcher processors.

Table 2.4 Moratorium Qualified Vessels By Class

Vessel Class	Groundfish	Groundfish and Crab	Total Vessels
CP1	-	13	13
CP1/LP1	-	13	13
CSEN*	33	15	48
DRG	17	1	18
GL1*	237	1	238
GL2*	154	1	155
LH1	82	-	82
LH2	734	-	734
LP1	36	8	44
MSC	162	5	167
PCP1	1	8	9
PH1	-	43	43
PH1*	-	3	3
PH2	-	105	105
PH2*	23	139	162
SEN*	274	1	275
SEN/PH2	483	230	713
SEN/TH4	89	49	138
TH1	12	8	20
TH1*	2	11	13
TH2	15	3	18
TH2*	16	49	65
TH3	30	7	37
TH3*	42	23	65
TP1	14	8	22
TP2	16	2	18
TP3	17	3	20
TP3*	5	10	15
Total Vessels	2,494	759	3,253

2.3 CRAB

A total of 345 vessels reported 1994 crab landings for species/areas included in the license limitation program (Table 2.5). These vessels fished 575 separate species/area combinations. Additional vessels may have fished during 1994 but would not be included in the tables. Vessels fishing exclusively for Brown King crab in the Bering Sea would be an example. The Council chose to classify non-endorsement fisheries as "developing" under the license program. Anyone holding a valid North Pacific crab license will be allowed to participate in these fisheries. For consistency between the tables in this section and those in Chapter 3, only the endorsement fisheries will be reported.

Table 2.5 Vessels Participating in the 1994 Crab Fishery

Area/Species	Current Owner's State of Residence																	
	Alaska									Other								
	CV				CP				Alaska	CV				CP				Other
	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	Total
Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	2	77	11	90	0	0	1	1	91	1	145	35	181	0	2	20	22	203
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	5	11	0	0	0	0	11
St. Matthew Blue King	0	16	4	20	0	0	0	0	20	0	52	8	60	0	1	6	7	67
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	33	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	33	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pribilof Red & Blue King	5	33	1	39	0	0	0	0	39	1	55	10	66	0	0	0	0	66
Adak Brown King	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	8	6	14	0	0	0	0	14
Adak Red King	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	11	2	13	0	0	1	1	14
Total Area/Species	**40**	**137**	**19**	**196**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**197**	**5**	**277**	**66**	**348**	**0**	**3**	**27**	**30**	**378**
Total Vessels	**40**	**82**	**11**	**133**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**134**	**5**	**147**	**37**	**189**	**0**	**2**	**20**	**22**	**211**

Area/Species	Total								
	CV				CP				
	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	<60	60-125	≥ 125	Total	Licenses
Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	3	222	46	271	0	2	21	23	294
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	8	6	14	0	0	0	0	14
St. Matthew Blue King	0	68	12	80	0	1	6	7	87
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	36	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	36
Pribilof Red & Blue King	6	88	11	105	0	0	0	0	105
Adak Brown King	0	11	7	18	0	0	0	0	18
Adak Red King	0	17	3	20	0	0	1	1	21
Total Area/Species	**45**	**414**	**85**	**544**	**0**	**3**	**28**	**31**	**575**
Total Vessels	**45**	**229**	**48**	**322**	**0**	**2**	**21**	**23**	**345**

Nearly 67% of the vessels that fished crab in 1994 were less than 125' LOA. Vessels in this size category are allowed to use a maximum of 200 pots. The vessels ≥ 125' LOA are allowed to fish a maximum of 250 pots.

Only 45 vessels were < 60' LOA. These vessels were generally participants in the Norton Sound summer king crab fishery. Severe winter weather conditions often do not allow small vessels to fish outside state waters in the BSAI. This explains the limited small boat participation in many of the federal crab fisheries.

Over 85% (294) of the 1994 vessels fished for Bering Sea *Chionocetes bairdi* and *Chionocetes opilio*. This was the largest fishery in terms of both vessels participating and pounds harvested (Table 2.6). The Pribilof red/blue king crab and St. Matthew blue king crab fisheries had second and third largest number of participants. Still, the combined number of participants in these fisheries (192) was considerably smaller than those in the Bering Sea *C. bairdi* and *C. opilio* fishery. The fisheries with the least number of participants were the Adak red, Adak brown, and Dutch Harbor brown crab fisheries.

A total of 759 vessels qualified for both groundfish and crab permits under the moratorium (Table 2.2). These vessels qualify to fish all of the BSAI crab fisheries under federal management with their moratorium permit. However, the Norton Sound red and blue king crab fishery will continue to operate under the super-exclusive management scheme.

Unlike groundfish which were mostly small vessels, most of the crab vessels were in the 60-125' LOA category (323+13=336). Intuitively this makes sense, because most of the crab fisheries take place in areas and under conditions that require a larger vessel for safety and efficiency reasons.

2.4 CRAB VESSEL CLASSES

Like groundfish, vessels operating in the crab fisheries have been grouped into classes. The definitions of these classes are consistent with those used for groundfish and may be found in Appendix II. The PH2 class had the most vessels in the fishery (Table 2.6) during 1994. Vessels in this class are defined as being between 58 and 124' LOA and using only pot gear when fishing Pacific cod or crab. A total of 95 catcher vessels met these criteria. The next largest class of vessels was the PH2*. This vessel class is the same as PH2 except they were not limited to the use of pot gear in the groundfish fishery. This difference is denoted by the asterisk at the end of the vessel category. Any class with an asterisk at the end means those vessels used more gear types than is indicated in the name. For example, a PH2* may have used pot gear to harvest crab and trawl gear for groundfish.

Table 2.4 reports the number of vessels by vessel class that qualified for both groundfish and crab moratorium permits. Comparing the total number of vessels that qualified to fish crab under the moratorium (759) to the number that fished in 1994 (345), we see that over twice as many vessels received moratorium permits to fish crab as participated in the 1994 fishery. Table 2.4 also indicates that most of the moratorium qualified vessels were in the SEN/PH2 (230), PH2* (139), and PH2 (105) vessel classes.

Table 2.7 indicates the pounds of reported crab landings, in 1994, by vessel class. The PH2 and PH2* vessel classes accounted for the most reported catch. As shown earlier, they also accounted for the most vessels as well. Vessels in these classes reported 54.5 and 39.1 million pounds of crab landings respectively. Vessels that were defined as MSC, or miscellaneous vessels, made up over 11% of the vessels that fished in 1994, but only accounted for 0.3% of the reported catch. Miscellaneous vessels were generally small vessels that participated in the Norton Sound red or blue summer king crab, Pribilof red or blue king crab, or Bering Sea *C. bairdi* and *C. opilio* fishery. As for groundfish, Appendix III contains additional information on the 1994 crab fisheries by county/borough of residence of the participants.

Table 2.6 The Number of Vessels by Vessel Class, 1994

Vessel Class	Total Vessels	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. *opilio*	Dutch Harbor Brown King	St. Matthew Blue King	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	Pribilof Red & Blue King	Adak Brown King	Adak Red King	Total
CP1	8	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	11
CP1/LP1	13	13	0	4	0	0	0	1	18
CSEN*	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
DRG	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
LP1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
MSC	39	8	0	0	27	5	0	1	41
PCP1	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	4
PH1	33	32	6	8	0	8	7	1	62
PH1*	5	5	0	3	0	0	0	1	9
PH2	95	93	7	43	0	36	10	8	197
PH2*	85	84	0	20	0	35	0	8	147
SEN/PH2	9	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	9
SEN/TH4	4	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	4
TH1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TH1*	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
TH2*	29	28	1	3	0	7	1	1	41
TH3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
TH3*	10	8	0	2	0	5	0	0	15
TP3*	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
UNK	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	345	294	14	87	36	105	18	21	575

Any class with an asterisk at the end means those vessels used more gear types than is indicated in the name. For example, a PH2 may have used pot gear to harvest crab and trawl gear for groundfish

Table 2.7 The Number of Vessels and Pounds of Landings by Vessel Class, 1994

Vessel Class	Total Vessels	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. *opilio*	Dutch Harbor Brown King	St. Matthew Blue King	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	Pribilof Red & Blue King	Adak Brown K	Adak Red King	Total
CP1	8	9,020,000	0	143,758	0	0	0	0	9,163,758
CP1/LP1	13	13,900,000	0	206,425	0	0	0	6,663	14,113,088
CSEN*	1	0	0	0	5,684	0	0	0	5,684
DRG	1	811,630	0	0	0	24,847	0	0	836,477
LP1	2	1,270,000	0	0	0	13,284	0	0	1,283,284
MSC	39	309,407	0	0	169,892	50,329	0	1	529,629
PCP1	2	1,410,000	0	0	0	21,711	0	0	1,431,711
PH1	33	23,200,000	1,350,000	356,804	0	142,614	2,560,000	2,091	27,611,509
PH1*	5	3,950,000	0	245,167	0	0	0	41,724	4,236,891
PH2	95	50,700,000	340,591	1,590,000	0	422,521	1,390,000	93,816	54,536,928
PH2*	85	37,700,000	0	910,698	0	453,919	0	61,378	39,125,995
SEN/PH2	9	0	0	0	152,359	15,191	0	0	167,550
SEN/TH4	4	2,753	0	0	0	39,967	0	0	42,720
TH1	1	234,478	0	0	0	0	0	0	234,478
TH1*	4	1,410,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,410,000
TH2*	29	6,880,000	25,305	169,289	0	78,282	80,496	3,686	7,237,058
TH3	1	259,913	0	0	0	15,112	0	0	275,025
TH3*	10	2,500,000	0	59,230	0	58,257	0	0	2,617,487
TP3*	2	1,650,000	0	32,489	0	0	0	0	1,682,489
Unknown	1	415,116	0	0	0	0	0	0	415,116
Total	345	155,623,297	1,715,896	3,713,860	327,935	1,336,034	4,030,496	209,359	166,956,877

Any class with an asterisk at the end means those vessels used more gear types than is indicated in the name. For example, a vessel in the PH2 class may have used pot gear to harvest crab and trawl gear for groundfish.

3.0 COUNCIL APPROVED LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM

The Council selected the elements and options for the groundfish and crab license limitation programs, that would be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce (SOC), at their June 1995 meeting. This decision was made after reviewing information presented to the Council during meetings dating back to November 1992. Chapter 3 describes the elements and options selected by the Council and provides the Council's rationale for those choices. These options are compared to the current vessel moratorium. The distribution of licenses and endorsements under the Council's final programs also are presented in this chapter. Information also is presented on the vessels that reported landings between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995, but did not qualify for the areas they had fished. Some of these vessels may qualify for part of the areas they fished. Others would not qualify for a general license or any endorsements. These vessels will be removed from the fishery unless they purchase a license and endorsement package from a qualifier.

3.1 VESSEL MORATORIUM vs. LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM

Some major differences exist between the vessel moratorium and license limitation programs passed by the Council. The vessel moratorium is more liberal in terms of qualification criteria and the areas a vessel can fish. Under the moratorium a vessel was only required to make one landing between January 1, 1988 and February 9, 1992 to qualify. Once they met the qualification criteria, moratorium recipients would be allowed to fish groundfish anywhere in federal waters off Alaska's coast. However, the moratorium may be more restrictive in the gear a qualified vessel can use. Vessels that crossed-over from crab to groundfish between February 10, 1992 and December 11, 1994 will be required to fish that same type of gear under the moratorium that was used to land the groundfish during the secondary period. Vessels that crossed-over to groundfish from crab after the December 11, 1994 are restricted to the use of pot gear under the moratorium. These qualified vessels will not be restricted to a specific gear type under the license limitation program.

The eligibility period for the moratorium is January 1, 1988 through February 9, 1992. To meet the landings requirements for a moratorium permit, a vessel must have made one landing of a qualifying species, at any time during the eligibility period. Halibut and longline sablefish landings do not count towards earning a moratorium permit for groundfish. The landings requirements under the license programs are more complex and stringent. Vessels are required to have made at least one landing in both the Base Qualifying Period, or BQP (January 1, 1988 through June 27, 1992) and Endorsement Qualifying Period, or EQP (January 1, 1992 through June 17, 1995) to earn a groundfish license, in most instances. Some vessels in the larger size categories would be required to make landings in two of the four EQP calendar years. The license program's qualification criteria will be explained in detail in the next section. Because of the license program's dual qualification criteria, many fewer vessels will qualify than did for the moratorium. This is due to the entry and exit patterns exhibited by vessels that participate in the fisheries. About 35% of the vessels fished only one year and, therefore, would not qualify for a license under the dual qualification criteria (NPFMC, 1994 p.43). These mainly are small vessels that may depend more heavily on salmon, herring, halibut, or Southeast Outside Demersal shelf rockfish fisheries, which are not covered under the license program, than larger vessels.

The moratorium and license programs have different regulations on the types of gear a qualified vessel can use. Moratorium permits are gear specific, while the license program does not restrict the use of legal gear types (except in the SEO where the use of trawl gear would be prohibited). The moratorium will require NMFS to issue permits with specific gear restrictions for groundfish. Only pot gear may be legally used to harvest crab and this will continue under both the moratorium and license programs. A moratorium permit would not be valid without at least one gear endorsement. Four types of fishery/gear endorsements are proposed under the moratorium that comprise categories of fishing gear that are specifically authorized in Federal regulations (with respect to groundfish) or in State of Alaska regulations (with respect to crab). These fishery/gear endorsement categories are as follows:

a. Groundfish/trawl, includes groundfish pelagic and non-pelagic trawl gears as defined at 50 CFR part 672;

b. Crab/pot, includes crab pot gear as defined in the Alaska Administrative Code at title 5, Chapters 34 and 35;

c. Groundfish/pot, includes groundfish longline pot and pot-and-line gears as defined at 50 CFR part 672; and

d. Groundfish/hook, includes groundfish hook-and-line and jig gears as defined at 50 CFR part 672.

This means a groundfish vessel which was restricted to the use of pot gear under the moratorium, could use any legal gear under the license program. Vessels switching to gear with greater harvest potential could lead to additional catching power in the groundfish fishery.

The distribution of gear types issued on moratorium permits are listed below:

Gears Qualified for Under the Moratorium

Permitted Gear	Groundfish Vessels	Groundfish and Crab Vessels	Total Vessels
Pot	-	162	162
Pot and Trawl	-	5	5
Pot, Hook	-	15	15
Pot, Trawl, Hook	2,494	577	3,071
Total Vessels	2,494	759	3,253

The only vessels that are restricted in the types of legal gear they are allowed to use to harvest groundfish are the crab cross-over vessels. Information reported above shows that 162 vessels are restricted to using pot gear to harvest groundfish under the moratorium, five vessels can only use pot and trawl gear (they are precluded from using hook and line gear), and 15 vessels can only use pot and hook and line gear (they are precluded from using trawl gear). Only these 182 vessels are restricted in the type of legal gear they can use under the moratorium.

Though differences exist between the license limitation and vessel moratorium programs, the Council structured the license program's BQP to reflect the moratorium's qualifying period. The Council crafted the license program with this BQP so that, in general, only moratorium qualified vessels will receive licenses. However, some vessels will qualify for the license program that were not moratorium qualified. These vessels will qualify because the BQP is approximately five months longer than the moratorium qualifying period, and small boats using pot or jig gear during most of the EQP (through December 31, 1994) were not required to make landings during the BQP.

3.2 GROUNDFISH LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM - COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

This section focuses on the Council's adopted license limitation program for groundfish. First, the specific elements of the program are presented along with the Council's primary rationale for those selections. This provides the reader with information on the requirements a vessel must meet in order to qualify for the program. It also provides recipients with the rules they must abide by after the license is issued. We then present information on the distribution of licenses and endorsements. Then information regarding the vessels that made landings during the BQP, EQP, or both but did not meet the programs qualification requirements is presented.

3.2.1 Components and Elements Affecting Initial Assignment of Licenses

This section defines the elements of the license program that determine who will receive a license. Several questions had to be answered to flesh out a complete allocation program. These questions include who should be issued the license, what is required in order to qualify, and what the license will allow the holder to do. Each of these questions is answered below.

License Classes

A single type of groundfish license will be issued. The Council had considered an option that would grant two types of licenses. One type would have been issued if a more stringent qualifying criterion was met and a second type of license would be issued for meeting a less stringent criterion. The first type of license would have given the recipients more rights than the second license. For example, the Council discussed making the first license transferable while the second license could not be transferred. After deliberation, the Council concluded that a single qualification criterion and license was the preferred alternative. Selection of this alternative was justified because it was the most direct method of implementing the program, there was overwhelming public testimony in support of a single class of license, and the alternative would have allowed many more vessels into the program, many of which had not fished in recent years. It was the Council's desire to construct a license program that was effective, but as straight forward as possible, and required some level of recent participation in the fisheries.

Nature of Licenses

The Groundfish License Program will restrict access to groundfish fisheries in the EEZ off the Coast of Alaska; the License Program does not restrict access to waters of the State of Alaska. Non-severable area endorsements will be issued for the following management areas: AI, BS, WG, CG+WY, SEO. The endorsement would be contained under one of the following General License Umbrellas: GOA, BSAI, or GOA/BSAI. The Council selected non-severable general licenses and endorsements because they did not want vessels that qualify for both the GOA and BSAI to be able to use the GOA license on one vessel and the BSAI license on a second vessel. The Council felt that severable licenses/endorsements could allow more vessels to fish under the license program then were initially issued licenses. This was not their intent. The Council was also concerned that by allowing endorsements to be separated from the general license the current nature of the fleet could change. Their intent was to keep vessels operating in a consistent manner.

For license limitation, the Council chose to redesignate the West Yakutat area (140° to 147° West Longitude) as part of the Central Gulf rather than leaving it in its traditional place in the Eastern Gulf. This change was based on the composition of the fleets in these areas. Vessels fishing the West Yakutat area tended to have more fishing history in and ties to the Central Gulf than the Eastern Gulf. These vessels were often larger than the typical vessels fishing east of 140° West Longitude. Also, they were often home ported in Central Gulf communities.

Consideration was given to species that are not included in the groundfish license program. Demersal Shelf Rockfish (DSR) in waters east of 140° W, and fixed gear sablefish fall into this category. The State of Alaska indicated that they intended to initiate a separate license program for DSR, which they currently manage with trip limits. For this reason, the Council chose to exclude DSR from their license program. Fixed-gear sablefish is already managed under an IFQ program.

License Recipients

Licenses will be issued to current owners (as of June 17, 1995) of qualified vessels. The owners on this date must be "persons eligible to document a fishing vessel" under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C. In cases where the vessel was sold on or before June 17, 1995, and the disposition of the fishing rights was not mentioned in the contract, the catch history would go with the vessel. If the transfer occurred after June 17, 1995, the fishing rights would stay with the seller of the vessel unless the contract specified otherwise. If at the time of issuance there is a

dispute concerning the fishing history or license qualification, NMFS will not issue the license until a settlement is reached by the parties involved.

The Council wished to issue licenses to current vessel owners as of June 17, 1995 in order to minimize disruption in the fishery. Issuing licenses to current owners generally results in a one vessel - one license allocation. This was seen as a means to limit the number of licenses that would be issued. It also "rewards" the individuals that were participating in the fishery at the time of final action, as opposed to individuals who had already left the fishery. These were both viewed as favorable outcomes because they would least disrupt the fishery.

The Council had also considered issuing licenses to vessel owners at the time of landing and to permit holders. The vessel owners at time of landing were rejected, in part, because they would have increased the number of license recipients, are not currently in the fishery using that vessel, and tracking ownership history through time would have been difficult. Issuing licenses to permit holders was rejected because they had not made the same level of investment in the fishery as vessel owners, and it would have increased the number of licenses issued.

License Designations

Licenses and endorsements will be designated as Catcher Vessel or Catcher Processor and with one of three Vessel Length Classes (<60', ≥60' but <125', or ≥125' LOA). In the SEO, an additional designation allowing the use of legal fixed gear only will be assigned, regardless of the gear used to qualify for the endorsement. A more complete discussion of this alternative is presented in the June 2, 1995 Supplemental Analysis (see pages 14-22). Catcher processor or catcher vessel designations will be determined based on the activities of the vessel during January 1, 1994 through June 17, 1995 or the most recent year of participation during the EQP. Vessel Length Classes will be based on the length overall of the vessel as of June 17, 1995, as long as the vessel conforms with the provisions of the '20% upgrade' and 'Maximum LOA' rules defined in the moratorium.[9] Owners of vessels which have upgraded beyond the "Maximum LOA" would receive licenses and endorsements, but these licenses and endorsements could not be assigned to the qualifying vessel. For example, a vessel that is 58' LOA on June 24, 1992 would be able to upgrade to 70' LOA under the license program. If the vessel's owner had violated the rules of the proposed moratorium and upgraded the vessel to 72' LOA, as of June 27, 1995, the owner would be issued a license in the 60-125' LOA category but could not use the license on his vessel. The vessel owner would need to purchase a new vessel ≤ 70' LOA, reduce the size of his current vessel to 70' LOA, or buy a new license good for a 72' LOA vessel in order to continue fishing under the license program.

The Council felt that catcher vessel/catcher processor designations and vessel length categories were important to the groundfish license program. These categories were viewed as mechanisms to prevent unnecessary and undue movement of capital between groups of vessels. License designations were also felt to aid the Council's

---

[9] Maximum LOA (*the "20% rule" from the moratorium regulations*) with respect to a vessel means the greatest LOA of that vessel or its replacement that may qualify it to use a moratorium permit to catch and retain moratorium crab species or conduct directed fishing for moratorium groundfish species during the moratorium, except as provided at § 676.4(d). The maximum LOA of a vessel with moratorium qualification will be determined by the Regional Director as follows:

(1) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is less than 125 ft LOA, the maximum LOA will be equal to 1.2 times the vessel's original qualifying length or 125 ft, which ever is less; and

(2) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is equal to or greater than 125 ft, the maximum LOA will be equal to the vessel's original qualifying length.

Original qualifying length with respect to a vessel means the LOA of the vessel on or before June 24, 1992.

Length overall of a vessel (*from 50 CFR § 672.2 & § 675.2*)means the horizontal distance, rounded to the nearest foot, between the foremost part of the stem and the aftermost part of the stern, excluding bowsprits, rudders, outboard motor brackets, and similar fitting or attachments. (*In instances when the length falls on a ½', the LOA is the nearest even number, e.g., 124'6" is LOA 124', and 125'6" is LOA 126'.*)

attempts to prevent preemption between vessel classes and provide a foundation for future steps in the CRP process.

SEO endorsements were designated as non-trawl gear only. This endorsement designation was selected in response to concerns raised by residents of Southeast Alaska. Council members supporting this provision felt that it "speaks directly to the problem statement of this entire comprehensive package . . . supporting the stability, economic well being, diversity of the seafood industry, and social needs of the communities dependent upon that industry." The SEO area was viewed as a unique fishery that supported many small fixed gear vessels. Many of these vessels traditionally had small amounts of groundfish landings, and vessels with greater catching power were seen as having the ability to preempt this small boat fleet. The major fishery impacted would be the Pacific ocean perch (POP) and pelagic shelf rockfish fisheries, typically prosecuted by a small number (4-5) of trawl catcher processors. This option was examined in some detail in the June 2, 1995 Supplemental Analysis (attached).

Qualifying Periods

For General Licenses, the Base Qualifying Period (BQP) is January 1, 1988 through June 27, 1992, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to groundfish from crab under the provisions of the proposed moratorium by June 17, 1995 would also qualify for a General License. For vessels under 60', the BQP is extended through December 31, 1994 when using pot or jig gear—recipients must choose one area endorsement if qualified for multiple endorsements. Vessels which qualify as "cross-overs" or because of the extended BQP would be allowed to use any legal gear to harvest groundfish. Vessel <60' which qualify through both the extended BQP and the "cross-over" provision will be given the choice of which scheme they will qualify under. This is important because it will impact the areas these vessels are licensed to fish.

The Council selected a BQP that was similar to the moratorium qualification period. The cut-off date was extended approximately four months to June 27, 1992 (as opposed to February 9, 1992 in the moratorium) to make it consistent with the Council's published cut-off date for qualification under CRP (control date was June 24, but the week ending date for Weekly Production Reports was June 27, so the date was modified to reflect our best available data). Vessels < 60' LOA, using pot/jig gear, were given until December 31, 1994 to qualify. The Council granted this extension because they wished to promote the use of gear types they consider to have low discards. The addition of this group of harvesters to the qualified fleet was seen by the Council as having little impact on the overall catching power.

For Area Endorsements, the endorsement qualifying period is January 1, 1992 through June 17, 1995.

> The following exemptions are included in the License Limitation program: (1) vessels that were exempted from the proposed moratorium would also be exempt from the license limitation program (< 26' in the GOA and < 32' in the BSAI); and (2) vessels in the BSAI using jig gear that are less than 60' using a maximum of 5 machines, one line per machine, and a maximum of 15 hooks per line. Unlike the moratorium, any 'exempt' vessel which qualifies for a license would receive that license.

Vessels must have fished in the same FMP area during the BQP and EQP to receive a general license and subarea endorsements. The only exception to this rule is for vessels that fished only the GOA in the BQP and only the BSAI in the EQP, or vice versa. These vessels would be granted a license and endorsements for the areas they fished during the EQP and not the BQP. Otherwise, they would not have qualified for a license. Vessels that crossed-over from crab to groundfish were determined to have qualified in the BSAI during the BQP. This was viewed by the Council as equitable treatment between groundfish and crab vessels. Had the Council not selected this option, vessels that fished only crab in the base period could have qualified for both GOA and BSAI endorsements during the EQP. This treatment would have valued BQP crab landings more highly than BQP groundfish landings in the groundfish license program. A complete listing of potential BQP and EQP participation patterns and the resulting potential endorsement areas are provided on the next page.

The Council selected January 1, 1992 through June 17, 1995 as the EQP. These dates were chosen to represent present participation in the groundfish fisheries as required in Section 303(b)(6)(A) of the Magnuson Act. Having an extended EQP (through June 17, 1995) was seen as providing vessel owners, currently involved in groundfish fisheries, the opportunity to earn endorsements in areas they currently, or recently, fish. This, of course, is predicated on the vessel meeting the criterion of historical dependence, Section 303(b)(6)(B) of the Magnuson Act, by making landings in the BQP.

Exemptions to the license program were provided for vessels < 26' LOA in the GOA, < 32' LOA in the BSAI, and < 60' LOA in the BSAI using jig gear (with limits on the amount of gear). The Council viewed these exemptions as a mechanism to allow entry level positions in the groundfish fishery. Individuals could purchase a small boat and fish in the federal waters off the coast of Alaska. In the future, these small boat owners may have the opportunity to purchase a larger vessel with a license. The Council felt that without the entry level ownership positions in the fishery, this opportunity may not be possible.

Participation in the Base Qualifying Period	Participation in the Endorsement Qualifying Period	Endorsement Eligibility
BSAI Groundfish or Crab	BSAI Groundfish	BSAI
BSAI Groundfish or Crab	BSAI and GOA Groundfish	BSAI
BSAI Groundfish or Crab	GOA Groundfish	GOA
GOA Groundfish	GOA Groundfish	GOA
GOA Groundfish	BSAI and GOA Groundfish	GOA
GOA Groundfish	BSAI Groundfish	BSAI
BSAI Groundfish or Crab and GOA Groundfish	BSAI Groundfish	BSAI
BSAI Groundfish or Crab and GOA Groundfish	GOA Groundfish	GOA
BSAI Groundfish or Crab and GOA Groundfish	BSAI and GOA Groundfish	BSAI & GOA
Vessel is < 60 ' and no base period landings	BSAI and/or GOA Groundfish with pot and/or jig gear.	One FMP Subarea Only
Vessel is < 60 ' with BSAI crab landings	BSAI and/or GOA Groundfish with pot and/or jig gear.	Choice -- See below.
These vessels may choose to qualify under the rules for "crab crossover" vessels or as "pot/jig" vessels. Choosing to qualify as "crab crossover" vessels will mean they qualify for only BSAI or GOA, but not both. Choosing to qualify as "pot/jig" vessels will mean selecting a single subarea endorsement.		

Landings Requirements for General License Qualification

One landing of any groundfish species included in the license program in the BQP (this includes landings made in State waters), or qualified "moratorium cross-over" vessels which "crossed-over" from crab by June 17, 1995. A single landing during the BQP was perceived by the Council as appropriate because it corresponded to the moratorium requirements, and the BQP was patterned after the moratorium.

Landings Requirements for Endorsement Qualification

The Council felt that significant differences exist between the fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Island areas. Because of these differences, it was decided that the endorsement qualification criteria should change depending on the fleet participating in the fisheries. In the Bering Sea/Aleutian Island areas, the fleet was viewed as being in an "industrialized fishery" that was fairly stable in its participation patterns. Vessels

that fish the Bering Sea tend to be larger vessels and return to that area year after year to participate in the pollock, Pacific cod, and/or flatfish fisheries. These vessels were typically not impacted by the minimum landings requirements that were analyzed. The Gulf of Alaska fleet was generally comprised of smaller vessels with more varied participation patterns. The vessels in this fleet, many under 60', were seen as relying on the Gulf groundfish stocks, often in addition to other fisheries, to complete their annual fishing cycle. A more complete discussion of these fleets will be presented later in this chapter. The Western GOA was seen as a special case due to its geographic location and the nature of its fisheries being similar to the BSAI. Often these vessels fish both the Western Gulf and the BSAI. Vessels fishing in this area were seen as needing the flexibility to qualify with one EQP landing. This provision will make the landings requirements the same for catcher vessels in the 60 to 125' LOA category in both the BSAI and Western Gulf.

Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands:
An FMP subarea endorsement will be issued if a vessel made at least one landing of a groundfish species included in the license program during the EQP, and the vessel qualified for a general license in that area. FMP subarea endorsements would be issued for the Bering Sea and/or Aleutian Islands subareas.

Gulf of Alaska:

(1) For all vessels < 60' in all GOA endorsement areas, an endorsement will be issued if the vessel made at least one landing in the area during the endorsement period (January 1, 1992 through June 17, 1995).

(2) For the Central Gulf + West Yakutat and Southeast Outside endorsement areas, all vessels ≥ 60' but less than 125', which made at least one landing in an area in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through June 17, 1995), **OR** four landings between January 1, 1995 and June 17, 1995 would receive an endorsement for the area. For all vessels ≥ 125', endorsements will be issued to vessels which made at least one landing in an area in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through June 17, 1995).

(3) For the Western Gulf area, all catcher vessels less than 125' which made at least one landing between January 1, 1992 and June 17, 1995 will receive an endorsement. Catcher processor vessels which are between 60 and 125' LOA must have made one landing of a qualifying species in the Western Gulf in any two of the four endorsement calendar years (1992, 1993, 1994, or 1995 through June 17, 1995), **OR** four landings between January 1, 1995 and June 17, 1995 in order to receive an endorsement. Catcher processors ≥ 125' LOA must have made a landing of a qualifying species in two of the four EQP calendar years.

3.2.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses

The section above defined who would be issued licenses. This section speaks to what license holders can do with the license once it is issued and other miscellaneous issues affecting the program. These issues include an allocation of groundfish species to the CDQ program, use caps, and various other provisions.

Who May Purchase Licenses
Licenses may be transferred only to "persons" defined as those eligible to document a fishery vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46 U.S.C. Leasing of groundfish licenses will not be allowed. The practice of leasing licenses was seen to have the potential of creating loopholes in the program. Council discussions indicated that leases would be difficult to monitor. Also, the possibility of vessels with different gear types trading licenses back and forth when fisheries were closed was considered. The Council felt this had the potential to add effort to the fishery. For example, when the Pacific cod trawl fishery closes in the Bering Sea, a trawl vessel could lease its license to a longliner who could then keep fishing Bering Sea Pacific cod. The Council's intent was not to allow these kinds of transfers.

Vessel/License Linkages

Licenses may be transferred without a vessel, i.e., licenses may be applied to vessels other than the one to which the license initially was issued, subject to license designations, vessel upgrade provisions, and the "no leasing" restriction. Licenses may be applied to vessels shorter than the "maximum LOA" regardless of vessel length class designations, i.e. "downgrades" in vessel classes are allowed. Vessels also will be allowed to downgrade from catcher processors to catcher vessels. This means that a catcher processor license in the ≥ 125' LOA class could be used on any vessel, so long as it does not exceed the maximum upgrade length under the moratorium. A catcher vessel license could be used on any catcher vessel that is less than the maximum upgrade size allowed under the moratorium for the original qualifying vessel.

The Council did not wish to discourage vessel owners from "downgrading." Restrictions on vessel length and processing capacity were included in the program to alleviate the problems associated with capital stuffing. This phenomenon has often been associated with license limitation programs in the past. Vessel owners will tend to increase the harvesting capacity of their vessel through capital expenditures which increase length, horsepower, or other input usage instead of bringing another vessel into the fleet. Reducing the size of vessels in the fleet was viewed as being within the program's objectives, because it would likely reduce the harvesting power of the vessel on which the license was used. It would also provide fishermen more flexibility in acquiring a new vessel. For example, if a vessel was 124' LOA on June 24, 1992 and no downgrades were permitted, this license could only be used on a 124' vessel, because it would be in the 60 to 125' LOA class. Should the owner need to replace this vessel they would be forced to acquire a 124' vessel. A vessel of that exact length may prove difficult to find and may be priced artificially high because of the limited supply. With the down grade provision the vessel owner could purchase and fish a vessel less than 124'. This will provide fishermen additional flexibility as they will have a broader pool of vessels from which to select.

Options Regarding the Separability of Area Designations

Area endorsements are not separable, and shall remain as a single "package," which includes the assigned catcher vessel/catcher processor and vessel length class designations. Crab and groundfish licenses that are initially issued to a person (as defined under "License Recipients") for an individual vessel, are not separable and shall remain as a block for a period of three years, after which time, the Council may review whether or not the groundfish and crab licenses should remain non-severable. Groundfish Licenses obtained after the initial allocation will not be combined with any other licenses owned by the person, and will remain a separate license.

The Council's intent was to package licenses to keep additional vessels from entering the fishery. If separable licenses were issued for the harvest of one vessel, then the owner could split the licenses and fish groundfish and crab on different vessels. In cases where a single vessel would need to choose between two simultaneous fisheries, adding another vessel would eliminate the need to make that choice. This could result in increased fishing effort.

Vessel Replacement and Upgrades

Vessels may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% Rule as defined in the moratorium proposed rule. If a vessel upgrades under the "20% rule" to a length which falls into a higher vessel length designation after June 17, 1995, then the vessel owner would receive the license and endorsements, but could not use them on that vessel.[10] The vessel owner would be required to gain access to a vessel that falls within the license's restrictions or acquire a license that fits the vessel's characteristics before it could be fished.

---

[10] This is an issue for vessels which have an original qualifying length >50' LOA but less than 60' LOA, or vessels which have an original qualifying length greater than 103' LOA but less than 125'. If these vessels upgrade to the full extent allowed by the "20% rule" after June 17, 1995, they will have exceeded the length allowed by the vessel length class designations.

License Ownership Caps
No more than 10 general groundfish licenses may be purchased or controlled by a "person,"[11] with grandfather rights to those persons who exceed this limit in the initial allocation. The intent of the Council is that this limit is applied to the "person" as defined under "License Recipients," and is not interpreted to apply to individual owners within corporations or partnerships.

The Council viewed the vessel ownership caps in terms of what the fleet could look like if everyone purchased licenses up to the cap. In the case where 2,435 licenses were issued initially, and the fleet consolidated to the point where everyone held ten licenses, the total number of vessel owners would be 244. In areas where there were smaller numbers of endorsements, like the Aleutian Islands where there are 230, the number of owners could be reduced to 23. It is very unlikely that this level of consolidation would ever be reached. However, by placing the cap at 10 licenses ensures that consolidation will not go beyond this level. It also ensures that no one "person" can end up owning a disproportionate share of the harvest of the resource.

Vessel License Use Caps
There is no limit on the number of licenses (or endorsements) which may be used on a vessel. This would allow a vessel owner to fish additional licenses in order to gain endorsements for other FMP subareas. If a vessel is licensed with endorsements in the Bering Sea and Western Gulf and the owner were also willing to fish the Aleutian Islands, this person could form an agreement with another license owner. The second license owner could use the first owner's vessel, which is already licensed to fish the Bering Sea and Western Gulf, to fish his Aleutian Island endorsement. This first owner also has the option of purchasing a license with an Aleutian Island endorsement and stacking the two general licenses on the vessel.

Vessel Designation Limits
A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations (i.e., both as a catcher vessel and as a catcher processor) under the use restriction component will be able to participate under any designation for which it qualifies. Catcher vessel/catcher processor designations will be based on **activities** during January 1, 1994 through June 17, 1995, or the most recent year of participation during the EQP. If a vessel qualifies only as a catcher processor it may select a one-time (permanent) conversion to a catcher vessel, though a catcher processor may operate in either mode. If a vessel qualifies as a catcher vessel only, it is restricted to operate as a catcher vessel. These provisions are consistent with the Council's license downgrading policies described under the vessel/license linkages section.

Community Development Quotas
CDQs will be issued for 7.5% of all BSAI groundfish TACs not already covered by a CDQ program, and a pro-rata share of PSC. The quotas will be allocated to communities as defined in the current CDQ program regulations, with the addition of Akutan. PSC will be allocated "off the top" before the trawl/non-trawl split. The Groundfish CDQ program will be patterned after the current pollock CDQ program, but will not contain a sunset provision. The pollock CDQ program remains coupled with the Inshore/Offshore reauthorization (Amendment 38/40) which has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce for 1996-1998. The Council is currently developing a potential IFQ program for BSAI pollock, which would accommodate future pollock CDQ allocations.

Currently, CDQ programs are in place for pollock, halibut, and sablefish. The annual exvessel value of pollock allocated to CDQ communities is estimated to be $30 million (EA/RIR/IRFA for Amendments 38/40, August 1, 1995, pp 230). The annual value of 7.5% percent of all remaining groundfish and crab TACs is in the $50

[11] "Person" is defined as a those eligible to document a fishing vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C. The Council also stated their intent that the cap be placed at the corporate level. This means a corporation will be limited to 10 licenses, with grandfather rights, but share holders within a corporation will not have those licenses count toward their individual cap of ten licenses. For example, a person who owns 100 shares of a corporation that operates eight vessels will not have those eight licenses counted towards his cap of ten.

million range (EA/RIR for License Limitation Alternatives, September 18, 1994). When the sablefish and halibut allocations are included, the total annual exvessel value of CDQ allocations should exceed $80 million.

The Council felt that, given the success of current CDQ programs, an allocation of 7.5% of the remaining groundfish species was warranted. The additional revenues will be used to help address long-standing problems in predominantly native communities in Western Alaska. These funds will aid the development of infrastructure that will allow these communities to build a stronger economic base.

Fisheries adjacent to these communities are often large industrial fisheries that require substantial capital investment. Through the CDQ programs, these remote villages, which often have high unemployment rates and few economic alternatives, will have a means to participate in these fisheries off their shores.

Other Provisions

1) Licenses represent a use privilege. The Council may convert the license program to an IFQ program or otherwise alter or rescind the program without compensation to license holders.

2) Severe penalties may be invoked for failure to comply with conditions of the license.

3) Licenses may be suspended or revoked for serious and/or multiple violations. (The Council recommends NMFS consult with the Coalition for Stability in Marine Financing regarding license revocation concerns.)

4) Implement a Skipper Reporting System which requires groundfish license holders to report skipper names, address, and service records to NMFS. Information collected through this program will aid in the development of a skipper license program, should the Council choose to implement such a program.

5) Vessels targeting non-groundfish species (salmon, crab, etc.) that are currently allowed to land incidentally taken groundfish without a groundfish permit, will be allowed to continue to land bycatch amounts. Additionally, vessels participating in the Sablefish and Halibut IFQ program would continue to be able to land bycatch amounts of groundfish as specified in regulations governing that program.

6) Vessels which qualified for the NPFMC license limitation program that have been lost or destroyed are still eligible to receive earned licenses and endorsements, subject to rules and conditions outlined in this program.

7) Vessels which qualify under the moratorium and were lost, damaged, or otherwise out of the fishery due to factors beyond the control of the owner and which were replaced or otherwise reentered the fisheries in accordance with the moratorium rules, and which made a landing in a fishery any time between the time the vessel left the fishery and June 17, 1995, will be qualified for a general license and endorsement for that area.

8) Vessels which receive an "empty umbrella" because they qualified under the GQP in one FMP area and made landings during the EQP in the other FMP area, would be issued endorsements and a general license for the FMP area and FMP subareas for which they meet the Endorsement Landings Requirements.

9) The CDQ vessel exemption included in the Moratorium will continue under the Groundfish License Limitation Program. This exemption allows vessels <125' obtained under an approved CDQ plan to participate in both CDQ and non-CDQ fisheries. If the vessel is sold to an interest outside the CDQ plan, the vessel will no longer be exempt from the requirements of the license program.

10) Each element of the Groundfish and Crab license limitation program as described in this action is integral to the overall program. None should be regarded as severable by the Secretary of Commerce.

11) The Council will consider options to compensate vessel owners who qualified for Southeast Outside endorsements using trawl gear, if and when individual quota programs are studied.

12) The option to allow vessels which are designated as catcher vessels to add limited amounts of processing capability will not be allowed under this action. This option will be further analyzed when the Council addresses "Improved Retention/Utilization" under a separate Plan Amendment.

3.2.3 Distribution of Groundfish Licenses and Endorsements

This section will focus on the actual distribution of licenses and endorsements under the groundfish license program. Tables will be presented showing the number of licenses and endorsements that could be issued. Emphasis will be on the number of vessels by catcher vessel/catcher processor designation, vessel length class, and the vessel owner's state of residence. Additional information will be provided on the vessel owner's borough/county of residence, vessel classes (as used in the Social Impact Analysis), and information on vessels reporting catch between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995 that did not qualify for a license.

3.2.3.1 Vessels Qualifying for Licenses

The tables in this section list the number of licenses and endorsements that would be issued through the groundfish license program. The license and endorsement numbers represent the Council staff's best estimates of who would qualify. Specific provisions included in the program require individuals to choose how they would qualify. Depending on their selection, the endorsements they will be issued will change. These changes are minor but will alter the actual allocation. Because it was not possible for staff to anticipate these decisions, all the potential endorsements are included in the tables. Including all the endorsements overstates the actual total, in the less than 60' LOA class, by four endorsements.

Table 3.1 represents the distribution of licenses and endorsements for qualified vessels. The table is structured so that the first five rows show the number of endorsements that would be issued in the five FMP subareas. FMP subareas were defined by the Council as the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, Western Gulf, Central Gulf including West Yakutat, and Southeast Outside. Row six is entitled "Total Endorsements" and is the sum of the five FMP subarea rows. Rows seven through nine represent the number of vessels that would receive various types of general license. General licenses were defined by the Council as Gulf of Alaska, Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands, and Gulf of Alaska combined with the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands. Once issued, these licenses and their corresponding endorsements will be non-severable. The bottom row of the table lists the number of vessels that would qualify for the groundfish license program. This number is calculated by summing the various types of general licenses in rows seven through nine.

The rows in the table are then broken into three main column groups: Alaska, other states, and total. Each of the column groups is based on the current vessel owner's state of residence. Reading from the third row and last column of the "total" group, we see that 1,369 vessels would be issued endorsements in the Central Gulf + West Yakutat subarea. This is the subarea with the most licensed vessels. The Southeast Outside FMP subarea has the second most qualified vessels with 1,045. The Western Gulf, Aleutian Islands, and Bering Sea had 447, 230, and 538 vessels, respectively. Summing the subareas results in a total of 3,625 groundfish endorsements for the North Pacific.

General license information is provided below the endorsement total row. As stated earlier, general licenses will be issued for Gulf of Alaska, Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands, and Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands. Reading down the final column of the table we can see that 375 general licenses will be issued for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and the Gulf of Alaska. Bering Sea/Aleutian Island-only general licenses will be issued to 173 vessels. General licenses for the Gulf of Alaska only will be issued to 1,887 vessels. These distributions indicate that the majority of vessels will be issued a general license in the Gulf of Alaska (93%). However, of

Table 3.1 Vessels That Qualified Under the Groundfish Vessel License Program

	Alaska									Other								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska Total	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Total
	<60	60-125	≥125	Total	<60	60-125	≥125	Total		<60	60-125	≥125	Total	<60	-65	≥125	Total	
AI	7	9	0	16	0	6	11	17	33	13	55	17	85	2	26	84	112	197
BS	99	54	2	155	1	7	12	20	175	35	177	32	244	2	33	84	119	363
CG+WY	914	105	0	1,019	3	7	9	19	1,038	175	97	5	277	1	27	22	50	327
SEO	855	19	0	874	2	1	0	3	877	144	10	0	154	1	10	3	14	168
WG	160	42	1	203	1	4	8	13	216	52	113	18	183	1	17	30	48	231
Total Endorsements	2,035	229	3	2,267	7	25	40	72	2,339	419	452	72	943	7	113	223	343	1,286
BSAI/GOA Vessels	80	43	1	124	1	6	10	17	141	32	111	18	161	1	25	37	63	224
BSAI Only Vessels	19	12	1	32	0	1	2	3	35	5	71	14	90	1	8	49	58	148
GOA Only Vessels	1,531	83	0	1,614	2	1	0	3	1,617	235	31	1	267	0	3	0	3	270
TOTAL VESSELS	1,630	138	2	1,770	3	8	12	23	1,793	272	213	33	518	2	36	86	124	642

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	
AI	20	64	17	101	2	32	95	129	230
BS	134	231	34	399	3	40	96	139	538
CG+WY	1,089	202	5	1,296	4	34	31	69	1,365
SEO	999	29	0	1,028	3	11	3	17	1,045
WG	212	155	19	386	2	21	38	61	447
Total Endorsements	2,454	681	75	3,210	14	138	263	415	3,625
BSAI/GOA Vessels	112	154	19	285	2	31	47	80	365
BSAI Only Vessels	24	83	15	122	1	9	51	61	183
GOA Only Vessels	1,766	114	1	1,881	2	4	0	6	1,887
TOTAL VESSELS	1,902	351	35	2,288	5	44	98	147	2,435

Note: Two vessels must choose between BS and CG+WY endorsements and two vessels must choose between BS and WG endorsements. These four vessels qualify as both crab to groundfish crossover vessels and vessels < 60' using pot/jig gear 1992-94.

the 2,262 (1,887+375) vessels with general licenses in the Gulf of Alaska only 61% can fish the Central Gulf + West Yakutat, 46% can fish the Southeast Outside, and 20% can fish the Western Gulf. It should be noted that these percentages will not sum to 100% because vessels can qualify in more than one FMP subarea. However, many of the vessels are limited to fishing one FMP subarea under the license program.

The bottom line of the table sums the vessels that qualify for each type of general groundfish license. This total represents the 2,435 vessels that will be licensed to fish groundfish in the North Pacific under license limitation. As mentioned above, these 2,435 will hold 3,625 area endorsements.

Information on the number of vessels in a license class is also provided in Table 3.1. Reading down the first column shows the number of endorsements and licenses that would be issued to Alaskans who owned catcher vessels that were less than 60' LOA. The table shows there were 2,035 endorsements issued to 1,630 vessels in this class. The same class of vessel whose owner lived in a state other than Alaska had 419 endorsements issued to 272 vessels. This table indicates that small vessels tend to be owned by Alaska residents. The largest size class, those vessels ≥ 125' LOA, were typically owned by residents of other states. Other vessel categories, for which licenses will be issued, can be studied in a similar manner using this table.

Additional information on owners of qualified vessels is provided in Table 3 of Appendix III. The same type of county/borough distributions provided for the 1994 fleet are presented here for qualified vessels. Comparison of these tables will allow the reader to study changes in participation between the 1994 fleet and what is expected to be the fleet if the groundfish license program is implemented.

Kodiak Island Borough in Alaska and King County in Washington each have many residents that will be issued licenses. Table 1 of Appendix III shows the vessels that reported groundfish catch during 1994. This table indicates that groundfish vessel owners, living on Kodiak Island, fished 154 vessels during 1994. Table 3 shows that 260 licenses would be issued to Kodiak Island residents. This means that over 100 additional vessels can fish groundfish under the license program than fished during 1994. Vessel owners residing in King County had 219 vessels that reported landings during 1994. A total of 331 vessels would be issued groundfish licenses. Again, this is an increase of over 100 vessels.

The pounds of groundfish catch reported by qualified vessels during the EQP is shown in Table 3.2. The purpose of this table is to provide an indication of the level of reliance these vessels had on groundfish. Reported catch between January 1, 1992 and June 17, 1995 was divided into three broad categories. These categories were vessels that reported catching < 1,000 pounds, 1,000 through 19,999 pounds, and 20,000 pounds or more of groundfish. Also included in the table are the number of vessels, minimum pounds, mean pounds, and the average number of years a vessel reported making landings during the EQP.

Table 3.2 The activities of qualified vessel during the Endorsement Qualifying Period.

Vessel's Reported Pounds	Number of Vessels	Minimum Pounds	Mean Pounds	Average Years Fished 1992-95
<1,000	631	2	320	1.40
1,000-19,999	800	1,003	6,239	2.31
20,000+	1,004	20,007	18,012,895	3.10
All	2,435	2	744,139	2.40

A total of 631 qualified vessels reported less than 1,000 pounds of landings. Vessels in this category represent 26% of the qualified fleet. At least one vessel qualified with only two pounds of groundfish landings. Two

pounds of groundfish landings would likely equate to having reported landing one fish in a three and one-half year period. On average, the vessels in this class reported fishing during 1.40 calendar years and catching 320 pounds of groundfish. Eight hundred vessels reported making 1,000 to 19,999 pounds of groundfish landings. An average vessel in this category would have fished groundfish in 2.31 calendar years and reported 6,239 pounds of catch. Applying an average price[12] per pound of $0.115 means that the average vessel received $717 for their catch. The remaining 1,004 vessels reported a minimum of 20,000 pounds of catch, but averaged over 18 million pounds per vessel during the EQP.

Table 3.3 identifies the number of groundfish endorsements issued per license. The structure of the columns is similar to that of Table 3.1, however, instead of listing the FMP subareas in the first column, the numbers of endorsements per license (vessel) are listed. Reading down the first column of the table, for Alaskan-owned catcher vessels less than 60' LOA, 1,292 vessels of this class will receive only one FMP subarea endorsement. Two endorsements per license will be issued to 287 vessels. Three endorsements per license will be issued to 37 vessels and so on. To calculate the total number of endorsements the reader must multiply the number of endorsements per vessel by the number of vessels in that category and sum the results. This table indicates the area limitations placed on vessels in a specific category.

Endorsement-per-vessel distributions in Table 3.3 indicate that small vessels will generally qualify for one endorsement area. Small catcher vessels normally operate in one area, though they may have fished in several fisheries such as salmon, halibut, sablefish, or Demersal shelf rockfish (in the SEO). Larger vessels tended to fish more areas but are often more specialized in the types of fish they catch. Surimi catcher processors are a good example. These vessels are mobile and can fish the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, Western Gulf, and Central Gulf for pollock. They probably don't fish species other than groundfish, and therefore, move from area to area to catch their target as fisheries open and close. This movement will often qualify them for more than one area endorsement.

3.2.3.2 Participation History of Vessels Qualifying for Groundfish Licenses

Years of participation in the groundfish fishery and the metric tons of reported landings are presented in this section. Data for January 1, 1988 through June 17, 1995 are presented by vessel class, the same classes used to describe the 1994 fleet in Chapter 2. This information allows the reader to compare the participation of qualified vessels throughout the qualification periods.

[12] Average price per pound for all groundfish was taken from the September 15, 1993 PacFIN report #128.

Table 3.3 Number of Endorsements per Vessel for Vessels That Qualified Under the Groundfish Vessel License Program

Endorsements Per License	Alaska									Other								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Other
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
One	1,292	81	1	1,374	1	1	0	2	1,376	179	80	13	272	0	5	4	9	281
Two	287	29	1	317	1	1	3	5	322	56	57	6	119	1	9	46	56	175
Three	37	23	0	60	0	2	2	4	64	25	48	9	82	0	7	20	27	109
Four	12	4	0	16	1	4	7	12	28	7	26	5	38	0	6	13	19	57
Five	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	7	1	9	3	13	20
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS*	2,035	229	3	2,267	7	25	40	72	2,339	419	452	72	943	7	113	223	343	1,286
BSAI/GOA Vessels	80	43	1	124	1	6	10	17	141	32	121	18	171	1	25	37	63	234
BSAI Only Vessels	19	12	1	32	0	1	2	3	35	5	61	14	80	1	8	49	58	138
GOA Only Vessels	1,531	83	0	1,614	2	1	0	3	1,617	235	31	1	267	0	3	0	3	270
TOTAL VESSELS	1,630	138	2	1,770	3	8	12	23	1,793	272	213	33	518	2	36	86	124	642

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
One	1,471	161	14	1,646	1	6	4	11	1,657
Two	343	86	7	436	2	10	49	61	497
Three	62	71	9	142	0	9	22	31	173
Four	19	30	5	54	1	10	20	31	85
Five	7	3	0	10	1	9	3	13	23
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS*	2,454	681	75	3,210	14	138	263	415	3,625
BSAI/GOA Vessels	112	164	19	295	2	31	47	80	375
BSAI Only Vessels	24	73	15	112	1	9	51	61	173
GOA Only Vessels	1,766	114	1	1,881	2	4	0	6	1,887
TOTAL VESSELS	1,902	351	35	2,288	5	44	98	147	2,435

Note: Two vessels must choose between BS and CG+WY endorsements and two vessels must choose between BS and WG endorsements.

These four vessels qualify as both crab to groundfish crossover vessels and vessels < 60' using pot/jig gear 1992-94.

All their potential endorsement areas are listed so the total number of endorsements that would be issued is overstated by four.

* The number of endorsements per vessel is calculated by multiplying the number of vessels by the endorsements per vessel and summing over that vessel class.

Table 3.4 lists the number of years vessels qualified for the groundfish license program fished between 1988 and 1995. The first column in the table lists 28 separate vessel classes. The next eight columns represent the number of years the vessels fished groundfish during that period. If a vessel fished each year, they could have made landings in eight separate calendar years. The bottom row of the table lists the total number of groundfish qualified vessels that fished that number of years. A total of 344 vessels qualified for the license program by reporting groundfish landings in just one year. Because the license program has both a base and endorsement qualifying period, these 344 vessels must have qualified one of three ways:

1) By making landings between January 1, 1992 and June 27, 1992. This window of overlap between the base and endorsement qualifying period allows a vessel to qualify for both periods by fishing one year.

2) Fishing with pot/jig gear on a vessel < 60' LOA between January 1, 1992 and December 31, 1994. Vessels that meet these parameters were granted an extended base qualifying period through 1994.

3) Fishing federally managed crab during the base qualifying period and groundfish between January 1, 1992 and June 17, 1995. The crab to groundfish cross-over provisions allow crab landings in the base period to count as if they were groundfish landings.

Other vessels qualifying for a groundfish license would be required to make landings in at least two calendar years. Reading across the bottom of the table, we see that the number of vessels qualifying for the license program decreases as the years of participation increase. This trend holds true except for the vessels that fished every year. Because vessels often enter and exit fisheries, for a variety reasons, this trend is expected.

Comparing the years fished to vessel classes provides information on the stability of participants in the fishery. Fifty-eight vessels qualified for the license program in the PH2 (vessels 58' - 124' LOA that only used pot gear) class. Forty of these vessels reported groundfish landings in only one year, and none of the vessels reported landings in more than five years. Because these are generally cross-over vessels they could qualify for the licence program by making landings in only one year. On the other hand, TP1 (surimi trawler processors) vessels all reported making groundfish landings in more than five calendar years. These are large catcher processor vessels that rely on the Bering Sea pollock fishery. Vessels in the LH2 class were more evenly distributed in terms of years fished. The most vessels (99) qualified with two years of reported groundfish catch. The fewest vessels (37) qualified with reported catch in every year.

The annual reported catch of qualified vessels is provided, by vessel class, in Appendix IV. Data for the years 1988-94 are reported for the same five species groups used to describe the current fleet in Chapter 2. Each of the groups was defined in Section 2.1.2. The purpose of these tables is to allow the reader to compare the catch of a class of vessels through time.

During their September 1995 meeting, the Council reaffirmed their intent to issue licenses to individuals whose vessel did not hold a federal vessel permit when its qualifying landings were reported. Because these vessels did not hold a federal permit, it would be illegal for them to harvest groundfish from the EEZ. Therefore, it is assumed that these vessels were making legal landings from State waters and reporting their catch on State of Alaska fish tickets.

Information in the analysis data base indicates that 685 vessels will qualify for a federal groundfish license because they fished only in State waters (Table 3.5). Six hundred and sixty of the vessels were < 60' LOA and only 2 were ≥ 125' LOA. These small vessels generally fished in the GOA as almost 91% of the endorsements would be issued for the Southeast outside or Central Gulf/West Yakutat subareas.

Table 3.4 Number of Years That Qualified Vessels Reported Groundfish Landings, 1988-95

Vessel Class	Years Fished								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	**Total**
CP1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
CP1/LP1	4	1	2	1	3	0	1	0	**12**
CSEN*	15	5	8	1	3	0	1	0	**33**
DRG	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	1	**10**
GL1*	16	46	47	24	38	22	13	14	**220**
GL2*	29	29	17	20	8	7	0	0	**110**
LH1	2	3	5	6	5	7	4	20	**52**
LH2	83	99	60	73	62	51	40	37	**505**
LP1	0	2	4	4	11	3	7	9	**40**
MSC	15	8	8	4	7	3	1	2	**48**
PCP1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	**7**
PH1	6	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	**13**
PH1*	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**3**
PH2	40	7	7	2	2	0	0	0	**58**
PH2*	16	18	15	9	9	11	14	12	**104**
SEN*	34	38	42	38	25	14	13	6	**210**
SEN/PH2	64	105	125	104	73	67	54	46	**638**
SEN/TH4	14	11	9	18	18	16	15	25	**126**
TH1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	6	**14**
TH1*	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	**6**
TH2	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	**13**
TH2*	2	3	0	2	7	10	8	21	**53**
TH3	1	0	3	0	7	3	2	3	**19**
TH3*	0	1	1	5	8	7	11	25	**58**
TP1	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	12	**24**
TP2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	**16**
TP3	0	0	2	3	0	6	[illegible]	5	**22**
TP3*	0	4	1	1	1	1	4	8	**20**
Total	**344**	**393**	**364**	**321**	**295**	**244**	**202**	**272**	**2435**

Any class with an asterisk at the end means those vessels used more gear types than is indicated in the name. For example, a PH2 may have used pot gear to harvest crab, and trawl gear for groundfish.

Table 3.5 Vessels That Qualified Under the Groundfish Vessel License Program but Did Not Hold a Federal Permit

	Alaska									Other								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Other
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	24	3	0	27	0	0	0	0	27	3	3	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	194	7	0	201	0	0	0	0	201	14	2	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
SEO (Vessels Fished)	390	4	0	394	0	0	0	0	394	45	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	45
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	23	2	0	25	0	0	0	0	25	5	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS	631	16	0	647	0	0	0	0	647	67	8	2	77	0	0	0	0	77
BSAI/GOA Vessels	13	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
BSAI Only Vessels	11	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	2	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
GOA Only Vessels	572	12	0	584	0	0	0	0	584	61	4	0	65	0	0	0	0	65
TOTAL VESSELS	596	15	0	611	0	0	0	0	611	64	8	2	74	0	0	0	0	74

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	27	6	2	35	0	0	0	0	35
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	208	9	0	217	0	0	0	0	217
SEO (Vessels Fished)	435	4	0	439	0	0	0	0	439
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	28	4	0	32	0	0	0	0	32
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS	698	24	2	724	0	0	0	0	724
BSAI/GOA Vessels	14	1	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
BSAI Only Vessels	13	6	2	21	0	0	0	0	21
GOA Only Vessels	633	16	0	649	0	0	0	0	649
TOTAL VESSELS	660	23	2	685	0	0	0	0	685

3.2.4 Participation History of Vessels Not Qualifying for Groundfish Licenses

Not all vessels that fished groundfish between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995 will qualify for a license, and some of the vessels that do qualify will not be issued endorsements for all the areas they fished. This section describes how many vessels fit into each of these categories and the reasons they did not qualify.

3.2.4.1 Vessels That Do Not Qualify for Any Groundfish Licenses

A total of 1,853 vessels reported groundfish landings between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995 but did not qualify for any groundfish license. Table 3.6 provides a description of these vessels and the reasons they did not qualify. There are three basic reasons that vessels did not qualify:

1) Minimum Landings Requirements. These are vessels that fished in both the EQP and BQP but did not meet the minimum landings requirements mandated by the Council. The only vessels this would apply to are vessels ≥60' LOA in the Gulf of Alaska. In general, the minimum landings requirement means a vessel had to fish two of the four calendar years during the EQP. For a complete list of the requirements see Section 3.2.1.

2) Fished BQP Only. Vessels in this group only made landings between January 1, 1988 and December 31, 1991,[13] thereby exhibiting historical participation, but no current dependence.

3) Fished EQP Only. These vessels fished only between June 28, 1992 and June 17, 1995, and were not vessels < 60' LOA using pot/jig gear.

A total of 41 vessels did not qualify for the groundfish license program because of the Council's minimum landings requirements. Of the 39 catcher vessels that did not qualify, 36 were between 60' and 125' LOA. The other three catcher vessels were ≥ 125' LOA. Two catcher processors ≥ 125' LOA did not meet the minimum landings requirements.

A total of 1,291 vessels did not qualify for the groundfish license program because they fished only during the BQP. These vessels would have qualified for the moratorium, but are excluded from the license program. Over 93% of these vessels were < 60' LOA. Because of the rapid turnover in the small boat fleet, it is not unexpected that so many of these boats reported catch only during the BQP.

Vessels that reported landings only during the EQP accounted for 521 of the vessels that did not qualify for a groundfish license. These vessels would be considered recent entrants into the fishery. It is this group of vessels that the moratorium was envisioned as preventing from entering the fishery.

[13] The cutoff date is December 31, 1991 instead of June 27, 1992 because of the overlap between the EQP and BQP. Vessels that fished between January 1, 1992 and June 27, 1992 would have been fishing in both the EQP and BQP by definition.

Table 3.6 Vessels That Did Not Qualify Under the Groundfish Vessel License Program For Any Endorsements or Licenses but Reported Groundfish Landings between 1/1/88 and 6/17/95

FMP	Reason Vessel	Alaska									Other								
		Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Other
Subarea	Did Not Qualify	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
AI	Fished BQP Only	3	1	0	4	0	1	1	2	6	6	4	1	11	0	1	3	4	15
	Fished EQP Only	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	5	0	3	3	6	11
BS	Fished BQP Only	23	9	0	32	0	1	1	2	34	8	15	2	25	0	1	3	4	29
	Fished EQP Only	60	5	2	67	0	0	0	0	67	16	8	4	28	0	4	4	8	36
CG+WY	Min. Landings Requirements	0	19	2	21	0	0	0	0	21	0	15	0	15	0	0	1	1	16
	Fished BQP Only	409	25	1	435	0	1	1	2	437	87	23	2	112	0	2	2	4	116
	Fished EQP Only	136	15	2	153	0	0	0	0	153	37	17	1	55	0	2	1	3	58
SEO	Min. Landings Requirements	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	2	2	5
	Fished BQP Only	596	11	0	607	1	0	0	1	608	111	4	0	115	0	1	1	2	117
	Fished EQP Only	172	4	1	177	0	0	0	0	177	38	2	0	40	0	1	1	2	42
WG	Min. Landings Requirements	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	Fished BQP Only	74	7	0	81	0	1	0	1	82	15	13	4	32	0	2	2	4	36
	Fished EQP Only	11	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	4	2	1	7	0	4	0	4	11
Total	Min. Landings Requirements	0	21	3	24	0	0	0	0	24	0	15	0	15	0	0	2	2	17
	Fished BQP Only	1,016	37	1	1,054	1	1	1	3	1,057	189	34	5	228	0	3	3	6	234
	Fished EQP Only	371	22	5	398	0	0	0	0	398	83	23	9	115	0	4	4	8	123
Total	Vessels	1,395	77	9	1,481	1	1	1	3	1,484	272	69	14	355	0	7	7	14	369

Table 3.6 (Continued)

FMP Subarea	Reason Vessel Did Not Qualify	Total								
		Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
		<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
AI	Fished BQP Only	9	5	1	15	0	2	4	6	21
	Fished EQP Only	4	1	3	8	0	3	3	6	14
BS	Fished BQP Only	31	24	2	57	0	2	4	6	63
	Fished EQP Only	76	13	6	95	0	4	4	8	103
CG+WY	Min. Landings Requirements	0	34	2	36	0	0	1	1	37
	Fished BQP Only	496	48	3	547	0	3	3	6	553
	Fished EQP Only	173	32	3	208	0	2	1	3	211
SEO	Min. Landings Requirements	0	6	0	6	0	0	2	2	8
	Fished BQP Only	707	15	0	722	1	1	1	3	725
	Fished EQP Only	210	6	1	217	0	1	1	2	219
WG	Min. Landings Requirements	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2
	Fished BQP Only	89	20	4	113	0	3	2	5	118
	Fished EQP Only	15	4	1	20	0	4	0	4	24
Total	Min. Landings Requirements	0	36	3	39	0	0	2	2	41
	Fished BQP Only	1,205	71	6	1,282	1	4	4	9	1,291
	Fished EQP Only	454	45	14	513	0	4	4	8	521
Total	Vessels	1,667	146	23	1,836	1	8	8	17	1,853

3.2.4.2 Vessels That Qualify for Endorsements in Only Part of the Areas They Fished

Table 3.7 provides information on the vessels that will qualify for endorsements in only part of the FMP subareas they fished between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995. All of these vessels will qualify for a general license and at least one endorsement. However they will not qualify for some of the areas they fished for three reasons:

1) The vessel only fished in one FMP area (GOA or BSAI) during the BQP, but fished both areas during the EQP. These vessels did not fulfill the past participation requirements in one FMP area. Vessels in this group would only be issued a general license for the BSAI <u>or</u> the GOA. Therefore, they can only earn endorsements for that area.

2) The vessel fished both FMP areas (GOA or BSAI) during the BQP and only one during the EQP. These vessels did not meet the recent participation requirements in an FMP area. They had fished an FMP area in the past but not recently.

3) The vessel did not meet the minimum landings requirements for some GOA endorsements. These are vessels ≥ 60' LOA that were required to make landings in two of four calendar years in the GOA. Some of these vessels could have also qualified with four landings in 1995.

There are 572 vessels that will not qualify for endorsements in all the areas they fished between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995. The Council's minimum landings requirements for GOA endorsements were not met by 111 vessels. These vessels did not make landings in two of the four calendar years of the EQP. A total of 394 vessels did not meet the Council's recent participation criteria in an FMP area. These vessels only fished one FMP area during the EQP while they had fished both during the BQP. The remaining sixty-seven vessels fished only one FMP area during the BQP but both areas during the EQP. These vessels would receive a general license for only one FMP area and could only earn endorsements in that area. They would not be issued endorsements in the FMP area for which they have no general license.

The 67 vessels that only fished one FMP area during the BQP, but both areas in the EQP, will not be issued endorsements for the FMP area they did not fish during the BQP because of the general license structure. Thirty-two of these vessels would lose GOA endorsements and 31 would lose BSAI endorsements. The remaining four vessels qualify as both crab to groundfish cross-over vessels and as vessels < 60' LOA that used pot/jig gear during the EQP. Each of these four vessels can choose which provision they will qualify under; so, they will be allowed to choose either their GOA or BSAI endorsement.

The 394 vessels which fished both the GOA and BSAI during the BQP, but only one of the areas during EQP, will not be issued endorsements in both areas. These vessels only had EQP participation in one FMP area. They would have qualified for both a GOA and BSAI general license, but would only be issued endorsements in one FMP area.

Table 3.7 Vessels That Did Not Qualify Under the Groundfish Vessel License Program For Part of Their Endorsements or Licenses but Reported Groundfish Landings between 1/1/88 and 6/17/95

FMP	Reason Vessel	Alaska									Other								
		Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Other
Subarea	Did Not Qualify	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
AI	Fished BQP Only	20	9	0	29	0	0	0	0	29	10	16	0	26	0	3	1	4	30
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
BS	Fished BQP Only	39	15	0	54	0	0	0	0	54	11	10	0	21	0	0	2	2	23
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	22	3	0	25	1	0	0	1	26	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	6
CG+WY	Min. Landings Requirements	0	13	0	13	0	0	1	1	14	0	22	7	29	0	4	20	24	53
	Fished BQP Only	89	2	1	92	0	0	1	1	93	13	22	4	39	1	1	21	23	62
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	5
SEO	Min. Landings Requirements	0	12	0	12	0	3	5	8	20	0	15	0	15	0	8	18	26	41
	Fished BQP Only	35	4	0	39	0	0	2	2	41	24	6	2	32	0	5	7	12	44
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	3	0	2	1	3	6
WG	Min. Landings Requirements	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	7	0	0	3	3	0	10	27	37	40
	Fished BQP Only	48	10	0	58	0	0	0	0	58	9	19	0	28	1	5	23	29	57
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	1	4	0	5	0	0	1	1	6	2	10	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Total	Min. Landings Requirements	0	20	0	20	0	6	6	12	32	0	26	9	35	0	9	35	44	79
	Fished BQP Only	196	29	1	226	0	0	3	3	229	59	54	5	118	1	9	37	47	165
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	28	8	0	36	2	0	3	5	41	9	20	1	21	0	6	1	10	31
Total	Vessels	220	58	2	280	1	6	10	17	297	68	99	20	187	1	23	74	98	285

Table 3.7 (Continued)

FMP Subarea	Reason Vessel Did Not Qualify	Total								
		Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
		<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
AI	Fished BQP Only	30	25	0	55	0	3	1	4	59
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	5	0	0	5	1	0	0	1	6
BS	Fished BQP Only	50	25	0	75	0	0	2	2	77
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	25	3	0	28	1	3	0	4	32
CG+WY	Min. Landings Requirements	0	35	7	42	0	4	21	25	67
	Fished BQP Only	102	24	5	131	1	1	22	24	155
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	3	1	0	4	0	2	3	5	9
SEO	Min. Landings Requirements	0	27	0	27	0	11	23	34	61
	Fished BQP Only	59	10	2	71	0	5	9	14	85
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	1	2	0	3	0	2	2	4	7
WG	Min. Landings Requirements	0	0	3	3	1	13	30	44	47
	Fished BQP Only	57	29	0	86	1	5	23	29	115
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	3	14	0	17	0	0	1	1	18
Total	Min. Landings Requirements	0	46	9	55	0	15	41	56	111
	Fished BQP Only	255	83	6	344	1	9	40	50	394
	No BQP Landings in FMP Area	37	28	1	57	2	6	4	15	67

There were 111 vessels that fished both the EQP and BQP but did not meet the minimum landings requirements in at least one of the GOA FMP subareas. All of these vessels are ≥60' LOA. Table 3.7 shows that 55 were catcher vessels and 56 were catcher processors. The majority of the catcher vessels were in the 60'-125' LOA category, while most of the catcher processors were in the 125' LOA and larger category. It is likely that other regulations, such as inshore-offshore allocations, adversely impacted some of the larger vessels' ability to meet the minimum landings requirements in the GOA.

Table 3.8

Reason License Would Not Be Issued	Vessels That Would Not Qualify for Any License	Vessels That Would Not Qualify for Some Part of Their Catch History
EQP Only Landings in a Given FMP area	521	67
BQP Only Landings in a Given FMP area	1,291	394
Minimum Landings Requirements	41	111
Total	1,853	572

3.3 CRAB LICENSE LIMITATION PROGRAM - COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The crab license limitation program selected by the Council is discussed in this section. A format similar to the groundfish discussion will be followed. First the elements and options that define the crab program are listed, including the Council's rationale for selecting those provisions. Next is presented information on the number of vessels that qualify for the program. These vessels are listed by endorsements earned, owner state of residence, vessel designation (catcher vessel or catcher processor), and vessel length. Additional tables provide more detail on the fleet that is projected to qualify. Finally, information on the vessels that do not qualify, but reported landings between January 1, 1988 and December 31, 1994 is presented.

3.3.1 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting Initial Assignment

License Classes

A single type of license will be issued. As with groundfish, the Council considered issuing two types of licenses. During Council discussions these were often referred to as "A" and "B" licenses. The "A" licenses were viewed as giving the owner more rights, but they required the recipient to meet more stringent qualification criteria. For example, "A" licenses would be transferable, but "B" licenses would not. This alternative was preferred by the Council for the same reasons they selected it for groundfish. A single class of license was the most direct method of implementing the program and there was overwhelming public support. Also, fewer licenses will be issued with a single class of license. The single class of license was also supported by the Council's Advisory Panel.

Nature of Licenses

The Crab License Program restricts access to the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab Fisheries in the EEZ. The program does not restrict access within waters of the State of Alaska, nor does it affect crab fisheries which are not managed by the BSAI King and Tanner Crab FMP. The Crab License Program will issue General Licenses and Endorsements for each species/area combination as follows:

1. Pribilof red + Pribilof blue king crab
2. *C. opilio* + *C. bairdi*
3. St. Matthew blue king crab
4. Adak brown king crab
5. Adak red king crab
6. Bristol Bay red king crab
7. Dutch Harbor brown king crab
8. Norton Sound red + blue summer king crab

The Council also recommends classifying all crab species not included in the endorsement list, but that are covered under the Crab FMP, as "developing fisheries." This list includes but is not limited to: Bering Sea brown king crab, BSAI *C. tanneri*, *Lithodes couesi*, and *C. angulatus*, and Dutch Harbor red king crab. To participate in a developing fishery a person must have a valid federal crab license as defined in this program.

Eight crab species/area endorsement combinations were chosen by the Council. The Council selected them to provide flexibility within the industry while controlling effort (especially in the smaller fisheries). Flexibility was viewed as important because of the "ratcheting down of opportunities" faced by crabbers. Providing crabbers with more opportunities when stocks are fluctuating gives them a better chance to make a living. The Council also felt that it was important to control effort especially in the smaller crab fisheries. Therefore, combining only those crab fisheries with similar participation histories (to create endorsement groups) was acceptable to the Council. Other endorsement groups were proposed and considered by the Council. These combinations were not selected because they could have allowed large increases in participation by vessels that had no history in that fishery.

Pribilof red and blue king crab were combined into a single endorsement to allow vessels fishing this area to have greater flexibility. Consideration was given to adding St. Matthew blue king crab into this endorsement, however, the Council felt that if at some point in the future it did not open concurrently with the Pribilof fisheries, too much effort could flow in the fishery. Therefore, St. Matthew blue king crab was included as a separate endorsement. *C. opilio* and *C. bairdi* were combined by the Council into a single endorsement. The Council selected this option to provide greater flexibility to the tanner crab fishermen. The remaining endorsements were for crab fisheries that are small and require greater effort control, are currently closed to directed fishing because of the stock size, or have been designated as a super-exclusive fishery. It is noted here that some vessels which qualify for the Norton Sound crab licenses may not be qualified to fish under the moratorium period.

The Council chose not to issue endorsements for other crab fisheries covered by the FMP. Instead, they will allow anyone holding a valid general crab license to fish these "developing fisheries" when they are open. The Council felt those fisheries were not fully developed and it was not appropriate to limit entry at this time. As envisioned, fisheries in this category will be conducted under developing species permits issued by the Commissioner of ADF&G. The restrictions placed on the permits should allow the State of Alaska to control these fisheries, while at the same time providing licensed crabbers the opportunity to develop new markets.

License Recipients

Licenses will be issued to current owners (as of June 17, 1995) of qualified vessels.[14] Owners must be "persons eligible to document a fishing vessel" under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C. In the Norton Sound summer king crab fishery, "persons" eligible to receive a license include the following:

---

[14] The language in this section has been changed from the "DRAFT FINAL ACTION" language distributed at the Council meeting on Sunday, June 18, 1995. These changes were made to more accurately reflect the intent of the Council regarding the definition of "current owners," and to ensure consistency regarding the specific dates in the action. All occurrences of the date "6/15/95" have been changed to "June 17, 1995" in this document to reflect the date of the final Council action. Originally, this section read as follows:

> Licenses will be issued to current owners of vessels. Current Owners are defined as those "persons" eligible to document a fishing vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46, U.S.C.

a) individuals who held State of Alaska Permit for the Norton Sound King Crab summer fishery and who made at least one landing; or

b) current vessel owners (as of 6/17/95) in instances where a vessel was corporate owned, but operated by a skipper who was a temporary contract employee.

The Council chose to issue licenses to current vessel owners as of June 17, 1995 for the same reasons they selected this option under groundfish, to minimize disruption in the fishery. Norton Sound was viewed as a unique situation because it is a super-exclusive[15] fishery. As with groundfish, granting licenses to people other than the current owners would issue many more, duplicate licenses, contrary to the goals of the license limitation program. Issuing licenses to Norton Sound permit holders who reported landings or current vessel owners when the vessel was corporate owned, was selected by Council because it better reflected how the fishery was prosecuted during the years it was super-exclusive. In some situations several permit holders fished off a single vessel. Issuing these permit holders each a license would allow them to use separate vessels in the future.

License Designations

Licenses and Endorsements will be designated as Catcher Vessel or Catcher Processor and with one of three Vessel Length Classes (<60', ≥60' & <125', ≥125'). Catcher Vessel/Catcher Processor designations will be determined based on the activities of the vessel during the most recent year of participation during the EQP. Vessel Length Classes will be based on the overall length of the vessel as of 6/17/95,[16] as long as the vessel conforms with the provisions of the '20% upgrade' and 'Maximum LOA' rules defined in the moratorium.[17] Owners of vessels which have upgraded beyond the "maximum length" would receive licenses and endorsements, but these licenses and endorsements could not be assigned to the qualifying vessel. Further, for the Norton Sound summer king crab fishery, vessels less than 32' may upgrade beyond 20% but may not exceed 32' unless the 20% upgrade would result in a vessel that exceeds 32'.

The Council selected the Catcher Vessel/Catcher Processor designations to prevent catcher vessels from upgrading to catcher processors and adding capacity. It was the desire of the Council to limit increases in catching (processing) power and inhibit capital stuffing that could occur under the license program. On the other hand, the Council wanted to allow vessels to "downgrade." Therefore, catcher processors would be permitted to operate as catcher vessels or select a one time conversion to a catcher vessel designation. Vessels would also

---

[15] Super-exclusive means that vessels and gear registered to fish crab in the Norton Sound (Northern District) cannot fish any other district during that registration year. The registration district shall be indicated on the inspection certificate (ADF&G, 1994-95 Shellfish regulations).

[16] This date is consistent with the date used to determine length classes in the Groundfish License Limitation Program. If different dates were used in the two programs, the possibility of having a single vessel with two different length class designations arises.

[17] Maximum LOA (*the "20% rule" from the moratorium regulations*) with respect to a vessel means the greatest LOA of that vessel or its replacement that may qualify it to use a moratorium permit to catch and retain moratorium crab species or conduct directed fishing for moratorium groundfish species during the moratorium, except as provided at § 676.4(d). The maximum LOA of a vessel with moratorium qualification will be determined by the Regional Director as follows:

(1) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is less than 125 ft LOA, the maximum LOA will be equal to 1.2 times the vessel's original qualifying length or 125 ft, which ever is less; and

(2) For a vessel with moratorium qualification that is equal to or greater than 125 ft, the maximum LOA will be equal to the vessel's original qualifying length.

Original qualifying length with respect to a vessel means the LOA of the vessel on or before June 24, 1992.

Length overall of a vessel (*from 50 CFR § 672.2 & § 675.2*)means the horizontal distance, rounded to the nearest foot, between the foremost part of the stem and the aftermost part of the stern, excluding bowsprits, rudders, outboard motor brackets, and similar fitting or attachments. (*In instances when the length falls on a ½', the LOA is the nearest even number, e.g., 124'6" is LOA 124', and 125'6" is LOA 126'.*)

be allowed to use licenses for larger vessel size classes on smaller vessels. In general, it was the intent of the Council to prohibit vessels from moving up in size or adding processing capabilities, but not to prevent a vessel from moving to smaller classes.

Safety was seen by the Council as a compelling reason to allow a limited amount of upgrading in vessels. Using the 20% upgrade rule defined in the moratorium, the Council felt they could allow vessels to increase their length without substantially increasing capacity or fishing power. The maximum length that a vessel would be allowed to upgrade is based on a 20% increase over its length as of June 24, 1992.

Norton Sound vessels less than 32' LOA will be allowed to upgrade to 32' LOA even if it is more than 20% of their June 24, 1992 length. The Council heard testimony that several vessels operating in Norton Sound were skiffs. Some of the skiffs were reported to be as small as 14' LOA. Concern for the skiff operators safety prompted the Council allow these vessels to upgrade to 32' LOA.

Qualifying Periods

For General Licenses, the BQP is January 1, 1988 through June 27, 1992, with the additional provision that any vessel which "crossed over" to crab from groundfish (by December 31, 1994) under the proposed moratorium would also qualify for a General License. Vessels meeting these requirements would receive endorsements based on landings in the January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1994 EQP except Bristol Bay red king crab which will use January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1994 as the EQP. Vessels in the Norton Sound king crab fisheries, and Pribilof king crab fisheries will be exempt from the requirements of the BQP, but must have made landings between January 1, 1993 and December 31, 1994 to qualify for a general license and endorsement.[18]

The crab BQP selected by the Council is the same as the BQP chosen for groundfish. This qualification period was selected for both fisheries because it reflects the moratorium years and the Council's long published Control Date. A four-month extension of the moratorium was included in the Council's BQP to match the cut-off date announced early in their Comprehensive Rationalization deliberations.

The three most recent years a fishery was open were used for the EQP. Using the most recent years for endorsement qualification was selected because they reflect a fishery's current fleet and participants. The Council felt endorsement periods that reach too far back in time may not adequately achieve this goal. Two fisheries have only been open since 1993. For these fisheries (Norton Sound summer king crab and Pribilof red king crab), the BQP requirements have been waived, but landings must have been made in 1993 or 1994 to qualify for a general license and endorsement.

Minimum Landings

To receive a red or blue king crab species/area endorsement a vessel must have made at least one landing in that red or blue king crab fishery during the EQP. To receive a brown king crab species/area endorsement, a vessel must have made at least three landings in the brown king crab fishery during the EQP of January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1994. To receive a combined *C. opilio*/*C. bairdi* crab species/area endorsement, a vessel must have made at least three landings of *C. opilio* or *C. bairdi* during the EQP.

---

[18] The Council passed an amendment in this section stating that a vessel which qualifies for a Norton Sound King Crab endorsement would not be issued other endorsements. The Council's intent is that a vessel not be allowed to participate in both the Norton Sound Fishery and another BSAI crab fishery in the same year. The Council's intent is best implemented by maintaining the current super-exclusive registration for the Norton Sound fishery, and allowing persons to receive any and all endorsements for which the vessel qualifies.

The above minimum landings requirements were selected based on the structure of the individual fisheries. Brown king crab seasons generally last longer than red or blue.[19] For example, the 1993/1994 Adak brown king crab fishery had 21 vessels report a total of 147 landings. Dividing the total number of landings by the number of vessels participating in the fishery yields an average of 7 landings per vessel. To qualify for an Adak brown king crab endorsement, vessels are only required to make three landings over a three year period. Given that the average vessel made seven landings during the 1993/1994 season, three landings should be obtainable by vessels dependent on that fishery.

C. opilio and *C. bairdi* fisheries also had relatively high numbers of landings per vessel during the EQP. These fisheries have traditionally not opened concurrently so vessels would have the opportunity to fish both. Vessels fishing *C. opilio* during the EQP averaged 10.2 landings per year. The average number of landings per year in the *C. bairdi* fishery was slightly lower at 6.0. Given these average numbers of landings per year, the three landings minimum does not seem overly restrictive to crabbers qualifying for the combined Bering Sea *C. opilio* and *C. bairdi* endorsement.

Many of the red and blue king crab fisheries have shorter seasons. The Bristol Bay red king crab fishery was open for seven days during 1991 and 1992. In 1993, the season lasted nine days. Because of the short seasons during the three endorsement qualifying year the vessels that participated averaged only 1.1 landings per year. Had the Council imposed the same three landing minimum that it did for Adak brown crab, the average crabber would have had to fish in all three EQP years to qualify for an endorsement. This would have been a very restrictive requirement. The average number of landings per vessel during the EQP in the St. Matthew blue king crab fishery [illegible] only slightly higher at 1.3.

3.3.2 Components and Alternative Elements Affecting the Ownership, Use, and Transfer of Licenses

This section of the crab license program will describe the components that are not specific to the initial allocation of licenses. The components listed in this section were chosen for the same reasons they were selected in the groundfish license program. Justification is provided in the groundfish section and will not be reiterated here. Should the reader wish to review the Council's justification it may be found in Section 3.2.2 of this document.

Who May Purchase Licenses
Licenses may be transferred only to "persons" defined as those eligible to document a fishing vessel under Chapter 121, Title 46 U.S.C. There shall be no leasing of crab licenses.

Vessel/License Linkages
Licenses may be transferred without a vessel, i.e., licenses may be applied to vessels other than the one to which the license initially was issued, subject to license designations, and the "20% rule" and "maximum LOA" in the moratorium regulations, and the "no leasing" restriction. Licenses may be applied to vessels shorter than the "maximum LOA" regardless of vessel class designations, i.e., "downgrades" in vessel classes are allowed.

Options Regarding the Separability of Species and/or Area Designations
Species/area endorsements are not separable, and shall remain as a single "package," which includes the assigned CV/CP and vessel length class designations. Crab and groundfish licenses that are initially issued to a person (as defined under "License Recipients") are not separable and shall remain as a block for a period of three years, after which time the Council may review whether or not the groundfish and crab licenses should remain non-severable. Crab Licenses obtained after the initial allocation will not be combined with any other licenses owned by the person, and will remain a separate license.

---

[19] Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the 1995 King and Tanner Crab Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Regions, September 1995.

Vessel Replacement and Upgrades
Vessels may be replaced or upgraded within the bounds of the vessel length designations and the 20% rule as defined in the moratorium proposed rule. If a vessel upgrades under the "20% rule" to a length which falls into a higher vessel length designation after 6/17/95, then the vessel owner would receive the license and endorsements, but could not use them on that vessel.[20]

License Ownership Caps
No more than 5 general licenses per person, with grandfather provisions to those persons who exceed this limit in the initial allocation. The intent of the Council is that this limit is applied to the "person" as defined under "License Recipients," and is not interpreted to apply to individual owners within corporations or partnerships.

Vessel License Use Caps
There is no limit on the number of licenses (or endorsements) which may be used on a vessel.

Vessel Designation Limits
A vessel which qualifies for multiple designations (i.e., both as a CV and as a CP) under the use restriction component will be able to participate under any designation for which it qualifies. Vessel designations will be based on **activities** during 1/1/94 - 12/31/94, or the most recent year of participation during the EQP. If a vessel qualifies as a CP only, it may select a one-time (permanent) conversion to a CV, though a CP may operate in either mode. If a vessel qualifies as a CV only, it is restricted to operate as a CV.

Community Development Quotas
For those BSAI Crab species for which there is an assigned Guideline Harvest Level, 7.5% of the GHL shall be allocated to CDQ communities, as defined in the current CDQ program, with the addition of Akutan. The Crab CDQ Program shall be patterned after current CDQ programs but will not contain a sunset provision.

Other Provisions
1) Licenses represent a use privilege. The Council may convert the license program to an IFQ program or otherwise alter or rescind the program without compensation to license holders.

2) Severe penalties may be invoked for failure to comply with conditions of the license.

3) Licenses may be suspended or revoked for serious and/or multiple violations. (The Council recommends NMFS consult with the Coalition for Stability in Marine Financing regarding license revocation concerns.)

4) A Skipper Reporting System will be implemented which requires crab license holders to report skipper names, address, and service records to NMFS.

5) No future super-exclusive areas will be proposed. This option is only an expression of Council intent. Currently Norton Sound is the only super-exclusive registration area.

6) Vessels which qualified for the NPFMC license limitation program that have been lost or destroyed are still eligible to receive earned licenses and endorsements, subject to rules and conditions outlined in this program.

7) Vessels which qualify under the moratorium and were lost, damaged, or otherwise out of the fishery due to factors beyond the control of the owner, and which were replaced or otherwise reentered the fisheries in accordance with the moratorium rules and which made a landing in a fishery any time between the time the

---

[20] This is an issue for vessels which have an original qualifying length >50' LOA but less than 60' LOA, or vessels which have an original qualifying length greater than 103' LOA but less than 125'. If these vessels upgrade to the full extent allowed by the "20% rule" after 6/17/95, they will have exceeded the length allowed by the vessel class designations.

vessel left the fishery and June 17, 1995 (the date of final Council action on the license program), will be qualified for a general license and endorsement for that fishery.

8) The CDQ vessel exemption included in the Moratorium, will continue under the Crab License Limitation Program. This exemption allows vessels <125' obtained under an approved CDQ plan to participate in both CDQ and non-CDQ fisheries. If the vessel is sold to an interest outside the CDQ plan, the vessel will no longer be exempt from the requirements of the license program.

9) Elements and components of the Groundfish and Crab License Limitation Program as described in this action are integral to the overall program. No component or element of the program should be regarded as severable by the Secretary of Commerce.

It should be noted that for both groundfish and crab, the Council voted not to implement the Two-Tiered Skipper License Program at this time. Future analysis of a license program for skippers, based on the amended program outlined by SEA, will be set on its own time line. The Council also chose not to set a sunset date for the groundfish or crab license programs at this time. These issues are discussed in some detail in previous (attached) analyses.

3.3.3 Distribution of Licenses and Endorsements

The number of licenses and endorsements that would be issued, based on the Council staff's analysis data base, will be described in this section. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the number of licenses and the number of vessels that qualify. So when a table reports the total number of licenses, it could also be read as the total number of vessels.

Table 3.9 reports the number of endorsements and licenses that would be issued under the Council's crab license program. This table can be interpreted much the same as the groundfish tables. The first eight rows of the table represent the individual species/area endorsements categories that were selected by the Council. Reading across each of those rows indicates the number of vessels that would receive endorsements for that fishery. The ninth row of the table sums each of the species/area endorsement rows to yield the total number of endorsements that would be issued. Finally, the last row identifies the number of vessels that would qualify for a general crab license.

Reading the bottom right row of this table shows there are 427 vessels that will qualify for crab licenses. Exactly 400 of these vessels are catcher vessels and the remaining 27 are catcher processors. Only two of the catcher processors are less than 125' LOA. A majority of the catcher vessels are less than 125' LOA. Therefore, only 55 of the 400 catcher vessels would qualify for the 250 pot limit.

Table 3.9 Licenses and endorsements issued to current vessel owners based on landings during the crab license qualifiying period. Vessels qualifying for Brown king crab and C. bairdi and C. opilio were required to make a minimum of three landings for those species and area combinations to earn an endorsement.

	Current Owner's State of Residence																	
	Alaska									Other								
	CV				CP				Alaska	CV				CP				Other
Area/Species Endorsements	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Bering Sea Bairdi & Opilio	2	86	11	99	0	0	1	1	100	0	156	41	197	0	2	24	26	223
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	7	14	0	0	4	4	18
St. Matthew Blue King	0	46	8	54	0	0	0	0	54	0	110	25	135	0	1	11	12	147
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	51	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	51	8	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Pribilof Red & Blue King	9	51	2	62	0	0	0	0	62	3	83	19	105	0	0	8	8	113
Adak Brown King	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	10	7	17	0	0	5	5	22
Adak Red King	0	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	18	3	21	0	0	1	1	22
Bristol Bay Red King	3	94	11	108	0	0	1	1	109	1	161	40	202	0	1	24	25	227
Total Endorsements	**65**	**291**	**35**	**391**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**393**	**12**	**549**	**142**	**703**	**0**	**4**	**77**	**81**	**784**
Total Licenses	**62**	**101**	**12**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**176**	**11**	**171**	**43**	**225**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**26**	**251**

	Total								
	CV				CP				
Area/Species Endorsements	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Licenses
Bering Sea Bairdi & Opilio	2	242	52	296	0	2	25	27	323
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	9	8	17	0	0	4	4	21
St. Matthew Blue King	0	156	33	189	0	1	11	12	201
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	59	4	0	63	0	0	0	0	63
Pribilof Red & Blue King	12	134	21	167	0	0	8	8	175
Adak Brown King	0	14	8	22	0	0	5	5	27
Adak Red King	0	26	4	30	0	0	1	1	31
Bristol Bay Red King	4	255	51	310	0	1	25	26	336
Total Endorsements	**77**	**840**	**177**	**1,094**	**0**	**4**	**79**	**83**	**1,177**
Total Licenses	**73**	**272**	**55**	**400**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**27**	**427**

The Bristol Bay red king crab fishery has the most endorsements with 336. The number of endorsements allocated in the combined Bering Sea *C. opilio* and *C. bairdi* fishery were second. A total of 323 endorsements was issued for this fishery. The fewest endorsements would be allocated to the Dutch Harbor and Adak brown king crab fisheries with 21 and 27 vessels qualifying, respectively. Sixty-three endorsements would be issued for the Norton Sound summer king crab fisheries. Only four of the 63 vessels are ≥60' LOA; 51 of the 59 vessels < 60' LOA had owners that reside in Alaska. Most of these small Norton Sound permits were issued to the permit holder. The vessel length for permit holders was determined based on the length of the most recent vessel they fished through June 17, 1995.

Dividing the total endorsements by the number of vessels that qualify yields the average number of endorsements per vessel. Catcher vessels < 60' LOA would be issued a total of 77 endorsements on 73 vessels. This equals less than 1.1 endorsements per vessel. In other words, small catcher vessels will generally qualify for only one species/area endorsement. Because 59 of these vessels qualify for the super-exclusive Norton Sound fishery they are only allowed to fish one area. So, this does not restrict their traditional fishing patterns. Catcher vessels between 60 and 125' LOA qualify for an average of just under 3.1 species/area endorsements per vessel. Often one of the endorsements they qualify for is Bristol Bay red king crab. This fishery is currently closed which leaves the average vessel just over two fishable species/area endorsements.

Some of the vessels that are unable to participate in specific fisheries because they hold too few endorsements may opt to shift their effort to a "developing fishery." This shifting of effort may cause a more rapid development of these fisheries than would have occurred under open access, as crabbers try to adapt to fewer fishing opportunities.

Comparing the number of qualified vessels in Table 3.9 to the vessels that fished during 1994, in Table 2.3, shows how the fishery may change if the license program is implemented. Because the Bristol Bay red king crab fishery was closed in 1994, this fishery is not presented in the "current fleet" table. However, the 1993 fishery had 292[21] vessels participating. The combined Bering Sea *C. opilio* and *C. bairdi* fishery had 294 vessels take part during 1994. A total of 323 vessels would qualify for the license program for this species/area combination. This means that 29 additional vessels would qualify for endorsements than fished during 1994. More vessels qualifying for the license program than fished during 1994 is the case for all species/area endorsements. St. Matthew blue king crab had over twice as many vessels qualify for endorsements as fished during 1994. This fishery had only 87 vessels participate during 1994, however in 1992 there were 174 vessels. Because St. Matthew blue king crab endorsements are issued to vessels that made a single landing between 1992 and 1994 (so long as they also met the BQP requirement), a total of 201 vessels qualify. The Pribilof red and blue king crab fishery, which opens concurrently with the St. Matthew blue king crab fishery, had 105 vessels participate in 1994. This fishery also had 175 vessels qualify for an endorsement. Since endorsements are non-severable, the 108 vessels that qualified for both the Pribilof and St. Matthew fisheries would only be allowed to take part in one of the fisheries each year. Dividing these 108 vessels between the two fisheries could make the actual participation much closer to the 1994 level under license limitation.

Information on the vessel owner's county/borough of residence is provided in Appendix III. Residence information has been provided to give the reader more detailed information on where these licenses and endorsements will be controlled at the time of issuance. The data do not provide any information on personal contracts that would affect the licenses after they are issued. This table should only be viewed as an estimate of the structure of the fleet at the time licenses are issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service. A similar table is provided for the "current" (1994) fleet.

---

[21] Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report for the 1995 King and Tanner Crab Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island Regions, September 1995.

Table 3.10 Number of endorsements per vessel (or permit holder) issued to qualifiers in the crab license limitation program.

Endorsements per License	Current Owner's State of Residence																	
	Alaska								Alaska Total	Other								Other Total
	CV				CP					CV				CP				
	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
1	60	14	2	76	0	0	0	0	76	10	13	1	24	0	1	0	1	25
2	1	20	1	22	0	0	1	1	23	1	38	10	49	0	0	6	6	55
3	1	38	6	45	0	0	0	0	45	0	59	14	73	0	1	11	12	85
4	0	24	2	26	0	0	0	0	26	0	33	12	45	0	0	4	4	49
5	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	20	5	25	0	0	2	2	27
6	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	6	0	0	1	1	7
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Total Endorsements	**65**	**291**	**35**	**391**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**393**	**12**	**549**	**142**	**703**	**0**	**4**	**77**	**81**	**784**
Total Licenses	**62**	**101**	**12**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**176**	**11**	**171**	**43**	**225**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**26**	**251**

Endorsements per License	Total								Licenses
	CV				CP				
	< 60	(65)	>=125	Total	< 60	(65)	>=125	Total	
1	70	27	3	100	0	1	0	1	101
2	2	58	11	71	0	0	7	7	78
3	1	97	20	118	0	1	11	12	130
4	0	57	14	71	0	0	4	4	75
5	0	23	6	29	0	0	2	2	31
6	0	7	1	8	0	0	1	1	9
7	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Total Endorsements	**77**	**840**	**177**	**1,094**	**0**	**4**	**79**	**83**	**1,177**
Total Licenses	**73**	**272**	**55**	**400**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**27**	**427**

Table 3.10 lists the number of endorsements per license (vessel). Earlier in this section we discussed how to calculate the average number of endorsements per vessel using the information provided in Table 3.8. This table provides more detail. The first seven rows of this table correspond to the number of endorsements a vessel would be issued. There is a maximum of seven different species/area endorsements that can be earned under the crab license program; there is a total of eight endorsements but the Norton Sound is super-exclusive.

To calculate the total number of endorsements, the reader must multiply the number of licenses by the endorsements per license. For example, 62 Alaskan-owned catcher vessels < 60' LOA would be issued 65 endorsements. Sixty of the vessels would be issued one endorsement, one vessel would be issued two, and one vessel would be issued three. Summing the number of endorsements (60+2+3) yields 65. Simply summing the columns (60+1+1) gives the total number of licenses (vessels).

Only three vessels will receive all seven crab endorsements. All three were catcher vessels between 60 and 125' LOA. These vessels will be able to participate in any crab fishery that would have been available to them under open access. Three crab endorsements per vessels were most common. This finding is consistent with the average vessel being issued 3.1 species/area endorsements for crab.

Table 3.11 shows the number of years qualifying vessels participated in the crab fishery from 1988 through 1994. Norton Sound vessels have been excluded from this table. The main reason for excluding these vessels is because permit holders, and not vessel owners, were the main recipients of licenses in this fishery. In these cases, a permit holder's catch history, not the vessel's catch history, was used as the criterion for issuing a license. The vessel's history of participation is not relevant. Also, several permit holders may have fished off the same vessel and qualified for Norton Sound endorsements.

Vessels in the crab fishery have a more consistent participation history than groundfish vessels (Tables 3.11 and 3.4). Vessels generally participated in the groundfish fishery less than five calendar years between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995. Crab vessels, on the other hand, generally participated in four or more calendar years between 1988 and 1994. This indicates there is less entry and exit in the crab fishery, for license qualified vessels, than in groundfish. A total of 164 crab vessels fished all seven of the calendar years between 1988 and 1994. Four calendar years (55) was next in terms of numbers of vessels, followed by five (43) and six years (34). Fewer vessels fished three years or less.

Consistent participation in the crab fisheries could be due to several factors. Crab vessels are generally ≥60' LOA; as we saw with groundfish, larger vessels had more consistent participation patterns. The crab fishery has been around longer than the groundfish fishery so these vessels may be closer to being paid off. Vessels carrying less debt are in a better position to stay solvent during bad seasons, and therefore are less likely to exit the fishery. Finally, crab vessels may have fewer alternatives than their groundfish counterparts. Small groundfish boats may participate in other fisheries like salmon, sablefish, demersal shelf rockfish, and halibut in addition to groundfish covered under the license program. Larger pot boats would have fewer opportunities during the winter months when they traditionally crab.

Information on the class of vessels participating in the crab fishery is listed in Table 3.12. These are the same vessel classes that were defined in Appendix II. Vessels in the pot harvester categories accounted for most of the vessels. Catcher vessels in the PH1, PH1*, PH2, PH2*, and SEN/PH2 categories accounted for 269 of the 427 vessels. Forty-five of the vessels were in the MSC category. Norton Sound permit holders were placed in this category because of the uncertainty surrounding the vessels on which their licenses will eventually be used. There are 44 TH2* vessels. These vessels had used trawl gear between 1988 and 1993 (for groundfish) in addition to pot gear.

Information on the amount of catch reported by vessels from each class is shown in Table 3.13. As expected, vessels in the larger classes reported the most catch. The crab catcher processor class (CP1) averaged over 4

million pounds of reported crab harvest per vessel. Crab processor vessels that also were longline processors (CP1/LP1) averaged over 5.4 million pounds per vessel. Small vessels like those in the miscellaneous (MSC) category averaged less than 10,000 pounds per vessel. These smaller vessels require less revenue to meet the debt payments. They are also more diversified in the species they target. Vessels in the seine/pot category are likely to also fish salmon. Longline/pot vessels may also fish Pacific cod, rockfish, or halibut. Small amounts of landings, relative to the large vessels, in several fisheries allow these vessels to be profitable.

3.3.4 Vessels That Did Not Qualify for a Crab License

Not all vessels that fished crab in federal waters between 1988 and 1994 will qualify for a license. Some of the vessels will not qualify because they fished in only one of the qualifying periods. Other vessels may not have met the minimum landings requirements that the Council required. In either case, a vessel could have had limited participation, but not qualified.

Table 3.14 lists the number of vessels and the reported catch of the vessels that made landings between 1988 and 1994, but did not qualify for a license. The first column is the year of the landing. Column two is the number of vessels that fished that year but did not get a license. Finally, the last six columns show the pounds of landings by species and the total pounds these vessels reported.

It should be noted that the total number of vessels does not equal the sum of vessels fishing each year. This is because some vessels fished multiple years but did not qualify. For example, a vessel could have fished only 1988 through 1991. This vessel would have participated only in the BQP and would not qualify. In fact, when the number of vessels participating by year is summed, it results in a total of 154 vessel years. This means the average vessel that didn't qualify fished just over 1.6 years.

The number of vessels that didn't qualify was larger in the historic period (BQP) than recent period (EQP). There is a steady downward trend in the number of vessels from 1988 though 1993 with a small upturn in 1994. This indicates that most of the 95 vessels that would not be issued a license fished prior to 1992. In other words, they have been out of the fishery for at least three years. The pounds of catch reported by these vessels also dropped after 1990. Before 1991, the smallest reported catch was 6.2 million pounds. Since 1991, the largest reported catch was only 2.6 million pounds.

Table 3.14 indicates that the crab fleet is relatively stable. Only 95 vessels that fished during the BQP or EQP would not receive a crab license, while 427 would. This equates to just under 82% of the vessels getting a license. Comparing this percentage to the groundfish fleet, where only about 57% of the vessels fishing the EQP or BQP qualified for a license, we can see the stability of the crab fleet. In the crab fleet, 82 vessels would be licensed for every 100 boats that fished at some time between January 1, 1988 and December 31, 1994. Only 57 out of 100 would be licensed in groundfish that fished between January 1, 1988 and June 27, 1995.

Table 3.11 Number of years qualifying vessels participated in the crab fishery between 1988 and 1994. Permit holders issued licenses for the Norton Sound red and blue crab fisheries are not included.

	Current Owner's State of Residence																	
	Alaska									Other								
	CV				CP				Alaska	CV				CP				Other
Years Fished	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
1	14	9	2	25	0	0	0	0	25	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	4
2	8	8	0	16	0	0	0	0	16	0	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	10
3	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	13	4	17	0	0	3	3	20
4	1	11	3	15	0	0	0	0	15	1	31	5	37	0	0	3	3	40
5	0	17	2	19	0	0	0	0	19	0	15	4	19	0	0	5	5	24
6	0	11	1	12	0	0	0	0	12	0	15	6	21	0	0	1	1	22
7	0	39	4	43	0	0	1	1	44	0	86	21	107	0	1	12	13	120
Total Vessels	**23**	**101**	**12**	**136**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**137**	**3**	**168**	**43**	**214**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**26**	**240**

	Total								
	CV				CP				
Years Fished	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
1	16	10	2	28	0	1	0	1	29
2	8	15	3	26	0	0	0	0	26
3	0	19	4	23	0	0	3	3	26
4	2	42	8	52	0	0	3	3	55
5	0	32	6	38	0	0	5	5	43
6	0	26	7	33	0	0	1	1	34
7	0	125	25	150	0	1	13	14	164
Total Vessels	**26**	**269**	**55**	**350**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**27**	**377**

Table 3.12 The Number of Qualified Vessels and Endorsements by Vessel Class

Vessel Class	Total Vessels	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. *opilio*	Dutch Harbor Brown King	St. Matthew Blue King	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	Pribilof Red & Blue King	Adak Brown King	Adak Red King	Bristol Bay Red King	Total
CP1	12	12	4	3	0	2	5	0	12	38
CP1/LP1	13	13	0	9	0	5	0	1	13	41
CSEN*	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
DRG	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
LP1	4	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	8
MSC	45	3	0	0	37	5	0	1	0	46
PCP1	5	5	0	3	0	2	0	1	5	16
PH1	35	33	8	25	0	14	8	1	34	123
PH1*	7	7	0	4	0	1	0	1	7	20
PH2	97	92	8	79	0	61	12	12	93	357
PH2*	104	90	0	56	1	53	1	10	100	311
SEN/PH2	26	0	0	0	21	4	0	0	1	26
SEN/TH4	6	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	10
TH1*	5	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	5	13
TH2*	44	43	1	15	0	8	1	3	43	114
TH3*	20	12	0	3	3	9	0	1	15	43
TP3*	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	7
Total	427	323	21	201	63	175	27	31	336	1,177

Table 3.13 The Number of Qualified Vessels and Pounds of Landings by Vessel Class

Class	Total Vessels	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. *opilio*	Dutch Harbor Brown King	St. Matthew Blue King	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	Pribilof Red & Blue King	Adak Brown King	Adak Red King	Bristol Bay Red King	Total
CP1	12	43,100,000	722,882	143,758	-	331,111	3,057,273	-	1,020,000	48,375,024
CP1/LP1	13	67,800,000	-	481,343	-	1,099,842	-	6,663	1,300,000	70,687,848
CSEN*	1	-	-	-	5,684	-	-	-	-	5,684
DRG	1	4,530,000	-	-	-	125,842	-	-	166,776	4,822,618
LP1	4	2,057,408	-	59,446	-	125,294	-	-	73,908	2,316,056
MSC	45	223,601	-	-	169,888	50,329	-	20	-	443,838
PCP1	5	14,630,000	-	55,478	-	195,797	-	20,980	488,611	15,390,866
PH1	35	116,400,000	2,520,158	1,047,079	-	2,606,486	7,700,000	2,091	2,960,000	133,235,814
PH1*	7	22,100,000	-	435,661	-	204,395	-	553,506	580,557	23,874,119
PH2	97	255,500,000	730,891	3,960,000	-	6,595,666	3,356,782	951,070	7,790,000	278,884,409
PH2*	104	174,100,000	-	2,257,463	30,221	4,491,036	25,699	598,022	5,810,000	187,312,441
SEN/PH2	26	-	-	-	259,417	152,790	-	-	1	412,208
SEN/TH4	6	9,200	-	-	-	115,000	-	-	20,962	145,162
TH1*	5	8,550,000	-	6,400	-	281,168	-	-	516,552	9,354,120
TH2*	44	32,492,547	25,305	443,259	-	2,041,139	80,497	111,218	3,050,001	38,243,966
TH3*	20	4,920,367	-	73,661	-	585,736	-	31,161	643,963	6,254,888
TP3*	2	6,510,000	-	84,934	-	146,141	-	-	279,224	7,020,299
Total	427	752,923,123	3,999,236	9,048,482	465,210	19,147,772	14,220,251	2,274,731	24,700,555	826,779,360

Table 3.14 Reported Catch from Vessels not Qualifying for a Crab License

Year	Vessels	Red king	Blue King	Brown King	C. *bairdi*	C. *opilio*	Total Pounds
1988	43	515,263	83,330	1,166,046	331,178	7,909,989	10,005,806
1989	40	553,482	36,274	306,422	284,165	5,043,406	6,223,749
1990	36	345,900	0	83,829	1,052,329	5,041,531	6,523,589
1991	18	0	521	0	139,572	1,669,140	1,809,233
1992	5	0	0	0	176,793	1,404,734	1,581,527
1993	5	0	0	0	1,136,135	732,558	1,868,693
1994	7	0	0	0	60,572	2,536,897	2,597,469
Total	95	1,414,645	120,125	1,556,297	1,807,244	19,664,066	24,562,377

3.3.5 Vessels That Qualify for Both Groundfish and Crab Licenses

Section 3.2 was devoted to the vessels that qualified for groundfish licenses. Section 3.3 provided similar information for the crab license program. This section will focus on the vessels that qualified for both groundfish and crab licenses. All of the vessels in this section have been discussed in the both the groundfish and crab sections above. No new vessels are included in this section.

Providing information on vessels that are licensed under both programs is important because of the non-severability clause. Vessels that qualify for both licenses will be issued a non-severable package. Should a vessel owner wish to sell the license, they would be required to sell both the groundfish and crab licenses along with all the attendant endorsements. This provision also restricts a vessel owner from fishing his crab licenses on one vessel and groundfish on another. The Council did not want additional vessels entering the fishery. However, if a vessel owner is initially issued only a groundfish or crab license, he may purchase the other and they will remain severable.

Table 3.15 reports the groundfish licenses and endorsements earned by vessels that qualify for both and Table 3.16 reports the crab. The structure of this table is exactly like that used to report the qualified groundfish vessels in Section 3.2.

A total of 243 vessels qualified for both groundfish and crab licenses. This represents almost 57% of the qualified crab fleet and just over 10% of the groundfish licensed vessels. Only 26 of these vessels were groundfish catcher processors. The remaining 217 were catcher vessels. These vessels earned a total of 442 area endorsements. The most endorsements would be issued for the Bering Sea (198). The second most area endorsements (100) were for the Western Gulf. Only one area endorsement would be issued for the Southeast Outside. Because the federal crab fisheries take place in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands, it seems logical that many of these vessels would also fish groundfish there. This indeed seems to be the case. The two areas furthest from the crab fisheries (SEO and CG+WY) only had a total of 92 endorsements issued to vessels qualifying for both crab and groundfish. This means that the remaining 2,318 groundfish endorsements in these two areas would be issued to vessels that only qualified for the groundfish program. The three areas closest to the federal crab fisheries (BS, AI, and WG) had a total of 350 groundfish endorsements that would be issued to vessels in both the groundfish and crab programs. This is over 44% of the total number of groundfish endorsements which would be issued in those areas.

Table 3.15 Vessels That Qualified Under Both the Groundfish and Crab Vessel License Program

	Alaska									Other								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Alaska	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processsors				Other
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	4	0	23	4	27	0	3	18	21	48
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	9	38	2	49	0	1	1	2	51	2	104	18	124	0	5	18	23	147
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	14	37	0	51	0	1	1	2	53	2	31	2	35	0	2	1	3	38
SEO (Vessels Fished)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	7	25	1	33	0	1	1	2	35	2	51	6	59	0	1	5	6	65
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS	30	103	3	136	0	4	4	8	144	6	209	30	245	0	11	42	53	298
BSAI/GOA Vessels	6	27	1	34	0	1	1	2	36	1	47	5	53	0	3	4	7	60
BSAI Only Vessels	3	11	1	15	0	0	0	0	15	1	59	13	73	0	2	15	17	90
GOA Only Vessels	9	19	0	28	0	0	0	0	28	1	12	1	14	0	0	0	0	14
TOTAL VESSELS	18	57	2	77	0	1	1	2	79	3	118	19	140	0	5	19	24	164

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	<60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutian Islands (Vessels Fished)	0	25	4	29	0	4	19	23	52
Bering Sea (Vessels Fished)	11	142	20	173	0	6	19	25	198
CG+WY (Vessels Fished)	16	68	2	86	0	3	2	5	91
SEO (Vessels Fished)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Western Gulf (Vessels Fished)	9	76	7	92	0	2	6	8	100
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS	36	312	33	381	0	15	46	61	442
BSAI/GOA Vessels	7	74	6	87	0	4	5	9	96
BSAI Only Vessels	4	70	14	88	0	2	15	17	105
GOA Only Vessels	10	31	1	42	0	0	0	0	42
TOTAL VESSELS	21	175	21	217	0	6	20	26	243

Table 3.16 Vessels That Qualified Under Both the Groundfish and Crab Vessel License Program

	Current Owner's State of Residence																	
	Alaska									Other								
	CV				CP				Alaska	CV				CP				Other
Area/Species Endorsements	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Bering Sea Bairdi & Opilio	2	53	3	58	0	0	0	0	58	0	113	23	136	0	1	14	15	151
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	9
St. Matthew Blue King	0	23	1	24	0	0	0	0	24	0	76	12	88	0	0	9	9	97
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pribilof Red & Blue King	8	31	1	40	0	0	0	0	40	3	58	11	72	0	0	5	5	77
Adak Brown King	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	11
Adak Red King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	13	3	16	0	0	1	1	17
Bristol Bay Red King	2	57	2	61	0	0	0	0	61	1	118	22	141	0	0	14	14	155
Total Endorsements	**21**	**169**	**7**	**197**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**197**	**4**	**392**	**77**	**473**	**0**	**1**	**43**	**44**	**517**
Total Licenses	**18**	**58**	**3**	**79**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**79**	**3**	**122**	**24**	**149**	**0**	**1**	**14**	**24**	**164**

	Total								
	CV				CP				
Area/Species Endorsements	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Licenses
Bering Sea Bairdi & Opilio	2	166	26	194	0	1	14	15	209
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	9
St. Matthew Blue King	0	99	13	112	0	0	9	9	121
Norton Sound Red & Blue King	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Pribilof Red & Blue King	11	89	12	112	0	0	5	5	117
Adak Brown King	0	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	11
Adak Red King	0	18	3	21	0	0	1	1	22
Bristol Bay Red King	3	175	24	202	0	0	14	14	216
Total Endorsements	**25**	**561**	**84**	**670**	**0**	**1**	**43**	**44**	**714**
Total Licenses	**21**	**180**	**27**	**228**	**0**	**1**	**14**	**15**	**243**

Table 3.16 lists the crab endorsements that would be earned by vessels qualifying for both licenses. The 243 vessels would be issued a total of 714 crab endorsements. This would account for over 60% of all the crab endorsements that would be issued. The most endorsements (216) would be issued for the Bristol Bay red king crab fishery. Vessels would also be issued 209 Bering Sea *C. opilio* and *C. bairdi* endorsements. It is interesting to note that nine vessels qualify for the Norton Sound fishery. These vessels will not be allowed to participate in other crab fisheries, but they will have a license to fish groundfish.

Comparing the total numbers of vessels in each vessel license category, you will notice some differences between Tables 3.15 and 3.16. For example, in Table 3.15, there were 26 catcher processors that would receive a groundfish license, but Table 3.16 shows only 16 catcher processors. These vessels operated as catcher vessels in the crab fisheries and catcher processors in groundfish. So, some vessels would be licensed as catcher vessels for crab and catcher processors for groundfish.

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT

This section is divided into two parts. The first focuses on the cost of implementing and enforcing the groundfish and crab license programs. Other issues relating to enforcement and implementation are discussed in the second section.

4.1 IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS

The regional office of NMFS has developed two documents on the cost of implementing and enforcing the groundfish and crab license programs. Both documents are presented in Appendix V. The first is dated January 30, 1995, and is broader in scope. It was developed when the Council was still considering issuing species endorsements for groundfish. NMFS preliminary analysis indicated that this type of a program would be more difficult to administer and enforce than area licenses. Therefore, a groundfish license program with species endorsements was expected to be more costly to administer. The second document was developed after the Council had narrowed its alternatives in April 1995. This paper, dated June 7, 1995, focuses on general licenses with area endorsements. This is the structure of the Council's adopted license program.

Both papers assumed that approximately 3,500 licenses would be issued in the groundfish fishery and 550 in crab. As has been reported earlier in this document, the Council's staff is estimating the actual number of vessels to be about 1,000 less in groundfish and 100 less in crab than NMFS used in their assumptions. However, reducing the number of vessels receiving licenses by that amount may not greatly impact the cost of implementing or running the program.

The Magnuson Act allows NMFS to collect fees for issuing the permits, which could cover the additional employees required by the RAM Division. Based on the estimated costs expected to be incurred by NMFS, the fee charged to permit holders could be in the $60 range.

NMFS estimates that the license program will require about 10 extra employees at an annual cost of $525,000. Five would be in the RAM Division, four in NOAA General Counsel, and one in enforcement. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) will monitor the crab portion of the license program. Officials at ADF&G did not feel the license program will require them to change their monitoring of the crab fishery. They will still require the vessels to have tank inspections, and the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission will still issue fishery permits to individuals wanting to participate in those fisheries. Therefore, ADF&G did not feel that the program would incur many additional expenses in terms of monitoring. The RAM Division will be tasked with issuing the licenses for both groundfish and crab.

4.2 OTHER IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

This section briefly describes implementation and enforcement issues other than those related to program costs. They involve disputed licenses, the CDQ program, and how vessel characteristics are determined.

4.2.1 Issuing Disputed Licenses

When there are disputes concerning the disposition of fishing rights, NMFS will not issue the license until a settlement is reached. These individuals will not be allowed to fish until the license is issued. A settlement could be reached either through the RAM Division's appeals process, the courts, or by the parties involved coming to an agreement. This same process was used by RAM when issuing quota shares under the sablefish and halibut IFQ program.

4.2.2 Implementation and Enforcement of the Groundfish and Crab CDQ Programs

Implementing and monitoring the CDQ portion of the license limitation program will be complex. The Council, in conjunction with NMFS, will need to establish guidelines for these fisheries, and two important considerations will be observer coverage for various sectors of the fleet and how the actual catch will be estimated. The Council stated its intent to pattern the CDQ portion of the license program after the pollock CDQ program. Currently, the pollock CDQ program requires two observers on each vessel, which allows NMFS to estimate the actual catch and discard rates. This level of coverage may not be practical in all cases. Should the CDQ groups wish to fish some of their groundfish allocation, such as Pacific cod on small vessels, two observers may not be appropriate, because small vessels would probably only make day trips in the Bering Sea. Two observers certainly would not be needed to estimate catch and discards, and space may be inadequate.

Closing of CDQ fisheries also raises issues. NMFS may choose to close the fishery when the CDQ community harvests all of an allocated species. This may be either the first target, bycatch, or PSC bycatch species for which all quota has been used. NMFS must develop a method to accurately account for the harvest of small amounts of bycatch species especially on small non-observed vessels. Without accurate accounting, closing a CDQ group's fishery, based on small amounts of catch or bycatch, may be difficult to justify.

Issues involving the transfer of CDQ species between groups also must be considered. For example, if trades are allowed, a community that has a small boat fleet and wants to fish Pacific cod may be able to trade quota to another group that needs more pollock in order to increase their share of the cod fishery. NMFS and the Council will need to develop guidelines for trading. If the Council and NMFS disallow quota transfers between CDQ groups, these issues are moot.

4.2.3 Vessel Characteristics

Determining the maximum allowable length of a vessel may be difficult in some cases. The license program in general allows vessels to increase their length overall by 20%, in accordance with the moratorium's rules. Vessels that are close to 60' LOA will not be allowed to upgrade 20% as this will put them in the 60 to 125' LOA vessel class. Upgrades will be based on the vessel's length as of June 24, 1992. A problem may arise wherein some vessels qualify for the license program, but not the moratorium. Our analysis indicates there are 240 vessels in this situation. Some may not have been registered with the U.S. Coast Guard, NMFS Enforcement, or the State of Alaska's Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission on June 24, 1992. For these vessels, an alternative date must be used. Also, the vessel characteristics are required to be reported to these various agencies but the data are often not verified, which may lead to inaccuracy in the data bases.

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the Council's groundfish and crab license programs and then discusses how they comply with NEPA, E.O. 12866, National Standards, other Magnuson Act requirements, and the Council's Problem Statement.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE LICENSE PROGRAMS

A total of 2,435 vessels (Table 3.1) will be issued groundfish licenses and an additional 427 licenses will be issued for the federal crab fishery (Table 3.9). There are 243 vessels that qualify under both programs (Tables 3.15 and 3.16). Therefore, 2,619 unique vessels will receive groundfish or crab licenses.

The analysis data base indicates that 4,288 vessels fished groundfish between January 1, 1988 and June 17, 1995. Of these, 2,435 will qualify for a groundfish license and at least one endorsement. The remaining 1,853 vessels did not qualify.

The number of vessels that qualify to fish groundfish under the license program is 818 fewer than the moratorium. This reduction in the number of qualifiers is because:

1) Demersal Shelf Rockfish (DSR) was included in the moratorium, but not the groundfish license limitation program. During the January 1, 1988 through February 9, 1992 moratorium qualifying period, 292 vessels fished only DSR in the Southeast Outside District (SEO).

2) The license program imposed dual qualification requirements on most[22] vessels to recognize both historical and current participation. Under the moratorium, vessels were only required to make a landing in one period. The dual qualification period disqualified 1,291 vessels from the groundfish license program. A complete listing of these vessels is provided in Table 3.6.

3) The license program imposed minimum landings requirements on most vessels ≥60' LOA in the GOA, thus disqualifying an additional 111 vessels.

4) Added 636 and 240 vessels back in for a net reduction of 818 vessels from moratorium to license limitation.

A total of 240 vessels qualified for a license even though they did not land during the moratorium qualifying period. Vessels in this group include those that reported catch for the first time (since January 1, 1988) between February 9, 1992 and June 27, 1992. This group also includes vessels < 60' LOA that used pot/jig gear during the EQP. Table 5.1 shows the relationship between the vessels discussed above.

Table 5.1

Vessel Category	Vessels
Groundfish Moratorium Qualified (total)	3,253
Fished DSR Only (1/1/88-2/9/92)	(292)
Reported Landings but not in RAM Qualified Data Set	636
BQP Landings Only	(1,291)
Did Not Meet Minimum Landings Requirements	(111)
Licensed but not Moratorium Qualified	240
Groundfish License Qualified	2,435

[22] For a complete list of the vessels excluded from the dual qualification period requirement see Section 3.2.3.2

Approximately 2,619 vessels will be issued a license to fish groundfish or crab in the federal waters off the coast of Alaska, but certain categories of non-licensed vessels will be exempt. Vessels that are less than 32' LOA in the BSAI, 26' LOA in the GOA, and those vessels that are < 60' LOA in the BSAI and use jig gear (with gear restrictions) are exempt from the license program. Given these exemptions, more than 2,619 vessels may be able to fish groundfish or crab in federal waters off Alaska, but it is not possible to estimate the exact number.

The groundfish license program will issue 1,045 endorsements for the SEO area, defined as the federal waters east of 140° W. The endorsements will be designated fixed gear only. Those vessels which qualified for an endorsement in the SEO using trawl gear will be issued the endorsement, but must use fixed gear.

A total of 427 licenses will be issued to current participants in the federally managed crab fisheries. These licenses will each contain at least one of eight separate species/area endorsements. No vessel will qualify for more than seven endorsements. This is because the Norton Sound red and blue summer king crab fisheries are managed as a super-exclusive area.

Ninety-five vessels reported crab landings between January 1, 1988 and December 31, 1994, but will not qualify for the license program (Table 3.14). Most participated in the crab fisheries only during the BQP and did not meet the dual qualification criteria.

Red and blue king crab endorsements can be earned by one landing during the EQP. Brown king crab and C. *opilio*/C. *bairdi* endorsements require at least three landings during the EQP. Vessels meeting these requirements will be issued endorsements in those species/area combinations they fished during the EQP.

Any vessel which has qualified for a general license and at least one endorsement will be allowed to fish other crab fisheries not covered by one of the eight endorsements, providing the fishery is open and the vessel meets all other state and federal requirements. Crab fisheries with no endorsements have been labeled "developing fisheries."

5.2 NEPA REQUIREMENTS

A description of the impacts of license limitation on the human environment was presented in the September 18, 1994 EA/RIR. Throughout this chapter that document will be referred to as the EA/RIR. The findings in that document remain applicable, and the discussions which follow are intended to summarize those findings, as supplemented by additional information.

5.2.1 Additions to the September 1994 EA/RIR

The EA/RIR considered the status quo and a general license limitation alternative. Information on the status quo has not changed and will not be revisited. Additional information on the license system is the focus of this section.

The Council program will license approximately 2,435 groundfish and 427 crab vessels (243 of these 427 also receive groundfish licenses, so that 2,619 unique vessels will be licensed overall). This is an increase over the number of vessels that fished during 1994. The EA/RIR stated that "if the fleet would have increased under the status quo, then a license limitation could be viewed as 'effective,' assuming that the program has some mechanisms for limiting increases in vessel capacity." The Council's license program limits the total number of vessels (with certain exemptions) and capacity increases of the licensed vessels. Vessels will not be allowed to increase their length beyond 120% of their length as of June 24, 1992. This is the date used for the moratorium's upgrade provision and has been carried over into license limitation. The Council also limited, to some extent, the amount of processing capacity by placing catcher vessel and catcher processor designation on licenses. A

provision was also included in the program that would allow vessels to "downgrade," which means vessels can use any license designated for a length longer than theirs within processor classes. It also means vessels operating as catcher vessels can use licenses with a catcher processor designation. However, catcher processors cannot use a license designated for catcher vessels. These provisions in the license program should help to constrain increases in capacity at both the vessel and fleet level.

Concerns with capacity increases in specific areas were addressed by issuing FMP subarea endorsements, based on historical participation. So, vessels that have never fished in an subarea will not be allowed to fish there unless they purchase a license from someone whose vessel qualified. This provision should help restrict effort from flowing into subareas as stock sizes and fishing seasons change, which may help limit the race for fish in the future.

Neither restraint on capacity will reduce the fishing power of the fleet below its 1994 level, because the number of licensed vessels in each class is greater than or equal to the number of vessels that fished during 1994. However fishing power would be reduced under the license program if all the moratorium qualified vessels begin fishing. In this case the fleet could be reduced by as many as 818 vessels if the license program is implemented. Under either the status quo or the License Limitation program, the general fishing patterns, including total removals and the spatial/temporal aspect of those removals, are not expected to change significantly. Fisheries will continue to be managed under current TACs and PSC bycatch caps.

Baseline EA/RIR discussions regarding CDQs, threatened or endangered species, marine mammals, seabirds, and the impacts on ecosystem and physical environment remain valid under the Council's license programs, and will not be reiterated here.

5.2.2 Finding of No Significant Impact

For the reasons stated above, neither retaining the status quo or implementing any of the proposed license limitation alternatives would significantly affect the quality of the human environment, and preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the final action is not required by Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA or its implementing regulations. Any of the proposed license limitation alternatives contained in this amendment would likely lessen the effects of the commercial fisheries off Alaska on the quality of the human environment, as compared to the status quo alternatives, as they would cap the overall fleet at less than the current moratorium levels, and limit the spacial distribution of fishing effort by FMP subareas.

_____ _____

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries Date

5.3 ECONOMIC IMPACTS (E.O. 12866)

The September 18, 1994 EA/RIR addressed overall economic impacts in some detail, from the expectations of license limitation programs in general to the more specific impacts of the various elements and options of the NPFMC's proposed program. The following discussions, relevant to economic impacts as well as National Standards, the Problem Statement, and other applicable laws, are excerpted or summarized from the September 18, 1994 EA/RIR, and updated where relevant.

Relative to the status quo (including the moratorium), the license programs proposed have the potential to prevent further deterioration of the economic benefits generated by the groundfish and crab fisheries. The specific configuration chosen by the Council reduces the number of qualified vessels substantially, relative to the moratorium, and places restrictions on the ability of those vessels to increase their capacity. Because the License Limitation program only identifies those which may continue to participate, and does not directly address the race for fish between those participants, it is not expected to generate gains in net economic benefits from the fisheries. In fact, if the same amount of fish is harvested, then producer and consumer surpluses are not expected to change relative to the status quo, and overall economic benefits remain largely unchanged. None of the alternatives contained in this proposed action is considered significant; i.e., they will not result in changes of $100 million or more annually to the fisheries.

Although the proposed License Limitation program is not expected to directly generate increased economic returns from the fisheries, it is considered by the Council to be an important step in the overall rationalization of the fisheries. A more stable operating environment for the participants and an enhanced ability for business planning may provide indirect economic benefits for these participants. The identification and limiting of the fishery participants provide a stable environment, not only for the fishermen, but also for the Council and other policy makers as they consider further management programs within the overall CRP initiative. As examples, the Council is currently in the process of analyzing and developing: (1) an IFQ program for BSAI pollock fisheries, (2) a system of individual accountability to manage PSC caps in the groundfish fisheries, and (3) improved retention and utilization requirements for fishing and processing operations.

5.4 REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT CONSIDERATIONS

The original EA/RIR discusses the consistency of this License Limitation program with NEPA, E.O. 12866, National Standards, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and other applicable law. Additional considerations relative to the Regulatory Flexibility Act are contained in this section.

The objective of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) is to require consideration of the capacity of those affected by regulations to bear the direct and indirect costs of regulation. Particularly, the RFA speaks to regulations which create economic disparities between different sized entities, with the intent of reducing relative burdens to small entities. Specifically, the revised RFA describes a process for *minimizing* the significant economic impacts (presumably adverse) to small entities. Under the RFA, if an action will have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities, an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) must be prepared to identify the need for the action, alternatives, potential costs and benefits of the action, the distribution of those impacts, and a determination of net benefits. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) must be supported by a similar level of analyses; i.e., evidence that there is not a significant impact to a substantial number of small entities.

NMFS has defined all fish harvesting or hatchery businesses that are independently owned and operated, not dominant in their field of operation, with annual receipts not in excess of $2 million as small businesses. In addition, seafood processors with 500 or fewer employees, wholesale industry members with 100 or fewer employees, not-for-profit enterprises, and government jurisdictions with a population of 50,000 or less are considered small entities. A 'substantial' number of small entities would generally be 20% or more of the total

universe of small entities affected by a regulation. A regulation would have a 'significant' impact on these small entities if it reduced annual gross revenues by more than 5%, or resulted in compliance costs that are at least 10 % higher than compliance costs as a percent of sales for large entities.

If an action is determined to significantly affect a substantial number of small entities, the analysis must include:

(1) A description and estimate of the number of small entities and the total number of small entities in a particular affected sector, and the total number of small entities affected.

(2) Analysis of economic impacts on small entities, including direct and indirect compliance costs, paperwork and recordkeeping burdens, effects on competitive positions of small entities, effect on the small entities' cash flow and liquidity, and the ability of small entities to remain in the market.

5.4.1 Numbers of Small Entities Affected

Chapters 2 and 3 of this document, in addition to specifying the alternatives considered and the Council's final PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, contain detailed information on: (1) the current fleet operating in the groundfish and crab fisheries off Alaska; (2) vessels which qualify for licenses/endorsements, and the participation history of those vessels; and (3) vessels which do not qualify for licenses/endorsements, and vessels which do not qualify for the full suite of endorsements for areas in which they may have fished at some time. Chapter 4 contains a description of the implementation, enforcement, and compliance costs associated with the proposed regulations. The information in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 is relevant to the consideration of the RFA and is referenced as necessary for purposes of this section.

The Council's previous, and intentionally temporary, limited entry program was a vessel moratorium. Established as a precursor to the License Limitation program, this moratorium established the 'de-facto' fleet size in the groundfish and crab fisheries off Alaska. While only 1,595 vessels reported groundfish landings in 1994 (and 345 reported crab landings in 1994), a total of 3,253 vessels qualified under the moratorium (groundfish and crab vessels combined). By comparison, a total of 2,619 vessels (groundfish and crab combined) qualify for the proposed License Limitation program. These numbers can be viewed as alternative reference points for defining the "universe of affected entities," and they serve to illustrate the high degree of entry and exit, or turnover, of vessels participating in these fisheries. The majority of the vessels qualifying for either the moratorium or the License Limitation program would be considered small entities for purposes of the RFA.

A simple comparison of the numbers above shows that about 81% of the moratorium fleet qualifies for the license program, while about 19% do not - assuming that the moratorium represents the affected universe of small entities, this action would be right on the border in terms of the 'substantial number' criteria. However, qualification for the license program requires satisfaction of a dual participation 'test' - a vessel must have participated in *both* the moratorium period (or base qualifying period) and the more recent period of 1992 through June 17 of 1995 (the endorsement qualifying period. There are many vessels which fished in the overall period of 1988 through June of 1995, but either did not fish in the more recent (endorsement) period, or did not fish in the moratorium (base) qualification period. In total there were 1,853 vessels which fished from 1988 to June of 1995 but would not receive a license under this proposed regulation, and another 572 that would receive only partial endorsements. Table 3.8 of this document provides a summary of those vessels (crab vessels are not addressed in this discussion as they have typically exhibited a much more stable pattern of participation, and lower overall numbers of vessels participating).

Because these vessels have participated in the fisheries, but would now be prevented from doing so, it would be tempting to include them in a more liberal definition of 'affected universe.' However, as is shown in Table 3.8, the vast majority of vessels which will not receive a license (or would receive a reduced set of endorsements) are excluded due to the fact that they had base period landings only. In other words, they fished prior to 1992 and

have not participated in the fisheries since that time, and are not considered by the Council to be active participants in the fisheries. The overall program is in fact designed to grant licenses/endorsements to those vessels which have been currently active in the fisheries. All vessels which made landings since 1992, *and* were moratorium qualified, would be granted licenses/endorsements under this proposed program. Vessels which did make landings since 1992, but did not qualify in the base period (moratorium) are excluded, but represent less than 20% of the total moratorium qualified fleet. Finally, the single landing requirement for both the base period and area endorsements (except for the 2 landing endorsement for large vessels in the western Gulf) represents the most liberal landing requirement possible, though many more stringent landing requirement alternatives were considered by the Council.

5.4.2 Magnitude of Impact to Small Entities

Discussion to this point has focused on the number of small entities affected - depending on how one defines the overall universe, the number of affected small entities is less than, but very close to, the 20% criteria established by NMFS to qualify as 'substantial.' RFA guidance recommends that in such cases, where a proposed rulemaking generates the interest of a 'significant number' of small entities, that the RFA's analysis tools be applied. Based on this guidance it can be argued that the number of small entities affected is 'substantial enough' to warrant RFA consideration; however, this must be coupled with an assessment of whether these entities are affected to a *significant* degree.

For those small entities that do qualify for the license program, positive impacts can be assumed, though quantification of these benefits is not possible. As is pointed out in the RIR section of this document, the License Limitation program, in and of itself, is not expected to increase overall net economic benefits to the nation, nor to the individual participants; this is due basically to the continued 'derby' nature of the fisheries and the fact that many more licenses will be granted than fished in the most recent, single year, and that are necessary to take the total catch quotas in existence. Although the program would provide a desired level of stability in the industry, and would prevent further erosion of economic benefits from the fisheries which could occur under the status quo, the program would not be expected to increase gross revenues (relative to the status quo) for any individual small entities.

For those small entities which are adversely affected - either do not get a license or do not get a full suite of endorsements - it is more difficult to determine the magnitude (hence, significance) of that impact. While the inability to fish for groundfish or crab off Alaska certainly represents a potential loss of income, that potential loss is relative to a number of factors which must be weighed, such as: (1) the degree to which the small entity in question has participated, or would participate in the fisheries in the future; (2) the amount of gross income for each small vessel attributable to the groundfish/crab fisheries off Alaska; and (3) the ability for these small vessels to make up potential lost income in other fisheries, or under exemptions from the license program.

As noted in the previous discussion, the vast majority of vessels not receiving licenses/endorsements have not fished since 1992, and therefore, are not considered to be dependent upon these fisheries. Their gross income would not change with implementation of this program, relative to what it was in the past three years or more. Of the 521 vessels which have fished recently, but do not get a license (Table 3.8 again), most of these would be considered small entities, and for the most part did not make significant amounts of groundfish landings. Over 90% of this group of vessels are less than 60' in length, participate in other fisheries such as State water groundfish, salmon, and sablefish/halibut IFQ fisheries, but do not derive significant amounts of income from the federal groundfish fisheries. Many of this group of vessels will also be eligible for the small boat exemptions built into the license program, further reducing any potential adverse impacts. These exemptions are described previously and are summarized below:

1. Vessels less than or equal to 32 feet are exempt from the program for fishing in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management areas.

2. Vessels less than or equal to 26 feet are exempt from the program for fishing in the Gulf of Alaska management area.

3. Vessels less than or equal to 60 feet are exempt from the program for purposes of using jig gear (less than 5 machines) in the Bering Sea Aleutian Islands management area.

4. Any vessel may participate in State water groundfish fisheries (subject to specific State regulations) independent of this program.

One collective effect of these exemptions is to provide an avenue of relief for any small business entities which do not qualify for licenses under this program, but wish to participate in the fisheries. Additionally, vessels participating in non-groundfish target fisheries (salmon, crab, and sablefish/halibut IFQ fisheries) will continue to be allowed to take and land bycatch amounts of groundfish species.

5.4.3 Finding of No Significant Impact

The previous discussion is not intended as a definitive summary of all potential impacts, economic or otherwise, of the proposed License Limitation program. Many impacts across various the alternatives considered are economic, or allocative, in nature and are described in the relevant sections of the RIR - these are impacts more relevant to E.O. 12866, the Magnuson Act, or the National Standards than to the Regulatory Flexibility Act. The more specific nature of the RFA points to consideration of *relative* impacts, relative to larger business entities as a group and relative to the overall universe of small entities. Compliance costs associated with this program will be diminimus in nature, no more than the present cost of licenses and permits necessary to operate in the fisheries. The data in this analysis, summarized in the preceding discussion, support a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in terms of *significant* impacts to a *substantial* number of small entities.

5.5 SECTION 303(B)(6) OF THE MAGNUSON ACT

Section 303(b)(6) requires the Council and Secretary of Commerce to take into account the following factors when developing a system of limited access: (A) present participation in the fisheries; (B) historical fishing practices in, and dependence on, the fisheries; (C) the economics of the fisheries; (D) the capability of fishing vessels used in the fisheries to engage in other fisheries; (E) the cultural and social framework of the fisheries; and, (F) any other relevant considerations.

Included in the broad range of alternatives under consideration were various options for qualification criteria covering a broad range of present and past participation in the fisheries. These options were evaluated for a wide range of fishery participants who depend on the fisheries (to varying degrees) including current vessel owners, past vessel owners, permit holders, and skippers involved in the fisheries. While much of the analyses are devoted to examination of the basic economic principles and theory concerning limited access systems, and particularly license limitation, an even greater emphasis is placed on the distributional aspects of the various alternatives as they relate to past, current, and future fishing privileges. These distributional impacts are detailed in the analyses for the entire range of alternatives.

The Council's PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE for the program incorporates a dual qualification criteria which recognizes both past and present participation in the fisheries. Basic qualification is dependent upon landings in the 'base period' (roughly equivalent to the moratorium qualification period), with area endorsements for fishing based on landings in a more recent time period. The 'endorsement period' is from January 1992 through June 17, 1995, which represents a fairly liberal time frame for a vessel to make landings for qualification for the program. Vessels which entered the fisheries since 1992, and therefore made only endorsement period landings are denied a license, consistent with the Council's stated intent to limit access to those who qualified under the moratorium.

The Council's record for the License Limitation program includes an exhaustive attempt to describe and quantify the social and cultural framework of the fisheries. Community Profiles of 126 Alaska and Pacific Northwest coastal communities were developed, as well as a Social Impact Analysis developed under contract to the Council by Impact Assessment, Inc. That document, titled 'Sector Description and Preliminary Social Impact Assessment,' is a generic, baseline reference document focusing on major industry sectors, their involvement in the fisheries, and the participants and communities from which each of these sectors is based. A Final Social Impact Assessment for the License Limitation Alternatives was also prepared by Impact Assessment, Inc. And is focused on the major License Limitation alternatives being considered by the Council.

The collective analyses for this program, including the original EA/RIR, supplements to that EA/RIR, and social impact studies, represent a most exhaustive consideration of the requirements under Section 303(b)(6).

5.6 OTHER ISSUES AND APPLICABLE LAWS

CRP Problem Statement

During the formative stages of the CRP process, the Council developed a 14-point problem statement. Each point was an area of concern the Council felt existed in the fishery. These concerns are listed in the EA/RIR on pages 196-199, along with a discussion of whether, and to what extent, the License Limitation program would address those problems. In many cases, the License Limitation program was not expected to directly address the specific problems identified, in and of itself. These previous assessments remain generally applicable, with the exception of Problem #3 - preemption conflicts between gear types.

The Council's proposed program does not specifically issue licenses or endorsements by gear type. One exception is that, in the Southeast Outside subarea of the Gulf of Alaska, licenses will only be issued to allow fishing with fixed gear; any license earned via trawl landings will be issued to the proper recipient, but no further trawling would be allowed in that area. By doing so, the Council intends to alleviate existing and potential gear conflicts in that area.

To the extent that the License Limitation program is seen by the Council as an essential first step, that alone establishes, to some degree, its merit in addressing the 14 specific problems identified; coupled with the License program, other management programs can now be effectively developed which more directly address these problems.

National Standards

The license program must also comply with the National Standards and other applicable laws. These issues were addressed on pages 200-205 of the EA/RIR. When the original EA/RIR was developed the Council was considering a wide range of options for the license program. Selecting restrictive or lenient options from those lists would have created vast differences in the final program. Now that the Council has settled on a complete program, the National Standards will be revisited to provide more specific information.

National Standard 1: Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery for the U.S. fishing industry.

Under license limitation, the fisheries of the North Pacific will continue to be managed by Total Allowable Catch (TAC) limits. These catch limits will continue to be set by the Council and enforced by NMFS and ADF&G to ensure that overfishing does not occur.

Optimum yield (OY) is the amount of fish which provides the greatest overall benefit to the nation; which is prescribed as such on the basis of the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) from such fishery, as modified by any

relevant economic, social, or ecological factor. The proposed license limitation program will only have a limited impact on OY. Most of these impacts would result from the SEO being designated as fixed gear only. Some valuable rockfish species in this area have traditionally been harvested by trawl gear, and to date can only be harvested by trawl gear. Unless provisions are made to redistribute potential foregone harvests to other areas in the Gulf, or unless technologies are developed to allow harvest of these species by fixed gear, it may be that harvest of certain rockfish species, and the economic revenue generated, will be foregone.

National Standard 2: Conservation and management measures shall be based on the best scientific information available.

Information was collected from the observer program's NORPAC data base to study the catcher vessels delivering to at-sea motherships. Weekly Production Reports in conjunction with NORPAC data were used to study the catcher processor fleet. Catcher vessels that deliver to shoreside plants or floating motherships operating inside State waters were studied using fish tickets collected by the State of Alaska. Each of these data sources represents the best and most complete information available for that sector of the fleet, and those data were used to select the Council's preferred alternative.

In-season management of the license program will be conducted in the same manner as under open access. Weekly Production Reports and In-season Observer data will be "blended" to determine the total catch on close to a real time basis. This information will be used to determine when the TAC has been reached and close fisheries.

National Standard 3: To the extent practicable, and 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.

The license program will not impact the way stocks are managed relative to National Standard 3. The current management practices are consistent with this standard and will continue to be under license limitation.

National Standard 4: Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states. If it becomes necessary to assign fishing privileges among various U.S. fishermen, such allocation shall be: (1) fair and equitable to all fishermen, (2) reasonably calculated to promote conservation, and (3) carry out in such a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires and excessive share of privileges.

The Council's program will issue licenses to residents of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and several other states. Each license will be issued to the current vessel owner, based on a vessel's catch history (or permit holder's catch history for some Norton Sound red and blue king crab endorsements). Catch history requirements are the same for all vessels in a designated class and area. No qualification requirements are based on a vessel owner's state of residence.

There are differences in the qualification requirements between FMP subareas and vessel classes. Owners of vessels with the greatest fishing power were often required to meet more stringent qualifying criteria in the GOA subareas. This may indirectly alter the distribution of fishing privileges between states as vessels in some classes may typically be based in specific geographic regions. However, any vessel in that class would be required to meet the qualifying criteria.

A Community Development Quota (CDQ) program for both groundfish and crab is included in this package. It will be patterned after the current pollock CDQ program. A total of 7.5% of all groundfish and crab stocks (with guideline harvest levels) in the BSAI, that are not currently included in a CDQ program, will be allocated

to Western Alaskan communities that meet specific requirements. This allocation does not distinguish between residents of states because only a small portion of Alaskans will benefit from the program. These individuals reside in isolated areas with limited economic opportunities.

The Council's program also includes ownership caps of ten groundfish and five crab licenses. These caps were selected to ensure that no "person" would gain control of an excessive share of the fishery. In this case, "person" refers to both individuals and corporations. It does not refer to share holders within a corporation.

National Standard 5: Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, promote efficient utilization of fishery resources, except that no such measure shall have economic allocation as its sole purpose.

The license limitation program is not expected to change how fishery resources are utilized. Market forces will continue to impact how the fishery is prosecuted, as they would under open access or the moratorium. As consumers demand a species or product, the fleet will provide it. This program contains no additional incentives for fishermen to utilize fishery resources that are not valued by consumers.

National Standard 6: Conservation and management measures shall take into account and allow for variations among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fisheries resources, and catches.

FMP subarea endorsements were selected for groundfish, in part because they provide fishermen flexibility. Variations in stock sizes and markets from year to year may cause fishermen to alter their fishing patterns. With the subarea(s) endorsement they are issued, fishermen will be allowed to target any legal groundfish species that is open, even if this species differs from their historical target.

Crab endorsements were issued for species/area groups in some cases. These groups, for example, *C. bairdi/ C. opilio* were combined to allow fishermen more opportunities during uncertain and changing fishery conditions. These groups were only created when the Council felt they would not allow inappropriate amounts of new effort to enter fisheries.

Licenses will be transferable. This will allow vessel owners to purchase or sell licenses to meet their specific needs. This provision will provide additional flexibility for the fleet, however, the Council will require that the entire license package, including endorsements, is transferred to avoid creation of additional numbers of vessels in the fisheries.

National Standard 7: Conservation and management measures shall, where practical, minimize costs and avoid unnecessary duplication.

The license program will increase the costs of managing the fisheries. Costs will increase because implementing and enforcing the program will require additional staff for NOAA General Council, NMFS RAM division, and NMFS enforcement. Some of these costs will be in addition to those needed to enforce and monitor the fishery under the moratorium. The Council considered, and rejected, the option to make licenses species-specific, which would have been considerably more burdensome and expensive to monitor. The license program, like the moratorium, will limit the size of the North Pacific fleet for most vessel classes. Major differences between the two programs exist. The moratorium is a temporary program that is due to expire three years after it is implemented. The license program is permanent, though the program may evolve as the CRP process continues. The license program is considerably more restrictive in terms of the number of vessels that would qualify, in terms of limiting crossovers between groundfish and crab fisheries, and in terms of limiting crossover effort between specific areas for groundfish, and species and areas for crab.

Although the Council is developing further CRP programs in addition to the License Limitation program, it is likely that License Limitation will be the primary management regime for some fisheries. As such, it is not redundant to the moratorium but complementary to it.

Other Applicable Laws

The original EA/RIR dated September 18, 1994 contains a detailed discussion of the proposed action relevant to other applicable laws. These include: (1) Section 303(b)(6) of the Magnuson Act, (2) Section 303(a)(9) of the Magnuson Act, (3) Regulatory Flexibility Act, and (4) Coastal Zone Management Act. The discussion may be found on pages 202-206 of that document, and is not reiterated here, other than the additions found in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of this document.

6.0 EXAMINATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA (CDQ) ALLOCATIONS

Because of the significance of the CDQ allocations within the overall License Limitation Preferred Alternative, this section of the Final Supplemental Analysis specifically addresses the allocation of federal groundfish and crab quotas to the CDQ program. This examination is from a general perspective and in the context of NEPA, E.O. 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Magnuson Act, National Standards, and other applicable laws. **Details of the implementation, accounting, and monitoring plan for the multi-species CDQ program are contained elsewhere, most notably in the Preamble to the Proposed Rule, and are not reiterated in this section.**

6.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The North Pacific Council has developed, and the Secretary of Commerce has approved and implemented, CDQ programs for pollock, sablefish, and halibut in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI). The first of these programs to come on line was the allocation of 7.5% of the BSAI pollock Total Allowable Catch (TAC) to eligible CDQ groups, consisting of remote, coastal villages on the Bering Sea with predominately Native populations and little or no other economic activity base. This allocation occurred as part of the overall inshore/offshore pollock allocations and is currently scheduled for expiration, unless extended, at the end of 1998. The stated purpose of the CDQ program was, and continues to be, to provide a means for these Bering Sea communities and residents to become meaningfully and economically involved in the groundfish fisheries which lay at their doorsteps. This occurs through direct participation in the fisheries as well as development projects including shoreside infrastructures; harbors, docks, processing, and other fishing support projects; education and training programs; and direct investments in fishing vessels, to name a few.

Due to the industrial nature of the pollock fishery, most of the pollock CDQ is harvested by the CDQ groups via existing trawl vessels (business partners), generating between $20 and $30 million in annual economic activity for the 63 combined CDQ communities since 1992. Beginning in 1995, the sablefish and halibut CDQ allocations have generated an additional $3-4 million in annual economic activity (based on exvessel value), as well as a more direct, hands-on fishery for the participating communities.

In 1993, the Council began discussions of Comprehensive Rationalization Planning (CRP) for the fisheries off Alaska - included as primary alternatives in this CRP process were Individual Fishing Quotas (IFQs) and License Limitation programs. Additional allocations to the CDQ program were included in the very beginning phases of CRP, and have been a notable and important alternative within the License Limitation program since the Council's developmental discussions in early 1994. While recognizing the merits and benefits of the existing CDQ allocations for pollock, sablefish, and halibut, the Council felt that additional allocations, for a percentage of all other groundfish and crab under the Council's jurisdiction, were not only desirable, but necessary to fully realize the original goals of the CDQ program.

As is reflected in the record of Council discussions from June of 1995, the underlying goal of the program is to develop a stable, diversified, seafood-based economy for the CDQ program participants. Fundamental to achievement of this goal is access to all groundfish and crab species of the Bering Sea, not just pollock, sablefish, and halibut. The development projects, infrastructures, and direct employment opportunities initiated originally via the pollock CDQ program, and developed through the income generated by the pollock CDQ allocations, are geared toward involvement in all Bering Sea fisheries. However, with the License Limitation program effectively limiting access to other groundfish and crab species to those previously involved, the only viable alternative to allow fruition of the CDQ program was, the Council felt, specific allocations of the other groundfish and crab species. The multi-species CDQ program created as part of this License Limitation package is intended to provide the CDQ constituents the realistic opportunity to create and maintain a diversified, seafood-based economy where no alternative economic opportunities exist. The additional allocations for the remaining groundfish (and crab) species have a two-fold purpose: (1) to generate additional economic activity to maintain and expand infrastructures to support involvement by CDQ communities in the BSAI fisheries. The recent and projected declines in pollock TACs, and attendant reductions in pollock CDQ allocations, increases the need for this additional economic activity to maintain existing infrastructures and underwrite future, planned development activities; and, (2) expand the *nature* of the CDQ allocations to incorporate access to the full range of fish species in the BSAI area. As mentioned above, the overall goals of the CDQ program necessitate involvement not in one or two species, but participation in a wide array of fisheries which will allow for development of direct, 'hands-on' participation, across a range of vessel types, processing methods, and different gear types. Variations in fishing methods, specific skills, and development of diversified market opportunities would be impossible under a CDQ program which allocated only pollock, sablefish, and halibut. Only with a multi-species allocation can these goals be realistically attained.

As part of the Council's 1995 action to extend the pollock CDQ program through 1998, an analysis was provided which detailed the accomplishments of the program thus far, and assessed the extent to which on-going development projects could be finalized in the absence of the 7.5% pollock allocation. These assessments are detailed in the 1995 EA/RIR/IRFA for the inshore/offshore/pollock CDQ extension, particularly Appendix VI titled 'Economic Impacts of the Pollock CDQ Program.' That document is reiterated here for reference, as Appendix VI once again. In summary, the analysis concluded that, despite the enormous gains realized through the CDQ program, the absence of a continued allocation would result in a digression to the status quo situation and the inability to fully realize the underlying objectives of the program. Additionally, the sunk costs in these development projects would be lost in the absence of an ongoing allocation to the CDQ program. The Council's decision to include other groundfish and crab species in the CDQ program was supported by a similar concern - that is, for the overall program to be successful, the foundation of the program needs to include a diversified suite of fisheries, and needs to do so over a long-range time frame. Quarterly reports submitted to the Council, NMFS, and State of Alaska by each of the CDQ groups are an additional source of detailed information regarding the specifics of existing and proposed development projects, and the accomplishments of each of the CDQ organizations.

Additional considerations and impacts relative to the 7.5% multi-species CDQ allocations are discussed in the following sections.

6.2 SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL

As part of the alternatives for CDQ allocations, within the overall License Limitation amendment package, the Council considered the following broad range of alternatives:

1. Community Development Quotas
   a. No (0%) CDQ allocations
   b. Set aside 3.% of any or all groundfish TACs (GHLs for crab) for CDQs patterned after current program with no sunset provisions.
   c. Set aside 7.5% of any or all groundfish TACs (GHLs for crab) for CDQs patterned after current program with no sunset provisions.
   d. Set aside 10% of any or all groundfish TACs (GHLs for crab) for CDQs patterned after current program with no sunset provisions.
   e. Set aside 15% of any or all groundfish TACs (GHLs for crab) for CDQs patterned after current program with no sunset provisions.

2. Community Development Licenses
   a. No Community Development Licenses
   b. Grant an additional 3% non-transferable licenses to CDQ communities.
   c. Grant an additional 7.5% non-transferable licenses to CDQ communities.
   d. Grant an additional 10% non-transferable licenses to CDQ communities.
   e. Grant an additional 15% non-transferable licenses to CDQ communities.

[Alternative 2, and its sub-options, as opposed to setting aside a specific amount of quota, would have simply created additional licenses to fish which would then be allocated to the CDQ groups]

6.2.1 The Preferred Alternative

The Council's action from June of 1995 was for a 7.5% CDQ allocation and read specifically as follows:

> '7.5% of all BSAI groundfish TACs not already covered by a CDQ program (and 7.5% of the Guideline Harvest Levels - GHLs - for Council managed BSAI crab fisheries), and a pro-rata share of PSC species will be allocated to CDQ communities as defined in the current CDQ program (with the addition of Akutan). PSC will be allocated "off the top" before the trawl/non-trawl split. The groundfish CDQ program will be patterned after the current CDQ program but will not contain a sunset provision.'

In setting the CDQ allocation at 7.5%, as opposed to a lesser or greater percentage, the Council felt that a 7.5% allocation, of all groundfish species, would provide the necessary basis for successful conduct of the CDQ program. While a greater percentage would have generated greater economic benefits for the CDQ program, the Council felt that 7.5% would be adequate, while a lesser percentage would not provide an adequate basis for sound, long-term business planning by CDQ program participants. In deciding on the 7.5% allocations, the Council made an implicit decision as to what would be 'adequate' (as discussed in Section 6.1) to maintain the CDQ program over a long-range horizon, balanced against the impact to the remaining, non-CDQ fishing industry, and hence what would be an appropriate allocation to the CDQ program.

The original allocation of 7.5% of pollock was based on the groundfish reserves contained within the BSAI FMP. Under those provisions of the FMP, 15% of all groundfish TACs, including pollock, are held 'in reserve' each year as an in-season management buffer account, or as an amount to allocate to Joint Venture or Foreign fisheries, if not taken by domestic fisheries. Part of the logic for the 7.5% allocation was that it would constitute fish which otherwise go into a non-species specific buffer, and therefore would not represent a direct loss of fish to the existing, non-CDQ fishing fleet. In many ways the 7.5% allocation of pollock was an experiment to test the necessary levels of CDQ allocations against the overall goals of the program (It should ne noted here that the allocation of halibut and sablefish were not made on the 7.5% basis, but represent such relatively small allocations that they should not be considered representative of appropriate levels of CDQ allocations. Rather,

they represent small supplements to the overall CDQ program, but are important in that the nature of those fisheries emphasizes hands-on participation at a small vessel level). Based on this 'experiment', the Council, the CDQ organizations, the State of Alaska, and by and large the non-CDQ fishing industry as a whole believe that the 7.5% allocation represents an appropriate level of allocation for the CDQ program - it is a level which has proven adequate, for purposes of pollock, for developing and maintaining the program while not inflicting undue burden to the remaining, non-CDQ fishing industry.

Indeed, the decision to extend a similar percentage allocation to other species represents a delicate balancing act of fisheries policy by the Council - that is, creating a CDQ program to develop a fisheries based economy where no other exists, while at the same time taking into account the needs of the existing fishing industry. In fact, the CDQ allocations were, and are, publicly supported by most of the affected fishing industry, recognizing that such allocations do impact the amount of fish available to them in the fisheries. As such , the CDQ program, and the attendant 7.5% allocations of all species managed by the Council in the BSAI, was in many ways a negotiated management decision with input and participation by all sectors of the fishing industry off Alaska, including those based in states outside of Alaska. Indeed, many vessels from both Alaska and the Pacific Northwest participate in the CDQ program, via 'joint business partner' arrangements, thereby sharing in the economic activity generated by the CDQ allocation.

Additionally, while the Council recognized that any allocation would be at some expense to the existing fishery participants, they noted that current discard levels of groundfish species by the existing fishing industry were greater than the percentage of the CDQ allocations, for some species significantly greater. While these discards are counted against the overall groundfish quotas, and are not a conservation concern from that perspective, they do represent a loss of potential economic activity which the Council felt could be recouped in the form of CDQ allocations. This information supported the Council's rationale that the 7.5% CDQ allocation would not inordinately impact the existing fishery participants, and is consistent with other Council objectives to minimize waste and discards in the fisheries off Alaska.

6.3 NEPA CONSIDERATIONS - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The original EA/RIR from September 1994 (included as part of the overall License Limitation Package for Secretarial review) contains a detailed description of NEPA requirements, as well as the program's expected impacts with regard to environmental impacts, impacts to threatened or endangered species, impacts to marine mammals, and consistency with the CZMA. That discussion included comparison of status quo management against a license limitation program in general, and examined differential impacts of various alternatives within the overall license limitation program, including CDQ allocations. Major points of that discussion (FONSI) are reiterated herein.

Council managed fisheries under the License Limitation program will continue to be managed with the use of overall TACs (catch quotas) established annually by the Council and Secretary. The fleet constraints implied by the License Limitation program, coupled with other improvements to the quota monitoring process, will enhance the agency's ability to open and close fisheries while staying within the overall TACs established. The monitoring process for CDQ allocations specifically (detailed in the Preamble to the Proposed Rule) maintains even more rigorous controls resulting in more accurate catch measurement and lower quota overruns. The original EA also emphasizes the nature of the CDQ fisheries, in terms of their slower paced prosecution and lower bycatch rates of non-target species. Increased levels of observer coverage on the CDQ fisheries further enhance the environmental aspects of the overall program. In summary, the CDQ allocations within the overall License Limitation program only serve to support the Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) relative to NEPA requirements.

6.4 REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW: ECONOMIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The original EA/RIR (September 1994) contains a detailed examination of the overall LLP/CDQ program's impacts relative to Executive Order 12866, and concludes that no significant impacts will result from implementation of the License Limitation program. In determining the CDQ allocations within this program, the Council recognized and considered the economic trade-offs associated with the allocation. Economic benefits derived by the CDQ participants would be at some expense to the remaining fishery participants, particularly in the context of fully capitalized, fully subscribed fisheries. As noted previously, a more complete description of the CDQ program, including its progress to date as well as unfulfilled objectives, is contained in the inshore/offshore analyses from 1995 (and in Appendix VI to this document). Discussions from the September 1994 EA/RIR, which provide an assessment of the magnitude of economic impacts, are reiterated below.

6.4.1 Community Development Quota (CDQ) Options

The License Limitation alternatives for both groundfish and crab contain options for CDQ allocations, either in the form of set asides of the TACs (or GHLs for crab) or as additional, non-transferable licenses. Under the first option, CDQ set asides could range from 0% (no CDQ allocations) up to 15% for any or all groundfish and crab species, excluding sablefish and halibut which are dealt with separately. Pollock CDQs are currently set at 7.5% of the BSAI TAC each year and are distributed among six CDQ organizations encompassing the eligible communities along the Bering Sea coastline. The pollock CDQ program is scheduled to sunset at the end of 1995 (now extended through 1998). The CDQ program associated with the sablefish/halibut IFQ program is scheduled to become effective in 1995 (now in effect), along with the overall IFQ program, and will operate in the same manner as the pollock program, with the CDQ quota set aside being distributed among the eligible CDQ groups based on recommendations from the Governor of Alaska. The major difference between this and the pollock program is that the CDQs associated with sablefish and halibut do not sunset.

6.4.1.1 Status Quo Implications

Under the status quo, there would be no limited entry program and no additional CDQ programs beyond those currently in place, though the Council is not precluded from considering a CDQ program independent of a limited entry program. Within this analysis, we assume the status quo contains no additional CDQ programs. The existing pollock program is scheduled to sunset at the end of 1998, thereby making an additional 7.5% of the TAC, roughly 95,000 metric tons, available to the existing, open access fishing fleet (unless the pollock program is extended at a similar percentage). This action might reduce some of the overcapacity problems in the fleet in the short term, but under open access these gains would quickly become overtaken by existing and, potentially new, vessels. The catching and processing capability of the inshore and offshore sectors combined significantly exceeds the existing overall TACs for pollock, as well as other species. Additionally, the temporary gains experienced by the fleet would only be realized in the pollock fisheries and would not affect similar over-capitalization problems in the other groundfish and crab fisheries.

Without the pollock CDQ program, six CDQ organizations encompassing over 60 predominately native, rural coastal communities would be affected adversely. The current pollock CDQ program generates in the neighborhood of $25 to $30 million annually, much of that money funneled into development projects for these communities. The program was set up to help bring these communities into self-sufficiency through the fisheries at their doorsteps which, until recently, they have been unable to enter to any economically significant degree. Development projects which are being funded through the CDQ program include: community services, fisheries and education training programs, processing and dock construction, fishing vessel procurement, and real income to participants. The alternatives in this document consider expansion of the current program to include other groundfish and crab species, along with a license limitation program. Under the status quo (no additional CDQ allocations for multi-species groundfish and crab), the additional gains to the CDQ program, potentially more

economically valuable than the pollock program, would not be realized. In the absence of any CDQ set asides, these organizations and communities would have to rely on the sablefish and halibut resources made available through that CDQ program for future fisheries development initiatives, likely mooting the significant progress made to date. Even if the pollock program is extended beyond 1998, the lack of allocations of other groundfish species, coupled with the overall limited entry program, would adversely impact the CDQ groups' ability to realize the goals of a broad, fisheries-based economy.

6.4.1.2 CDQs as TAC Set Asides

If this option is included in the license limitation alternative, some amount of the TACs, up to 15%, would be designated for existing, eligible CDQ groups. None of the options currently under consideration would expand the CDQ program beyond the existing communities (except that Akutan has been added to the list of eligible communities). The general benefits of such a set aside have already been discussed relevant to pollock, and would expand under this option. Based on a similar percentage (7.5%) (the Council's PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE), the projected value of additional CDQ set asides, for all remaining groundfish and crab, could be in the range of $35 - $45 million annually (based on exvessel prices). If pollock is continued as well, the total value of this program to the participants approaches $75 million annually. This is a mid-range estimate and would depend on the percentage finally approved by the Council and Secretary, as well as fish prices, overall TAC levels and other factors.

Such a set aside involves a redistribution of the fisheries benefits from the existing commercial fleet to the CDQ communities, though some of this loss is recaptured by the existing commercial fleet through 'joint venture' fishing contracts with the CDQ organizations. Under either open access or a license limitation program, any reductions in the TAC available to the commercial fleet would likely exacerbate the problems facing those fisheries. An increased race for the available fish, with all of the attendant problems, would be the likely result. While the CDQ allocation would tend to exacerbate the current overcapitalization in the remaining , non-CDQ fisheries, it (1) is proposed as one element of a broader management package whose primary focus (the License Limitation Program) is to address the overcapitalization problem; (2) it accomplishes other important Council, and Congressional, objectives with respect to coastal fishing communities; and, (3) it does so in a way which is not expected to significantly affect the remaining, non-CDQ fisheries - recall that current discard levels of these species are greater than the CDQ allocations at 7.5%. The non-CDQ fishery can, by reducing discard levels, still harvest the same amount of fish (assuming stable stock levels) as they did prior to the CDQ allocations. This would be further consistent with other important, overriding management goals of the Council and the U.S. Congress.

The CDQ fisheries would function with a guaranteed quota for each organization, either with their own vessels or through 'joint venture' arrangements with other vessels. The benefits of this type of fishery have been exhibited in the current pollock CDQ program where the result has been a slower paced fishery, higher value fisheries relative to the open access fishery, generally lower bycatch rates of PSC species, lower discard rates, and a more stable planning environment for the participants. They have also been exhibited in the halibut and sablefish IFQ fisheries. While the CDQ fisheries are not considered to be IFQ fisheries, they will provide the participants a 'guaranteed quota', and the ability to harvest that fish at optimal times in terms of flesh quality, recovery rates, bycatch considerations, and market conditions. *As an example*, cost savings and price increases in the sablefish and halibut IFQ program were projected to outweigh the costs by $30 to $67 million annually. These projections are based on the same circumstances and advantages associated with the CDQ fisheries.

A November 1995 report by economists from the NMFS (see Kent Lind and Joe Terry - 'COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA (CDQ) AND OPEN ACCESS POLLOCK FISHERIES IN THE EASTERN BERING SEA: A COMPARISON OF GROUNDFISH UTILIZATION AND PROHIBITED SPECIES BYCATCH) examined some of the differences between the open access pollock fishery and the pollock fishery

conducted via the CDQ program. In this study they examined vessels which participated in both fisheries, and provided comparisons of bycatch rates, discards, and product values generated.

The results of the study show that (1) bycatch rates of prohibited species were generally lower in the CDQ fisheries, though there were variations by season and across years in the study; (2) discard rates of fish, both pollock and other groundfish species, were lower in the CDQ fishery - they were about half the rate as the 'open access' fishery; and, (3) differences in product value between the two group were substantial, with the CDQ fisheries generating higher product values, on the order of 25% higher return per metric ton of fish. These types of benefits would be expected to accrue under a multi-species CDQ allocation as well. Appendix VII contains the NMFS Processed Report from which these summary findings are drawn.

Although a formal, quantitative analysis of costs and benefits specific to the multi-species CDQ alternative has not been undertaken, some overall economic generalizations can be made based on theory and observed practice, such as those programs described above. Though there are costs associated with monitoring and enforcing these types of 'individually accountable' fisheries, the expected benefits likely outweigh these costs. NMFS is in the process of finalizing an implementation plan for the multi-species CDQ program and has not developed definitive estimates of overall program costs attributable to the multi-species CDQ program. In discussing costs associated with this proposed program, it is important to remember that the recently reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act requires a fee to be imposed on CDQ and IFQ fisheries. Expected to be 3% of the exvessel value of fish harvested, this fee could generate, based on a $50 million estimate of CDQ fish value, up to $1.5 million to help cover the costs of administering the program. Though up to 33% of that amount will be diverted to the State of Alaska to pay their costs of administering the program, as much as $1 million may be available to the agency (NMFS) to offset the costs of administering, monitoring, and enforcing the multi-species CDQ program.

Again, the benefits realized by the CDQ program participants are at some expense to the existing commercial fleet by virtue of their reduced TAC. The decrease in net benefits associated with this TAC reduction is difficult to quantify, but likely would not outweigh the benefits. A critical point to be made here is that the economic benefits derived from assigning a specific percentage of the TAC to an individual operation would be realized regardless of whether the recipient was a CDQ group or some other business organization. The allocation of these specific harvest privileges to CDQ organizations would produce social benefits in addition to the purely economic benefits. More details on the accomplishments of the existing pollock CDQ program, including employment, training programs, and infrastructure development, are contained in Appendix VI.

6.4.1.3 CDQs as Additional Licenses

Another option within the license limitation alternatives for both groundfish and crab would be to create additional, non-transferable licenses for CDQ allocation. For example, a base number of licenses would be allocated for fishing vessels (this number depends on the qualification criteria adopted) and then an additional number, from 0 to 15% of the base amount, of licenses would be 'created' and allocated for use by CDQ organizations. Under this option numerous questions arise as to the nature of the licenses which would be created for CDQ use. One solution, if the Council wishes to proceed with this option, would be to prorate the additional license in the same proportion as the base licenses by area, species, vessel size, or whatever other designations exist.

In the context of the overall problems the Council wishes to address through the limited entry proposal, this particular option does not represent the most effective means to implement a CDQ program. Creating additional licenses in the fisheries will result in additional vessels, thereby exacerbating the very problems the Council is attempting to solve. Any potential benefits of a license limitation program may be offset by the creation of additional licenses.

Another perspective to examine involves the functioning of the CDQ program itself. Under this option, CDQ groups would be allocated licenses, the benefits of which would only be realized with the purchase of vessels on which to fish those licenses. These vessels would likely be additional to the existing pool of initially licensed vessels. Assuming these groups acquire the necessary vessels, they would not be guaranteed any percentage of the harvest, but would conduct their fisheries in competition with other licensed vessels. The resulting harvest by these groups may be larger or smaller than would be expected under Option A, simply setting aside a portion of the TAC.

In summary, the Council found this an untenable alternative for several reasons, including: (1) the practical difficulties associated with creating additional licenses, and then having to match those against vessel size categories, operational modes, ownership caps, and other license designations created by the program; (2) such licenses would not necessarily match up with the specific operational plans and development objectives of individual Community Development Plans (CDPs); (3) the artificial, and perhaps unnecessary, creation of additional fishing licenses would be inconsistent with the Council's overall objectives of the License Limitation program and CRP initiative; (4) creation of additional licenses was viewed as an inefficient and inappropriate way to effect the objectives of the CDQ program; and, (5) the existing CDQ program, though still in its infancy, had illustrated to the Council the effectiveness of TAC allocations as the most direct and efficient way to realize the goals of the CDQ program.

6.4.1 Administrative, Enforcement, and Monitoring Costs

While definitive cost estimates for the multi-species CDQ program are unavailable, the issue of increased monitoring requirements was considered by the Council. Throughout consideration of the License Limitation program the Council held extensive discussions regarding the costs, administration, and monitoring of the CDQ allocations. These discussions included, for example, the issues of: observer coverage and monitoring of individual CDQ vessel allocations; accounting of the CDQ catch within the overall TAC catch accounting process by NMFS; distribution of catch allocations and PSC allocations within the CDQ groups; and, in-season monitoring and transfers of CDQ groundfish and PSC allocations. These issues are summarized in Chapter 4 of this document and are described in detail in the Preamble to the Proposed Rule. In summary, the Council felt that the increased benefits from the CDQ program outweighed the increased costs associated with monitoring and administration. Further, and consistent with expectations voiced by the Council, the recently reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act allows for fees to be extracted from both IFQ and CDQ program participants to dissipate the costs of implementation and administration of these programs.

6.5 REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT CONSIDERATIONS

Chapter 5.4.1 of this document specifically addresses the overall License Limitation program in terms of consistency with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). The associated FONSI - that this program would not result in *significant* impacts to a *substantial* number of small entities - would not be expected to change due to the CDQ allocations. While the CDQ allocations certainly provide significant benefits to the recipient groups and communities, and at the same time impose additional reporting and administrative requirements, the six CDQ organizations likely would not be classified as 'small entities' under the auspices of the RFA, nor would they, in total, comprise a 'substantial' number of entities (large or small) operating in the fisheries off Alaska.

The associated 7.5% reduction in overall quota available to the remaining fishing fleet (which includes a substantial number of small entities) is not expected to result in a direct 7.5% reduction in catch, for example, by any individual small fishing operation. As noted previously, the 7.5% allocation is far less than the percentage of fish currently discarded in the collective groundfish fisheries. Council programs which mandate retention and utilization of groundfish species beginning in 1998 are estimated to more than make up for the 7.5% quota reduction, in terms of overall fish available for both small and large fishing operations. It is also true that the gross income for individual, small fishing operations is less dependent on overall quotas available than it is on

other factors such as, relative fish prices across species, unpredictable weather patterns, timing and magnitude of alternative fishing opportunities such as salmon, and other business decisions made independent of the overall TAC levels for groundfish.

6.6 NATIONAL STANDARDS

Chapter 5.4 of this document details the overall program's consistency with National Standards. The overall License Limitation program, and the CDQ program specifically, were found to be consistent with all existing National Standards. Since the time this document was originally drafted, the Magnuson Act has been amended and three new National Standards created, two of which appear relevant to the CDQ program.

National Standard 8 states:

'Conservation and management measures shall, consistent with the conservation requirements of this Act (including the prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks), take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities in order to (A) provide for the sustained participation of such communities, and (B) to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities.'

The License Limitation program, if approved, would preclude access to the majority of fish species available to residents of western Alaska coastal communities as few residents would qualify to fish under that program. The multi-species CDQ allocations proposed as part of the overall management action represent the only viable alternative to avoid such adverse impacts. National Standard 8 further requires management actions to allow for sustained participation in the fisheries by these communities. A sustained participation can be ensured by access to a wide range of fisheries species, as opposed to a program which relies solely upon one species - pollock- a stock which is subject to natural fluctuations in biomass and available TAC (halibut and sablefish are also current CDQ species, but represent a very minor fishery relative to pollock, other groundfish, and crab species). Access to this range of species will allow the CDQ communities the opportunity for sustained participation by eliminating the possibility for stock conditions, or unforeseeable market conditions, to halt the program, which is a possibility if the overall CDQ program is based predominately on a single species, the pollock fishery.

As stated by the Council in reaching its decision for the CDQ allocations of groundfish and crab, the 7.5% allocations are necessary to both bring the Bering Sea coastal communities up to a meaningful participation level and to sustain that participation level into the future. Failure to make such an allocation to the CDQ program could result in not only the inability of these communities to sustain participation in the fisheries, but also the loss of infrastructure developments and economic investments made to date via the pollock CDQ program.

National Standard 9 states:

'Conservation and management measures shall, to the extent practicable, (A) minimize bycatch and (B) to the extent bycatch cannot be avoided, minimize the mortality of such bycatch.'

Previous analysis and discussions have pointed out the nature of the CDQ fisheries in terms of slower paced fishing practices, accurate accounting of catch and bycatch, and reduced levels in catch of non-target species and PSC species (bycatch). The Council's decision to allocate a portion of the BSAI groundfish and crab resources to this program appears to be in line with the spirit of this new National Standard.

6.7 MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT AND CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVES

In October 1996, the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act was reauthorized, amended via the Sustainable Fisheries Act, and renamed the Magnuson-Stevens Act. In the reauthorization and amendment process the U.S. Congress included a variety of provisions specific to the issues of coastal community

involvement in the Nation's fisheries. Foremost among these provisions are mandates for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and the Secretary of Commerce, to make allocations of BSAI groundfish and crab resources to the CDQ program. In drafting the amendments to the Act, Congress was cognizant of the Council's decision to create a multi-species CDQ allocation, in perpetuity, and crafted the language of the Act to not only support, but mandate, those allocations at the percentage levels approved by the Council (note that the Act slightly alters the Council's actions by phasing in the BSAI crab CDQ allocations over a three year period). The relevant excerpts of the language of the Act are provided below:

'The North Pacific Council and the Secretary ***shall*** *establish a western Alaska community development quota program under which a percentage of the total allowable catch of any Bering Sea fishery is allocated to the program...with respect to a fishery management plan, plan amendment, or regulation for a Bering Sea fishery that (I) allocates to the western Alaska CDQ program a percentage of the TAC of such fishery; and, (II) was approved by the North Pacific Council prior to October 1, 1995; the Secretary shall, except as provided in clause iii* (phase-in of percentages for crab fishery) *and after approval of such plan, amendment, or regulation under section 304,* ***allocate to the program the percentage of the TAC described in such plan, amendment, or regulation...****'*

The language of the Act, and the intent of Congress in adopting that language, appear unequivocal with regard to both the concept of allocations of groundfish and crab to the CDQ program, and the percentage which is to be allocated. The language clearly mandates the percentages as adopted by the Council in June of 1995, with an explicit phase-in of the percentages for the crab fisheries at 3.5% in 1998, 5% in 1999, and 7.5% for the year 2000 and thereafter. Groundfish would be at the 7.5% level for 1998 and beyond.

The Congressional record is replete with examples of Congress' commitment to the CDQ provisions of the Act. The Committee on Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, in its report which accompanied H.R. 39 (the House version of proposed Magnuson Act amendments) reviewed the economic difficulties associated with remote coastal villages on the Bering Sea and reviewed the progress and development accomplished via the pollock CDQ program, and included the following comments in their report:

"...because of these benefits, the Committee determined that it was important to continue the CDQ program and that, in addition to pollock, sablefish, and halibut, the program should be expanded to allow communities participating in the program the opportunity to harvest a percentage of the TAC of each Bering Sea fishery.

To accomplish that objective, section 14 of H.R. 39 amends section 313 of the Magnuson Act to require the NPFMC to establish, and the Secretary of Commerce to adopt, regulations implementing the western Alaska CDQ program as a permanent, stand alone program. The subsection also requires the North Pacific Fishery Management Council to allocate the opportunity to harvest a percentage of the TAC of each Bering Sea fishery to communities, or groups of communities, eligible to participate in the program.

The Committee expects that, for each Bering Sea fishery, the NPFMC, with final approval of the Secretary, will allocate to the communities participating in the program a percentage that is adequate to ensure their significant and sustainable economic participation in the fishery.'

The Senate version of the Bill (S.39, or the Sustainable Fisheries Act) is accompanied by a report reflecting similar intent. The report of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation provides an exhaustive history of the CDQ program's development, as well as a firm endorsement of the new Magnuson Act amendments to expand the scope of the program and to sustain its development.

In summary, the directives of Congress contained within the Magnuson-Stevens Act appear to not merely authorize and support the proposed CDQ allocations, but to mandate those allocations. Though the Council's action occurred prior to the reauthorization of the Act, the program will undergo Secretarial review under the

auspices of the new Act, and alternatives other than those contained, relative to the CDQ program, would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

7.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Darrell Brannan
Chris Oliver
Linda Roberts
North Pacific Fishery Management Council
605 West 4th Avenue, Suite 306
Anchorage, AK 99501

Appendix I

Vessels Participating in the 1988 - 93 and 1995 Groundfish and Crab Fisheries

Table 1. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1995

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	10	10	-	20	-	3	4	7	27	11	31	14	56	1	15	58	74	130
BS	68	46	2	116	-	6	5	11	127	18	150	35	203	1	29	79	109	312
SEO	520	20	1	541	2	3	-	5	546	78	22	-	100	1	6	4	11	111
WG	88	28	-	116	-	5	3	8	124	25	84	22	131	1	18	38	57	188
WY+CG	525	115	2	642	2	6	4	12	654	83	94	5	182	1	15	25	41	223
Total	1,054	135	5	1,194	2	6	5	13	1,207	132	190	36	358	1	30	79	110	468

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	21	41	14	76	1	18	62	81	157
BS	86	196	37	319	1	35	84	120	439
SEO	598	42	1	641	3	9	4	16	657
WG	113	112	22	247	1	23	41	65	312
WY+CG	608	209	7	824	3	21	29	53	877
Total	1,260	249	32	1,552	7	35	79	123	1,675

Table 2. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1993

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	3	1	-	4	1	1	9	11	15	8	32	14	54	4	19	54	77	131
BS	40	23	1	64	1	6	12	19	83	15	91	23	129	4	29	67	100	229
SEO	605	22	-	627	2	-	-	2	629	81	11	2	94	-	1	2	3	97
CG+WY	413	84	3	500	2	5	8	15	515	102	86	12	200	-	25	27	52	252
WG	138	25	-	163	1	5	12	18	181	49	44	7	100	1	16	28	45	145
Total	1,067	107	4	1,178	3	6	12	21	1,199	193	142	28	363	4	29	67	100	463

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	11	33	14	58	5	20	63	88	146
BS	55	114	24	193	5	35	79	119	312
SEO	686	33	2	721	2	1	2	5	726
CG+WY	515	170	15	700	2	30	35	67	767
WG	187	69	7	263	2	21	40	63	326
Total	1,260	249	32	1,541	7	35	79	121	1,662

Table 3. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1992

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	4	6	-	10	-	4	10	14	24	7	26	9	42	1	21	75	97	139
BS	53	34	-	87	-	5	12	17	104	20	123	28	171	1	32	84	117	288
SEO	558	21	-	579	2	-	3	5	584	75	15	-	90	-	11	15	26	116
CG+WY	714	117	2	833	3	7	3	13	846	143	101	3	247	1	30	24	55	302
WG	119	24	2	145	1	5	8	14	159	40	77	17	134	1	20	42	63	197
Total	1,257	134	4	1,395	3	7	12	22	1,417	212	178	28	418	2	36	87	125	543

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	11	32	9	52	1	25	85	111	163
BS	73	157	28	258	1	37	96	134	392
SEO	633	36	-	669	2	11	18	31	700
CG+WY	857	218	5	1,080	4	37	27	68	1,148
WG	159	101	19	279	2	25	50	77	356
Total	1,469	312	32	1,813	5	43	99	147	1,960

Table 4. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1991

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	17	6	-	23	-	4	7	11	34	15	21	4	40	1	16	40	57	97
BS	73	36	1	110	1	6	12	19	129	34	115	15	164	1	30	72	103	267
SEO	585	13	-	598	2	1	2	5	603	93	12	-	105	1	12	7	20	125
CG+WY	681	98	1	780	2	3	3	8	788	115	107	8	230	1	17	36	54	284
WG	107	32	-	139	-	3	6	9	148	30	78	12	120	1	21	40	62	182
Total	1,236	121	2	1,359	2	6	12	20	1,379	199	166	15	380	2	31	72	105	485

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	32	27	4	63	1	20	47	68	131
BS	107	151	16	274	2	36	84	122	396
SEO	678	25	-	703	3	13	9	25	728
CG+WY	796	205	9	1,010	3	20	39	62	1,072
WG	137	110	12	259	1	24	46	71	330
Total	1,435	287	17	1,739	4	37	84	125	1,864

Table 5. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1990

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	5	7	-	12	-	2	8	10	22	14	34	5	53	2	12	41	55	108
BS	42	19	1	62	-	4	10	14	76	23	70	17	110	1	19	69	89	199
SEO	591	12	-	603	2	-	2	4	607	77	9	-	86	-	4	4	8	94
CG+WY	479	85	-	564	1	4	6	11	575	119	83	10	212	1	19	32	52	264
WG	53	11	-	64	-	3	6	9	73	9	46	13	68	-	13	44	57	125
Total	1,053	102	1	1,156	2	4	10	16	1,172	179	122	20	321	2	24	71	97	418

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	19	41	5	65	2	14	49	65	130
BS	65	89	18	172	1	23	79	103	275
SEO	668	21	-	689	2	4	6	12	701
CG+WY	598	168	10	776	2	23	38	63	839
WG	62	57	13	132	-	16	50	66	198
Total	1,232	224	21	1,477	4	28	81	113	1,590

Table 6. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1989

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	8	7	-	15	-	4	5	9	24	10	11	1	22	-	14	32	46	68
BS	18	12	-	30	-	4	6	10	40	8	54	10	72	1	17	51	69	141
SEO	542	13	1	556	2	1	3	6	562	82	12	1	95	-	3	6	9	104
CG+WY	303	69	-	372	2	5	6	13	385	81	67	6	154	2	13	31	46	200
WG	79	13	-	92	-	4	6	10	102	26	47	5	78	2	12	40	54	132
Total	817	86	1	904	2	5	6	13	917	140	107	12	259	2	19	56	77	336

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	18	18	1	37	-	18	37	55	92
BS	26	66	10	102	1	21	57	79	181
SEO	624	25	2	651	2	4	9	15	666
CG+WY	384	136	6	526	4	18	37	59	585
WG	105	60	5	170	2	16	46	64	234
Total	957	193	13	1,163	4	24	62	90	1,253

Table 7. Number of vessels that reported groundfish landings of qualifying species during 1988

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	13	7	-	20	-	2	2	4	24	11	18	1	30	-	10	15	25	55
BS	28	11	1	40	-	2	4	6	46	12	46	10	68	1	11	42	54	122
SEO	685	15	-	701	2	2	2	6	707	118	9	1	128	1	1	5	7	135
CG+WY	408	79	1	488	1	4	4	9	497	103	66	4	173	2	7	21	30	203
WG	108	13	-	121	-	4	4	8	129	18	44	8	70	1	13	29	43	113
Total	1,102	92	2	1,197	2	5	5	12	1,209	191	104	15	310	2	16	45	63	63

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Area	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
AI	24	25	1	50	-	12	17	29	79
BS	40	57	11	108	1	13	46	60	168
SEO	803	24	1	829	3	3	7	13	842
CG+WY	511	145	5	661	3	11	25	39	700
WG	126	57	8	191	1	17	33	51	242
Total	1,293	196	17	1,507	4	21	50	75	1,582

Table 8. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1995

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4	13	0	0	1	1	14
St. Matthew Blue King	0	22	5	27	0	0	0	0	27	0	45	16	61	0	0	2	2	63
Norton Sound Red and Blue King	42	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	42	6	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Pribiliof Red and Blue King	19	39	0	58	0	0	0	0	58	3	61	2	66	0	1	1	2	68
Adak Brown King	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	13	8	21	0	0	1	1	22
Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
C. opilio and C. bairdi	0	65	7	72	0	0	1	1	73	0	128	31	159	0	2	16	18	177
Total	61	73	7	141	0	0	1	1	142	9	135	33	177	0	2	16	18	195

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	11	5	16	0	0	1	1	17
St. Matthew Blue King	0	67	21	88	0	0	2	2	90
Norton Sound Red and Blue King	48	1	0	49	0	0	0	0	49
Pribiliof Red and Blue King	22	100	2	124	0	1	1	2	126
Adak Brown King	0	19	9	28	0	0	1	1	29
Adak Red King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
C. opilio and C. bairdi	0	193	38	231	0	0	17	19	250
Total	70	208	40	318	0	2	17	19	337

Table 9. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1993

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
St. Matthew Blue King	0	26	8	34	0	0	0	0	34	0	47	9	56	0	0	2	2	58
Norton Sound Red and Blue King	13	1	1	15	0	0	0	0	15	6	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Pribiliof Red and Blue King	8	30	2	40	0	0	0	0	40	2	57	10	69	0	0	2	2	71
Adak Brown King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4	11	0	0	3	3	14
Adak Red King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	9
C. opilio and C. bairdi	5	85	12	102	0	0	1	1	103	3	162	42	207	0	1	20	21	228
Bristol Bay Red King	3	78	11	92	0	0	1	1	93	0	151	31	182	0	1	14	15	197
Total	24	90	13	127	0	0	1	1	128	11	165	43	219	0	1	20	21	240

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
St. Matthew Blue King	0	73	17	90	0	0	2	2	92
Norton Sound Red and Blue King	19	3	1	23	0	0	0	0	23
Pribiliof Red and Blue King	10	87	12	109	0	0	2	2	111
Adak Brown King	0	11	4	15	0	0	3	3	18
Adak Red King	0	11	1	12	0	0	0	0	12
C. opilio and C. bairdi	8	247	54	309	0	1	21	22	331
Bristol Bay Red King	3	229	42	274	0	1	15	16	290
Total	35	255	56	346	0	1	21	22	368

Table 10. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1992

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	0	0	4	4	10
St. Matthew Blue King	0	39	9	48	0	0	0	0	48	0	97	23	120	0	0	6	6	126
Adak Brown King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	10	0	0	5	5	15
Adak Red King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
C. opilio and C. bairdi	2	82	11	95	0	0	1	1	96	0	153	40	193	0	1	23	24	217
Bristol Bay Red King	1	78	10	89	0	0	0	0	89	0	141	35	176	0	1	12	13	189
Total	3	87	11	101	0	0	1	1	102	0	156	42	198	0	1	24	25	223

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	4	3	7	0	0	4	4	11
St. Matthew Blue King	0	136	32	168	0	0	6	6	174
Adak Brown King	0	8	4	12	0	0	5	5	17
Adak Red King	0	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	12
C. opilio and C. bairdi	2	235	51	288	0	1	24	25	313
Bristol Bay Red King	1	219	45	265	0	1	12	13	278
Total	3	243	53	299	0	1	25	26	325

Table 11. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1991

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	0	0	3	3	10
Adak Red King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	2	6	0	0	2	2	8
Bristol Bay Red King	0	82	11	93	0	0	1	1	94	1	151	35	187	0	1	18	19	206
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	0	0	3	3	10
St. Matthew Blue King	0	14	6	20	0	0	1	1	21	0	29	12	41	0	1	5	6	47
C. opilio and C. bairdi	4	73	11	88	0	0	1	1	89	2	147	33	182	0	1	22	23	205
Total Vessels	4	88	11	103	0	0	1	1	104	3	160	37	200	0	1	22	23	223

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	5	5	10	0	0	3	3	13
Adak Red King	0	7	2	9	0	0	2	2	11
Bristol Bay Red King	1	233	46	280	0	1	19	20	300
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	4	4	8	0	0	3	3	11
St. Matthew Blue King	0	43	18	61	0	1	6	7	68
C. opilio and C. bairdi	6	220	44	270	0	1	23	24	294
Total Vessels	7	248	48	303	0	1	23	24	327

Table 12. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1990

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	4	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	0	11	6	17	0	0	5	5	22
Adak Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	5	0	0	2	2	7
Bristol Bay Red King	2	68	7	77	0	0	1	1	78	0	122	24	146	0	1	15	16	162
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	10	0	0	6	6	16
St. Matthew Blue King	0	7	1	8	0	0	1	1	9	0	11	7	18	0	0	4	4	22
C. opilio and C. bairdi	10	74	7	91	0	0	1	1	92	3	120	29	152	0	1	16	17	169
Total Vessels	12	77	7	96	0	0	1	1	97	3	125	31	159	0	1	19	20	179

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	15	6	21	0	0	6	6	27
Adak Red King	0	5	2	7	0	0	2	2	9
Bristol Bay Red King	2	190	31	223	0	1	16	17	240
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	8	3	11	0	0	6	6	17
St. Matthew Blue King	0	18	8	26	0	0	5	5	31
C. opilio and C. bairdi	13	194	36	243	0	1	17	18	261
Total Vessels	15	202	38	255	0	1	20	21	276

Table 13. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1989

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	40	13	53	0	0	9	9	62
Adak Red King	0	7	2	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	32	6	38	0	0	7	7	45
Bristol Bay Red King	7	56	3	66	0	0	1	1	67	1	102	29	132	0	0	12	12	144
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	7	0	0	5	5	12
St. Matthew Blue King	1	7	1	9	0	0	1	1	10	0	41	9	50	0	0	9	9	59
C. opilio and C. bairdi	14	41	4	59	0	0	1	1	60	4	94	26	124	0	1	15	16	140
Total Vessels	19	63	4	86	0	0	1	1	87	5	110	32	147	0	1	16	17	164

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥ 125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	46	14	60	0	0	9	9	69
Adak Red King	0	39	8	47	0	0	7	7	54
Bristol Bay Red King	8	158	32	198	0	0	13	13	211
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	5	3	8	0	0	5	5	13
St. Matthew Blue King	1	48	10	59	0	0	10	10	69
C. opilio and C. bairdi	18	135	30	183	0	1	16	17	200
Total Vessels	24	173	36	233	0	1	17	18	251

Table 14. Vessels reporting landings of crab by license species and area combinations during 1988

	Alaska									Other States								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors					Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	11	2	13	0	0	0	0	13	0	44	14	58	0	1	6	7	65
Adak Red King	1	15	3	19	0	0	0	0	19	0	42	9	51	0	0	6	6	57
Bristol Bay Red King	4	47	5	56	0	0	1	1	57	1	100	26	127	0	1	14	15	142
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	11	5	16	0	0	2	2	18
St. Matthew Blue King	0	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	24	11	35	0	0	4	4	39
C. opilio and C. bairdi	17	36	5	58	0	0	1	1	59	1	96	26	123	0	0	13	13	136
Total Vessels	20	49	6	75	0	0	1	1	76	2	111	30	143	0	1	15	16	159

	Total								
	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				
Fishery	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	<60'	60-124'	≥125'	Total	Total
Adak Brown King	0	55	16	71	0	1	6	7	78
Adak Red King	1	57	12	70	0	0	6	6	76
Bristol Bay Red King	5	147	31	183	0	1	15	16	199
Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	12	6	18	0	0	3	3	21
St. Matthew Blue King	0	30	12	42	0	0	4	4	46
C. opilio and C. bairdi	18	132	31	181	0	0	14	14	195
Total Vessels	22	160	36	218	0	1	16	17	235

Appendix II

Vessel Classification Definitions

Vessel Classification Scheme

1. **Catcher Processors:** Vessels that harvested and processed crab or groundfish. If a vessel processed crab, ADFG fish tickets were used to determine their catch history. A groundfish catcher processor's catch history was based on NMFS weekly production reports. Catch data from 1988-93 was used to determine a vessel's class.

   a. Trawl Vessels
      i. TP1 = Trawler Processor 1 - Processed surimi and has the ability to do fillets and H&G.
      ii. TP2 = Trawler Processor 2 - Processed fillets and has the ability to do H&G.
      iii. TP3 = Trawler Processor 3 - Processed H&G and used trawl gear only.
      iv. TP3* = Trawler Processor 3* - Processed H&G and in addition to trawl gear used longlines and/or pots.

   b. Pot Vessels
      i. CP1 = Crab Processor 1 - Processed king and/or Tanner crab and only used pots (only has chilling tanks and brine freezers for processing crab).
      ii. PCP1 = Pacific cod Processor 1 - Processed only Pacific cod and pots are the only gear used (only has H&G line and plate freezers for processing Pacific cod).

   c. Longliners
      i. LP1 = Longline Processor 1- Processor that used only longline gear.

   d. Pot/Longline Vessels
      i. CP1/LP1 = Crab Processor 1/Longline Processor 1 - Processed crab and either used longline gear for groundfish or pot gear for Pacific cod (vessel has both crab processing and H&G line).

2. **Harvest Vessels:** Vessels that only havested crab or groundfish. If vessel did not process groundfish or crab than the vessel is designated a catcher vessel. Observer program data and ADFG fish tickets were used to determine the catch history of catcher vessels.

   a. Trawlers
      i. TH1 = Trawler Harvester 1- Trawlers 125 ft and over that used only trawl gear
      ii. TH2 = Trawler Harvester 2- Trawlers 90' - 124' LOA and used only trawl gear
      iii. TH3 = Trawler Harvester 3- Trawlers less then 90 ft and used only trawl gear
      iv. TH1* = Trawler Harvester 1* - Trawlers 125 ft and over that used trawl gear in addition to other gear types.
      v. TH2* = Trawler Harvester 2*- Trawlers 90 ft to 124 ft in length and used trawl gear in addition to other gear types
      vi. TH3* = Trawler Harvester 3*- Trawlers 58 ft to 90 ft in length and used trawl gear in addition to other gear types.

   b. Pot Vessels
      i. PH1 = Pot Harvester 1- Vessels 125 ft or greater in length that harvested king crab, Tanner crab, and/or Pacific cod using only pot gear
      ii. PH2 = Pot Harvester 2 - Vessels 58 ft - 124 ft in length that harvested king crab,Tanner crab, and/or Pacific cod using only pot gear.
      iii. PH1* = Pot Harvester 1* - Vessels 125 ft or greater in length that harvest king and/or Tanner crab using pot gear and used either longline, jig, or dredge (didn't trawl).
      iv. PH2* = Pot Harvester 2* - Vessels 58 ft - 124 ft in length that harvest king and/or Tanner crab using pot gear and used either longline, jig, or dredge (didn't trawl).

c. Longline Vessels

i. LH1= Longline Harvester 1- Longline vessels that are greater than 58 ft and used only longline and/or jig gear.

ii. LH2= Longline Harvester 2 - Longline vessels that are less than 58 ft and used only longline and/or jig gear.

d. Seine Vessels Which Harvested Groundfish

i. SEN/TH4 = Seiner/Trawler Harvester 4 - Vessels less then 58 feet which used seine gear and also used trawl gear.

ii. SEN/PH2 = Seiner/Pot Harvester 2 - Vessels less then 58 feet which used seine gear and also used pot gear.

iii. SEN* = Seiner * - Vessels less than 58 feet which used seine gear and also used longline and/or jig gear (didn't trawl or pot).

iv. CSEN* = Chignik Seiner* - Vessel less than 58 feet which used seine gear and also fished in Chignik fishery.

e. Gill Net Vessels Which Harvest Groundfish

i. GL1* = Gill Net 1* - Vessels greater than or equal to 32 but less than 58 feet which used gill nets rather than seine gear.

ii. GL2* = Gill Net 2* - Vessels less than 58 feet which used gill nets rather than seine gear.

f. Dredge Vessels Which Harvest Groundfish

i. DRG = Dredge Vessel - Vessels that only used dredge gear.

g. Miscellaneous

i. MSC = Those groundfish or crab harvestors that did not fall in any other category.

Appendix III

Participation in the 1994 Fisheries and License Qualified Vessels by the Owner's County/Borough of Residence

Table 1. Participation in the 1994 Groundfish Fishery by County/Borough

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Aleutians East	AI	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians East	BS	8	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Aleutians East	CG+WY	27	2	0	29	0	0	0	0	29
Aleutians East	WG	60	5	1	66	0	0	0	0	66
Aleutians East	**Endorsements**	**96**	**8**	**1**	**105**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**105**
Aleutians East	**Vessels**	**61**	**5**	**1**	**67**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**67**
Aleutians West (Census)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians West (Census)	BS	12	2	0	14	0	0	0	0	14
Aleutians West (Census)	SEO	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians West (Census)	WG	11	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Aleutians West (Census)	**Endorsements**	**23**	**5**	**0**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**28**
Aleutians West (Census)	**Vessels**	**16**	**3**	**0**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**
Anchorage	AI	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Anchorage	BS	5	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
Anchorage	CG+WY	35	2	0	37	0	1	0	1	38
Anchorage	SEO	6	1	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
Anchorage	WG	4	2	0	6	0	1	0	1	7
Anchorage	**Endorsements**	**50**	**5**	**0**	**55**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**60**
Anchorage	**Vessels**	**43**	**5**	**0**	**48**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**49**
Bethel (Census)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Bethel (Census)	WG	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bethel (Census)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Bethel (Census)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	[illegible]	**0**	**3**
Dillingham (Census)	CG+WY	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Dillingham (Census)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Dillingham (Census)	**Vessels**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Fairbanks North Star	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Fairbanks North Star	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Fairbanks North Star	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Haines	CG+WY	5	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Haines	SEO	18	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	18
Haines	**Endorsements**	**23**	**1**	**0**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Haines	**Vessels**	**20**	**1**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**
Juneau	BS	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Juneau	CG+WY	23	1	0	24	0	0	0	0	24
Juneau	SEO	42	3	0	45	0	0	0	0	45
Juneau	WG	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Juneau	**Endorsements**	**71**	**4**	**0**	**75**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**75**
Juneau	**Vessels**	**58**	**3**	**0**	**61**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**61**

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Kenai Peninsula	AI	3	0	0	3	0	1	6	7	10
Kenai Peninsula	BS	9	2	0	11	1	2	9	12	23
Kenai Peninsula	CG+WY	211	18	0	229	1	3	5	9	238
Kenai Peninsula	SEO	17	2	0	19	1	0	2	3	22
Kenai Peninsula	WG	2	2	0	4	1	1	7	9	13
Kenai Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**242**	**24**	**0**	**266**	**4**	**7**	**29**	**40**	**306**
Kenai Peninsula	**Vessels**	**222**	**21**	**0**	**243**	**1**	**3**	**9**	**13**	**256**
Ketchikan Gateway	CG+WY	8	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Ketchikan Gateway	SEO	33	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	33
Ketchikan Gateway	WG	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ketchikan Gateway	**Endorsements**	**41**	**2**	**0**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**43**
Ketchikan Gateway	**Vessels**	**39**	**1**	**0**	**40**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**40**
Kodiak Island	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	2
Kodiak Island	BS	5	17	0	22	0	1	2	3	25
Kodiak Island	CG+WY	101	45	0	146	0	1	1	2	148
Kodiak Island	SEO	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Kodiak Island	WG	1	3	0	4	0	1	1	2	6
Kodiak Island	**Endorsements**	**111**	**66**	**0**	**177**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**185**
Kodiak Island	**Vessels**	**104**	**47**	**0**	**151**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**154**
Matanuska-Susitna	CG+WY	14	1	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
Matanuska-Susitna	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Matanuska-Susitna	WG	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Matanuska-Susitna	**Endorsements**	**19**	**1**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**
Matanuska-Susitna	**Vessels**	**15**	**1**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
Northwest Artic	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Northwest Artic	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Northwest Artic	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Prince of Wales-Outer Ketchikan	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Prince of Wales-Outer Ketchikan	SEO	49	1	0	50	0	0	0	0	50
Prince of Wales-Outer Ketchikan	**Endorsements**	**50**	**1**	**0**	**51**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**51**
Prince of Wales-Outer Ketchikan	**Vessels**	**50**	**1**	**0**	**51**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**51**
Sitka	AI	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	3
Sitka	BS	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
Sitka	CG+WY	23	2	0	25	2	1	0	3	28
Sitka	SEO	131	3	0	134	0	0	0	0	134
Sitka	**Endorsements**	**155**	**7**	**0**	**162**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**6**	**168**
Sitka	**Vessels**	**136**	**4**	**0**	**140**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**143**
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	CG+WY	36	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	36
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	SEO	56	0	0	56	0	0	0	0	56
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	**Endorsements**	**92**	**0**	**0**	**92**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**92**
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	**Vessels**	**82**	**0**	**0**	**82**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**82**

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	BS	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	CG+WY	26	4	0	30	0	0	0	0	30
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	WG	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	**Endorsements**	**31**	**6**	**2**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**39**
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	**Vessels**	**28**	**4**	**1**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**33**
Wrangell-Petersburg	BS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
Wrangell-Petersburg	CG+WY	19	4	0	23	0	0	1	1	24
Wrangell-Petersburg	SEO	121	8	0	129	0	1	0	1	130
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Endorsements**	**140**	**12**	**0**	**152**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**156**
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Vessels**	**130**	**11**	**0**	**141**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**143**
Alaska Endorsements		**1,153**	**142**	**3**	**1,298**	**7**	**20**	**36**	**63**	**1,361**
Alaska Vessels		**1,013**	**107**	**2**	**1,122**	**3**	**7**	**12**	**22**	**1,144**
Baker (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Baker (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Baker (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Benton (OR)	SEO	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Benton (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Benton (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clackamas (OR)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clackamas (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Clackamas (OR)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Clallam (WA)	CG+WY	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Clallam (WA)	SEO	4	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Clallam (WA)	**Endorsements**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Clallam (WA)	**Vessels**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Clatsop (OR)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Clatsop (OR)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Clatsop (OR)	CG+WY	4	3	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
Clatsop (OR)	SEO	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clatsop (OR)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**6**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**13**
Clatsop (OR)	**Vessels**	**4**	**5**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**10**
Coos (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Coos (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Coos (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Crook (OR)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Crook (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Crook (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**4**
Crook (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**2**

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Curry (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Curry (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Curry (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Deschutes (OR)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Deschutes (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Deschutes (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Grays Harbor (WA)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	BS	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Grays Harbor (WA)	CG+WY	4	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Grays Harbor (WA)	SEO	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Grays Harbor (WA)	WG	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Endorsements**	**7**	**9**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Vessels**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
Island (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Island (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Island (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Jefferson (WA)	CG+WY	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Jefferson (WA)	SEO	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Jefferson (WA)	**Endorsements**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**
Jefferson (WA)	**Vessels**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
King (WA)	AI	6	16	9	31	2	11	41	54	85
King (WA)	BS	13	54	16	83	2	20	59	81	164
King (WA)	CG+WY	29	36	5	70	1	13	23	37	107
King (WA)	SEO	18	8	0	26	1	7	9	17	43
King (WA)	WG	13	24	8	45	1	13	15	29	74
King (WA)	**Endorsements**	**79**	**138**	**38**	**255**	**7**	**64**	**147**	**218**	**473**
King (WA)	**Vessels**	**47**	**72**	**17**	**136**	**2**	**21**	**60**	**83**	**219**
Kitsap (WA)	AI	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kitsap (WA)	BS	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Kitsap (WA)	CG+WY	2	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
Kitsap (WA)	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kitsap (WA)	WG	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kitsap (WA)	**Endorsements**	**5**	**6**	**8**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**
Kitsap (WA)	**Vessels**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
Kittatas (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kittatas (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Kittatas (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lane (OR)	CG+WY	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lane (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lane (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Lincoln (OR)	BS	0	15	1	16	0	0	0	0	16
Lincoln (OR)	CG+WY	2	13	1	16	0	0	0	0	16
Lincoln (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	WG	0	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	9
Lincoln (OR)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**36**	**3**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**42**
Lincoln (OR)	**Vessels**	**2**	**21**	**1**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Marion (OR)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Marion (OR)	CG+WY	26	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	26
Marion (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Marion (OR)	**Endorsements**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**28**
Marion (OR)	**Vessels**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**28**
Okanogan (WA)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Okanogan (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Other	AI	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	5
Other	BS	1	3	1	5	0	3	1	4	9
Other	CG+WY	6	4	0	10	0	3	1	4	14
Other	SEO	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Other	WG	0	4	0	4	0	2	1	3	7
Other	**Endorsements**	**14**	**13**	**2**	**29**	**0**	**9**	**4**	**13**	**42**
Other	**Vessels**	**11**	**7**	**1**	**19**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**24**
Pacific (WA)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	CG+WY	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pacific (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	WG	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Pacific (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Pierce (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pierce (WA)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Pierce (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
San Juan (WA)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
San Juan (WA)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
San Juan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
San Juan (WA)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**

County/Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels < 60	Catcher Vessels 60-125	Catcher Vessels >=125	Catcher Vessels Total	Catcher Processors < 60	Catcher Processors 60-125	Catcher Processors >=125	Catcher Processors Total	Total Vessels
Skagit (WA)	AI	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	3
Skagit (WA)	BS	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	4
Skagit (WA)	CG+WY	5	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	7
Skagit (WA)	SEO	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Skagit (WA)	WG	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Skagit (WA)	**Endorsements**	**15**	**2**	**7**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**26**
Skagit (WA)	**Vessels**	**14**	**1**	**2**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**18**
Snohomish (WA)	AI	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3
Snohomish (WA)	BS	0	6	0	6	0	3	2	5	11
Snohomish (WA)	CG+WY	15	7	0	22	0	3	0	3	25
Snohomish (WA)	SEO	6	1	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
Snohomish (WA)	WG	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Snohomish (WA)	**Endorsements**	**23**	**17**	**0**	**40**	**0**	**7**	**4**	**11**	**51**
Snohomish (WA)	**Vessels**	**20**	**11**	**0**	**31**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**36**
Thurston (WA)	AI	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Thurston (WA)	BS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
Thurston (WA)	CG+WY	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Thurston (WA)	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	4
Thurston (WA)	WG	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Thurston (WA)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**9**
Thurston (WA)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**5**
Union (OR)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Union (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Union (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Washington (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Washington (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Washington (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Whakiakum (WA)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whakiakum (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Whakiakum (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Whatcom (WA)	AI	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
Whatcom (WA)	BS	0	2	1	3	0	2	0	2	5
Whatcom (WA)	CG+WY	8	3	0	11	0	2	0	2	13
Whatcom (WA)	SEO	8	0	0	8	0	2	0	2	10
Whatcom (WA)	WG	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Whatcom (WA)	**Endorsements**	**18**	**6**	**1**	**25**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**8**	**33**
Whatcom (WA)	**Vessels**	**16**	**3**	**1**	**20**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**22**
Other States Endorsements		**241**	**243**	**59**	**543**	**7**	**97**	**159**	**263**	**806**
Other States Vessels		**191**	**136**	**24**	**351**	**2**	**33**	**65**	**100**	**451**
TOTAL ENDORSEMENTS		**1,394**	**385**	**62**	**1,841**	**14**	**117**	**195**	**326**	**2,167**
TOTAL VESSELS		**1,204**	**243**	**26**	**1,473**	**5**	**40**	**77**	**122**	**1,595**

Table 2. Participation in the 1994 Crab Fishery by County/Borough

		CV				CP				
Borough	Species and Area	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutians East	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	8
Aleutians East	St. Matthew Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians East	Pribilof Red & Blue King	4	4	1	9	0	0	0	0	9
Aleutians East	**Endorsements**	**4**	**13**	**2**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**
Aleutians East	**Vessels**	**4**	**7**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**
Aleutians West	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Aleutians West	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Aleutians West	Adak Brown King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians West	**Endorsements**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**
Aleutians West	**Vessels**	**1**	**5**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Anchorage	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	6
Anchorage	St. Matthew Blue King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Anchorage	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Anchorage	Adak Red King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Anchorage	**Endorsements**	**0**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
Anchorage	**Vessels**	**0**	**6**	**1**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**
Kenai Peninsula	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	13
Kenai Peninsula	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kenai Peninsula	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Kenai Peninsula	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Kenai Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**9**	**22**	**0**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**
Kenai Peninsula	**Vessels**	**9**	**13**	**0**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22**
Kodiak Island	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	40	8	48	0	0	1	1	49
Kodiak Island	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kodiak Island	St. Matthew Blue King	0	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	12
Kodiak Island	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kodiak Island	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	11	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Kodiak Island	Adak Brown King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Kodiak Island	Adak Red King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Kodiak Island	**Endorsements**	**2**	**67**	**12**	**81**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**82**
Kodiak Island	**Vessels**	**2**	**42**	**8**	**52**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**53**
Lake and Peninsula	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lake and Peninsula	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lake and Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lake and Peninsula	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Nome	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	20	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	20
Nome	**Endorsements**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**
Nome	**Vessels**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**

Table 2 Continued		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
Valdez-Cordova	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
Valdez-Cordova	St. Matthew Blue King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valdez-Cordova	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valdez-Cordova	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Valdez-Cordova	**Vessels**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Wade Hampton	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Wade Hampton	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Wade Hampton	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Wrangell-Petersburg	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Wrangell-Petersburg	St. Matthew Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wrangell-Petersburg	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Endorsements**	**1**	**7**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Vessels**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Yakutat	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Yakutat	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Alaska Total	**Endorsements**	**40**	**137**	**19**	**196**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**197**
Alaska Total	**Vessels**	**40**	**82**	**11**	**133**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**134**
Chelan (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Chelan (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clatsop (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clatsop (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clatsop (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Clatsop (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Crook (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
Crook (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crook (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**4**
Crook (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**
Grays Harbor (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Hood River (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Hood River (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**

Table 2 Continued		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
King (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	1	101	31	133	0	1	20	21	154
King (WA)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	9
King (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
King (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	37	7	44	0	1	6	7	51
King (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	37	9	47	0	0	0	0	47
King (WA)	Adak Brown King	0	8	5	13	0	0	0	0	13
King (WA)	Adak Red King	0	7	1	8	0	0	1	1	9
King (WA)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**195**	**57**	**254**	**0**	**2**	**27**	**29**	**283**
King (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**103**	**32**	**138**	**0**	**1**	**20**	**21**	**159**
Kitsap (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kitsap (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kitsap (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Kitsap (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lewis (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lewis (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lincoln (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Lincoln (OR)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lincoln (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Lincoln (OR)	Adak Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**18**	**2**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**
Lincoln (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
Other	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	St. Matthew Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	**Endorsements**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Other	**Vessels**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Pacific (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Pacific (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Pierce (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pierce (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pierce (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Pierce (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**

Table 2 Continued		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**60-125**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
Skagit (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Skagit (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Skagit (WA)	Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Skagit (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
Skagit (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Snohomish (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	9	1	10	0	0	0	0	10
Snohomish (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Snohomish (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Snohomish (WA)	Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Snohomish (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**18**	**1**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**
Snohomish (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**9**	**1**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
Thurston (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Thurston (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Thurston (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Thurston (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Whakiakum (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Whakiakum (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Whatcom (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
Whatcom (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whatcom (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whatcom (WA)	Adak Red King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whatcom (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Whatcom (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Other States Total	**Endorsements**	**5**	**277**	**66**	**347**	**0**	**3**	**27**	**30**	**378**
Other States Total	**Vessels**	**4**	**147**	**37**	**189**	**0**	**2**	**20**	**22**	**211**
Total Endorsements		**45**	**414**	**85**	**544**	**0**	**3**	**28**	**31**	**575**
Total Vessels		**44**	**229**	**48**	**322**	**0**	**2**	**21**	**23**	**345**

Table 3. Groundfish Endorsements and Licenses by Vessel Owner's Bourough/County of Residence

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Aleutians East	AI	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians East	BS	18	5	1	24	0	0	0	0	24
Aleutians East	CG+WY	41	3	0	44	0	0	0	0	44
Aleutians East	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians East	WG	86	3	0	89	0	0	0	0	89
Aleutians East	**Endorsements**	**148**	**11**	**1**	**160**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**160**
Aleutians East	**Vessels**	**93**	**5**	**1**	**99**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**99**
Aleutians West (Census)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Aleutians West (Census)	BS	13	4	0	17	0	1	0	1	18
Aleutians West (Census)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Aleutians West (Census)	WG	12	4	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
Aleutians West (Census)	**Endorsements**	**26**	**9**	**0**	**35**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**37**
Aleutians West (Census)	**Vessels**	**17**	**4**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**22**
Anchorage	AI	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Anchorage	BS	7	3	0	10	0	1	0	1	11
Anchorage	CG+WY	47	6	0	53	0	1	0	1	54
Anchorage	SEO	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Anchorage	WG	6	4	0	10	0	1	0	1	11
Anchorage	**Endorsements**	**70**	**13**	**0**	**83**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**87**
Anchorage	**Vessels**	**58**	**7**	**0**	**65**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**66**
Bethel (Census)	CG+WY	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Bethel (Census)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bethel (Census)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Bethel (Census)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Bristol Bay	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bristol Bay	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Bristol Bay	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Dillingham (Census)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dillingham (Census)	CG+WY	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Dillingham (Census)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dillingham (Census)	**Endorsements**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Dillingham (Census)	**Vessels**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Fairbanks North Star	SEO	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Fairbanks North Star	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Fairbanks North Star	**Endorsements**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Fairbanks North Star	**Vessels**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Haines	CG+WY	10	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Haines	SEO	30	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	30
Haines	**Endorsements**	**40**	**1**	**0**	**41**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**41**
Haines	**Vessels**	**32**	**1**	**0**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**33**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Juneau	BS	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Juneau	CG+WY	51	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	51
Juneau	SEO	91	2	0	93	0	0	0	0	93
Juneau	WG	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Juneau	**Endorsements**	**153**	**2**	**0**	**155**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**155**
Juneau	**Vessels**	**103**	**2**	**0**	**105**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**105**
Kenai Peninsula	AI	2	4	0	6	0	2	9	11	17
Kenai Peninsula	BS	26	6	0	32	1	2	9	12	44
Kenai Peninsula	CG+WY	267	23	0	290	1	3	7	11	301
Kenai Peninsula	SEO	24	1	0	25	1	0	0	1	26
Kenai Peninsula	WG	21	5	0	26	1	2	7	10	36
Kenai Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**340**	**39**	**0**	**379**	**4**	**9**	**32**	**45**	**424**
Kenai Peninsula	**Vessels**	**276**	**25**	**0**	**301**	**1**	**3**	**9**	**13**	**314**
Ketchikan Gateway	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ketchikan Gateway	CG+WY	15	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
Ketchikan Gateway	SEO	67	0	0	67	0	0	0	0	67
Ketchikan Gateway	WG	4	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Ketchikan Gateway	**Endorsements**	**87**	**2**	**0**	**89**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**89**
Ketchikan Gateway	**Vessels**	**76**	**1**	**0**	**77**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**77**
Kodiak Island	AI	2	2	0	4	0	0	2	2	6
Kodiak Island	BS	10	30	0	40	0	1	2	3	43
Kodiak Island	CG+WY	190	53	0	243	0	1	1	2	245
Kodiak Island	SEO	8	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Kodiak Island	WG	4	18	0	22	0	1	1	2	24
Kodiak Island	**Endorsements**	**214**	**104**	**0**	**318**	**0**	**3**	**6**	**9**	**327**
Kodiak Island	**Vessels**	**194**	**63**	**0**	**257**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**260**
Lake and Peninsula	WG	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lake and Penninsula	CG+WY	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
Lake and Penninsula	**Endorsements**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**
Lake and Penninsula	**Vessels**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
Matanuska-Susitna	BS	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Matanuska-Susitna	CG+WY	19	1	0	20	0	0	0	0	20
Matanuska-Susitna	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Matanuska-Susitna	WG	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Matanuska-Susitna	**Endorsements**	**27**	**1**	**0**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**28**
Matanuska-Susitna	**Vessels**	**20**	**1**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**
Nome (Census)	BS	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Nome (Census)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nome (Census)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Nome (Census)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	CG+WY	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	SEO	84	2	0	86	0	0	0	0	86
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	WG	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	**Endorsements**	**93**	**2**	**0**	**95**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**95**
Prince of Wales Outer Ketchikan	**Vessels**	**86**	**2**	**0**	**88**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**88**
Sitka	AI	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	4
Sitka	BS	5	2	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
Sitka	CG+WY	65	4	0	69	2	1	0	3	72
Sitka	SEO	201	3	0	204	1	0	0	1	205
Sitka	WG	8	3	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Sitka	**Endorsements**	**281**	**13**	**0**	**294**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**6**	**300**
Sitka	**Vessels**	**207**	**5**	**0**	**212**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**215**
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	BS	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	CG+WY	64	0	0	64	0	0	0	0	64
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	SEO	106	0	0	106	0	0	0	0	106
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	WG	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	**Endorsements**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**175**
Skagway-Yakutat-Angoon	**Vessels**	**138**	**0**	**0**	**138**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**138**
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	BS	3	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	8
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	CG+WY	66	8	0	74	0	0	0	0	74
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	WG	3	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	8
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	**Endorsements**	**74**	**17**	**2**	**93**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**93**
Valdez-Cordova (Census)	**Vessels**	**68**	**11**	**1**	**80**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**80**
Wade Hampton (Census)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wade Hampton (Census)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wade Hampton (Census)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Wade Hampton (Census)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Wrangell-Petersburg	AI	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Wrangell-Petersburg	BS	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3
Wrangell-Petersburg	CG+WY	42	5	0	47	0	1	1	2	49
Wrangell-Petersburg	SEO	219	10	0	229	0	1	0	1	230
Wrangell-Petersburg	WG	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Endorsements**	**264**	**15**	**0**	**279**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**285**
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Vessels**	**222**	**11**	**0**	**233**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**235**
Alaska Total	**Endorsements**	**2035**	**229**	**3**	**2267**	**7**	**25**	**40**	**72**	**2339**
Alaska Total	**Vessels**	**1630**	**138**	**2**	**1770**	**3**	**8**	**12**	**23**	**1793**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Baker (OR)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Baker (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Baker (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Baker (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Benton (OR)	SEO	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Benton (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Benton (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clackamas (OR)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clackamas (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Clackamas (OR)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Clallam (WA)	CG+WY	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Clallam (WA)	SEO	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Clallam (WA)	WG	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clallam (WA)	**Endorsements**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**
Clallam (WA)	**Vessels**	**6**	**1**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**
Clark (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Clark (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clark (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clatsop (OR)	AI	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
Clatsop (OR)	BS	0	4	0	4	0	1	0	1	5
Clatsop (OR)	CG+WY	6	5	0	11	0	1	0	1	12
Clatsop (OR)	SEO	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Clatsop (OR)	WG	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Clatsop (OR)	**Endorsements**	**11**	**14**	**0**	**25**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**28**
Clatsop (OR)	**Vessels**	**9**	**8**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**18**
Coos (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Coos (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Coos (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Crook (OR)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Crook (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
Crook (OR)	WG	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crook (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**5**
Crook (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**2**
Curry (OR)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Curry (OR)	BS	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Curry (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Curry (OR)	WG	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Curry (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Curry (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Deschutes (OR)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Deschutes (OR)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Deschutes (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Deschutes (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Deschutes (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Grays Harbor (WA)	AI	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	BS	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Grays Harbor (WA)	CG+WY	3	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Grays Harbor (WA)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Grays Harbor (WA)	WG	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Endorsements**	**6**	**8**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Vessels**	**5**	**3**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Island (WA)	AI	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
Island (WA)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3
Island (WA)	CG+WY	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Island (WA)	SEO	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Island (WA)	WG	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Island (WA)	**Endorsements**	**5**	**4**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**4**	**13**
Island (WA)	**Vessels**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**7**
Jefferson (WA)	AI	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Jefferson (WA)	BS	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Jefferson (WA)	CG+WY	9	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Jefferson (WA)	SEO	10	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Jefferson (WA)	WG	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Jefferson (WA)	**Endorsements**	**23**	**4**	**0**	**27**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**
Jefferson (WA)	**Vessels**	**14**	**2**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
King (WA)	AI	8	38	12	58	2	19	77	98	156
King (WA)	BS	14	111	25	150	2	25	76	103	253
King (WA)	CG+WY	50	45	3	98	1	19	21	41	139
King (WA)	SEO	37	4	0	41	1	9	3	13	54
King (WA)	WG	25	66	12	103	1	14	28	43	146
King (WA)	**Endorsements**	**134**	**264**	**52**	**450**	**7**	**86**	**205**	**298**	**748**
King (WA)	**Vessels**	**72**	**127**	**26**	**225**	**2**	**26**	**78**	**106**	**331**
Kitsap (WA)	AI	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
Kitsap (WA)	BS	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	6
Kitsap (WA)	CG+WY	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Kitsap (WA)	SEO	7	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Kitsap (WA)	WG	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	6
Kitsap (WA)	**Endorsements**	**10**	**14**	**6**	**30**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**30**
Kitsap (WA)	**Vessels**	**8**	**5**	**2**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**
Kittitas (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kittitas (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Kittitas (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Lane (OR)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lane (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lane (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lane (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lewis (WA)	BS	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lewis (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lewis (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lincoln (OR)	AI	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lincoln (OR)	BS	0	21	1	22	0	0	0	0	22
Lincoln (OR)	CG+WY	2	13	1	16	0	0	0	0	16
Lincoln (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	WG	0	13	1	14	0	0	0	0	14
Lincoln (OR)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**49**	**3**	**55**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**55**
Lincoln (OR)	**Vessels**	**2**	**21**	**1**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Linn (OR)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Linn (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Linn (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Linn (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Marion (OR)	BS	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Marion (OR)	CG+WY	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	21
Marion (OR)	WG	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Marion (OR)	**Endorsements**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**
Marion (OR)	**Vessels**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Okanogan (WA)	BS	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	CG+WY	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Okanogan (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	WG	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Okanogan (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Other	AI	2	3	1	6	0	1	1	2	8
Other	BS	2	7	1	10	0	1	2	3	13
Other	CG+WY	12	7	1	20	0	3	1	4	24
Other	SEO	15	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
Other	WG	3	6	1	10	0	2	1	3	13
Other	**Endorsements**	**34**	**24**	**4**	**62**	**0**	**7**	**5**	**12**	**74**
Other	**Vessels**	**22**	**10**	**1**	**33**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**38**
Pacific (WA)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	CG+WY	5	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Pacific (WA)	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pacific (WA)	WG	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	**Endorsements**	**10**	**2**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**
Pacific (WA)	**Vessels**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Pierce (WA)	BS	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**2**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Pierce (WA)	**Vessels**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
San Juan (WA)	AI	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
San Juan (WA)	BS	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
San Juan (WA)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
San Juan (WA)	SEO	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
San Juan (WA)	WG	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
San Juan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**
San Juan (WA)	**Vessels**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Sherman (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Sherman (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Sherman (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Skagit (WA)	AI	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	3
Skagit (WA)	BS	3	3	2	8	0	0	1	1	9
Skagit (WA)	CG+WY	17	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	18
Skagit (WA)	SEO	13	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	13
Skagit (WA)	WG	5	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
Skagit (WA)	**Endorsements**	**38**	**5**	**6**	**49**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**51**
Skagit (WA)	**Vessels**	**23**	**4**	**2**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**30**
Snohomish (WA)	AI	1	5	0	6	0	3	2	5	11
Snohomish (WA)	BS	18	7	0	25	0	1	0	1	26
Snohomish (WA)	CG+WY	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Snohomish (WA)	SEO	6	10	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
Snohomish (WA)	WG	3	9	0	12	0	3	2	5	17
Snohomish (WA)	**Endorsements**	**36**	**31**	**0**	**67**	**0**	**7**	**4**	**11**	**78**
Snohomish (WA)	**Vessels**	**22**	**13**	**0**	**35**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**40**
Spokane (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Spokane (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Spokane (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Thurston (WA)	AI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Thurston (WA)	BS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Thurston (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Thurston (WA)	SEO	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Thurston (WA)	WG	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Thurston (WA)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**7**
Thurston (WA)	**Vessels**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	[illegible]	**1**	**1**	**4**

Borough	FMP Subarea	Catcher Vessels				Catcher Processors				Total Vessels
		< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	
Tillamook (OR)	CG+WY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Tillamook (OR)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Tillamook (OR)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Tillamook (OR)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Unknown (WA)	CG+WY	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Unknown (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Unknown (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Washington (OR)	SEO	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Washington (OR)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Washington (OR)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Whakiakum (WA)	CG+WY	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whakiakum (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	**Endorsements**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Whakiakum (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Whatcom (WA)	AI	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
Whatcom (WA)	BS	2	4	1	7	0	2	0	2	9
Whatcom (WA)	CG+WY	10	4	0	14	0	2	0	2	16
Whatcom (WA)	SEO	10	0	0	10	0	1	0	1	11
Whatcom (WA)	WG	2	4	0	6	0	1	0	1	7
Whatcom (WA)	**Endorsements**	**24**	**12**	**1**	**37**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**8**	**45**
Whatcom (WA)	**Vessels**	**20**	**5**	**1**	**26**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**28**
Yakima (WA)	SEO	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakima (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Yakima (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Other States	**Endorsements**	**419**	**452**	**72**	**943**	**7**	**113**	**223**	**343**	**1,286**
Other States	**Vessels**	**272**	**213**	**33**	**518**	**2**	**36**	**86**	**124**	**642**
Total	**Endorsements**	**2,454**	**681**	**75**	**3,210**	**14**	**138**	**263**	**415**	**3,625**
Total	**Vessels**	**1,902**	**351**	**35**	**2,288**	**5**	**44**	**98**	**147**	**2,435**

Table 4. Distribution of Endorsements by the Vessel Owner's County/Borough of Residence for the Council's Perferred Alternative

		CV				CP				
Borough	Species and Area	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	< 60	60-125	>=125	Total	Total
Aleutians East	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	1	7	1	9	0	0	0	0	9
Aleutians East	Bristol Bay Red King	2	7	1	10	0	0	0	0	10
Aleutians East	Pribilof Red & Blue King	6	5	1	12	0	0	0	0	12
Aleutians East	St. Matthew Blue King	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Aleutians East	**Endorsements**	**9**	**25**	**3**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**37**
Aleutians East	**Vessels**	**6**	**7**	**1**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**
Aleutians West	Adak Brown King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Adak Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	1	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Aleutians West	Bristol Bay Red King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Aleutians West	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Aleutians West	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Aleutians West	St. Matthew Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Aleutians West	**Endorsements**	**2**	**22**	**0**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Aleutians West	**Vessels**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**
Anchorage	Adak Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Anchorage	Adak Red King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Anchorage	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	6
Anchorage	Bristol Bay Red King	1	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	6
Anchorage	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Anchorage	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Anchorage	St. Matthew Blue King	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
Anchorage	**Endorsements**	**4**	**16**	**4**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**
Anchorage	**Vessels**	**4**	**6**	**1**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
Juneau	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Juneau	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Juneau	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Kenai Peninsula	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	15	1	16	0	0	0	0	16
Kenai Peninsula	Bristol Bay Red King	0	17	0	17	0	0	0	0	17
Kenai Peninsula	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	9	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Kenai Peninsula	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Kenai Peninsula	St. Matthew Blue King	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Kenai Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**9**	**46**	**1**	**56**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**56**
Kenai Peninsula	**Vessels**	**9**	**17**	**1**	**27**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**
Ketchikan Gateway	Bristol Bay Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ketchikan Gateway	**Endorsements**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Ketchikan Gateway	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**

		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
Kodiak Island	Adak Brown King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Kodiak Island	Adak Red King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Kodiak Island	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	44	7	51	0	0	1	1	52
Kodiak Island	Bristol Bay Red King	0	49	7	56	0	0	1	1	57
Kodiak Island	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kodiak Island	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Kodiak Island	Pribilof Red & Blue King	2	23	1	26	0	0	0	0	26
Kodiak Island	St. Matthew Blue King	0	23	6	29	0	0	0	0	29
Kodiak Island	**Endorsements**	**4**	**145**	**23**	**172**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**174**
Kodiak Island	**Vessels**	**4**	**51**	**7**	**62**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**63**
Lake And Peninsula	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lake And Peninsula	**Endorsements**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lake And Peninsula	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Nome (Census)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	33	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	33
Nome (Census)	**Endorsements**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**33**
Nome (Census)	**Vessels**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**33**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**33**
Valdez-Cordova	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	6
Valdez-Cordova	Bristol Bay Red King	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
Valdez-Cordova	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Valdez-Cordova	St. Matthew Blue King	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
Valdez-Cordova	**Endorsements**	**0**	**16**	**4**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**
Valdez-Cordova	**Vessels**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**
Wade Hampton	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Wade Hampton	**Endorsements**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Wade Hampton	**Vessels**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Wrangell-Petersburg	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Wrangell-Petersburg	Bristol Bay Red King	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Wrangell-Petersburg	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Wrangell-Petersburg	St. Matthew Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Endorsements**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**
Wrangell-Petersburg	**Vessels**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Yakutat	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yakutat	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Yakutat	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Alaska Total	**Endorsements**	**65**	**291**	**35**	**391**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**393**
Alaska Total	**Vessels**	**62**	**101**	**12**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**176**

		CV				CP				
Borough	Species and Area	< 60	(65)	>=125	Total	< 60	(65)	>=125	Total	Total
Chelan (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Chelan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Chelan (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clatsop (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clatsop (OR)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clatsop (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Clatsop (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Clatsop (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Crook (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
Crook (OR)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Crook (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Crook (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**6**
Crook (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**
Grant (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grant (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Grant (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Grays Harbor (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Grays Harbor (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Hood River (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hood River (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Hood River (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Island (WA)	Adak Red King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Island (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Island (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Island (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Island (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**

		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
King (WA)	Adak Brown King	0	10	6	16	0	0	5	5	21
King (WA)	Adak Red King	0	12	1	13	0	0	1	1	14
King (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	109	34	143	0	1	23	24	167
King (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	110	33	143	0	1	23	24	167
King (WA)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	6	6	12	0	0	4	4	16
King (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	3	4	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
King (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	56	17	74	0	0	8	8	82
King (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	78	23	101	0	1	11	12	113
King (WA)	**Endorsements**	**4**	**385**	**120**	**509**	**0**	**3**	**75**	**78**	**587**
King (WA)	**Vessels**	**3**	**118**	**35**	**156**	**0**	**1**	**23**	**24**	**180**
Kitsap (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kitsap (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kitsap (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kitsap (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Kitsap (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lewis (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lewis (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Lewis (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lincoln (OR)	Adak Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	Adak Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lincoln (OR)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	13	1	14	0	0	1	1	15
Lincoln (OR)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	14	1	15	0	0	1	1	16
Lincoln (OR)	Dutch Harbor Brown King	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Lincoln (OR)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Lincoln (OR)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Lincoln (OR)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**44**	**4**	**48**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**50**
Lincoln (OR)	**Vessels**	**0**	**14**	**2**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**17**
Okanogan (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Okanogan (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Okanogan (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Other	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	Bristol Bay Red King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	St. Matthew Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	**Endorsements**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**
Other	**Vessels**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**

		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	< 60	(65)	>=125	**Total**	< 60	(65)	>=125	**Total**	**Total**
Pacific (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pacific (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Pacific (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Pierce (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pierce (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pierce (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pierce (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	3
Pierce (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**3**	**8**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
Pierce (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Skagit (WA)	Adak Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Skagit (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Skagit (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Skagit (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skagit (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Skagit (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Skagit (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**15**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**17**
Skagit (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**
Snohomish (WA)	Adak Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Snohomish (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	12	1	13	0	0	0	0	13
Snohomish (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	12	1	13	0	0	0	0	13
Snohomish (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Snohomish (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Snohomish (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**40**	**2**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**42**
Snohomish (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**12**	**1**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**
Thurston (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Thurston (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Thurston (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Thurston (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Thurston (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Walla Walla (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walla Walla (WA)	**Endorsements**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Walla Walla (WA)	**Vessels**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Whakiakum (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	St. Matthew Blue King	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whakiakum (WA)	**Endorsements**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Whakiakum (WA)	**Vessels**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**

		CV				CP				
Borough	**Species and Area**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**< 60**	**(65)**	**>=125**	**Total**	**Total**
Whatcom (WA)	Adak Red King	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whatcom (WA)	Bering Sea C. bairdi & C. opilio	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
Whatcom (WA)	Bristol Bay Red King	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
Whatcom (WA)	Norton Sound Red & Blue King	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Whatcom (WA)	Pribilof Red & Blue King	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whatcom (WA)	**Endorsements**	**2**	**6**	**5**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**
Whatcom (WA)	**Vessels**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**
Other States Total	**Endorsements**	**12**	**549**	**142**	**703**	**0**	**4**	**77**	**81**	**784**
Other States Total	**Vessels**	**11**	**171**	**43**	**225**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**26**	**251**
Total	**Endorsements**	**77**	**840**	**177**	**1,094**	**0**	**4**	**79**	**83**	**1,177**
Total	**Vessels**	**73**	**272**	**55**	**400**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**27**	**427**

Appendix IV

Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species 1988 - 1994

Table 1 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1994

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1994					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	3	11	315	3,712	4	102	4,147
CSEN*	8	0	6	173	0	2	189
DRG	5	44	16	435	46	4	550
GL1*	163	14	30	575	0	146	928
GL2*	79	7	11	156	0	43	296
LH1	53	352	788	3,331	66	139	4,729
LH2	324	95	3	849	0	191	1,462
LP1	38	306	14,201	68,052	2,706	381	85,684
MSC	30	162	4	144	1	14	355
PCP1	4	4	345	3,518	13	5	3,889
PH1	3	0	0	903	0	0	906
PH1*	2	0	0	1,361	6	0	1,369
PH2	17	0	5	1,069	0	4	1,095
PH2*	62	37	45	9,191	1	34	9,370
SEN*	120	18	21	556	1	109	825
SEN/PH2	382	28	59	5,753	20	251	6,493
SEN/TH4	93	549	53	15,563	10,029	37	26,324
TH1	15	6,871	509	5,638	149,625	61	162,719
TH1*	6	743	22	1,043	50,514	6	52,334
TH2	10	2,566	360	6,991	59,863	22	69,812
TH2*	44	9,528	741	22,615	216,668	132	249,728
TH3	14	1,471	245	8,440	18,752	23	28,945
TH3*	50	6,659	606	11,955	49,633	330	69,233
TP1	24	38,580	14,102	15,748	615,853	753	685,060
TP2	13	37,699	16,736	16,845	148,733	7,164	227,190
TP3	18	111,450	76,574	22,369	36,966	19,570	266,947
TP3*	15	31,768	15,419	17,613	12,524	3,950	81,289
Total	1,595	248,962	141,216	244,598	1,372,024	33,473	2,041,868

Table 2 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1993

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1993					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	4	3	1,078	1,975	3	61	3,124
CSEN*	8	0	5	219	1	3	236
DRG	5	129	16	539	46	12	747
GL1*	137	50	51	510	1	109	858
GL2*	52	28	11	167	0	27	285
LH1	38	313	9	361	1	146	868
LH2	282	99	3	333	1	166	884
LP1	38	234	15,412	52,820	1,804	722	71,030
MSC	25	23	0	11	0	18	77
PCP1	4	1	655	2,131	3	76	2,870
PH1	2	0	0	627	0	0	629
PH1*	2	0	0	92	0	0	94
PH2	7	0	3	109	0	0	119
PH2*	62	120	62	6,228	1	48	6,521
SEN*	104	55	23	311	0	94	587
SEN/PH2	376	54	134	5,377	3	355	6,299
SEN/TH4	94	983	58	15,330	5,826	51	22,342
TH1	14	1,226	2,798	5,539	143,262	9	152,848
TH1*	6	87	79	324	49,541	4	50,041
TH2	9	178	10,431	2,637	49,634	3	62,892
TH2*	47	3,459	35,104	17,659	214,220	68	270,557
TH3	18	1,524	10,375	8,761	19,308	12	39,998
TH3*	57	9,458	5,109	16,375	51,266	226	82,491
TP1	24	28,240	10,594	14,177	593,200	967	647,202
TP2	16	38,926	14,188	21,570	135,476	7,405	217,581
TP3	20	105,596	69,705	22,610	33,994	22,570	254,495
TP3*	16	20,255	18,517	15,966	5,669	6,770	67,193
Total	1,467	211,041	194,420	212,758	1,303,260	39,922	1,962,868

Table 3 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1992

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1992					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	12	17	1,024	10,299	77	60	11,489
CSEN*	27	1	42	530	4	4	608
DRG	6	95	3,030	119	15	18	3,283
GL1*	172	25	15	1,318	4	150	1,684
GL2*	79	13	8	335	3	33	471
LH1	50	62	7	707	4	218	1,048
LH2	371	38	10	596	96	283	1,394
LP1	39	240	11,840	77,539	2,450	792	92,900
MSC	36	8	0	72	0	18	134
PCP1	6	4	785	5,450	12	87	6,344
PH1	8	0	4	503	0	0	515
PH1*	2	0	0	184	0	0	186
PH2	17	7	18	1,086	0	0	1,128
PH2*	83	3	40	7,551	13	64	7,754
SEN*	161	11	29	1,106	16	128	1,451
SEN/PH2	503	47	119	6,652	7	453	7,781
SEN/TH4	108	902	41	15,843	4,293	105	21,292
TH1	14	3,698	3,994	1,907	129,834	25	139,472
TH1*	6	510	910	465	45,386	3	47,280
TH2	12	629	34,383	3,133	29,266	2	67,425
TH2*	50	3,117	56,228	8,687	182,533	92	250,707
TH3	18	1,299	25,068	7,490	11,648	41	45,564
TH3*	54	8,874	6,131	16,840	41,802	410	74,111
TP1	24	36,738	17,347	21,041	667,088	893	743,131
TP2	16	53,735	23,667	26,890	134,760	7,239	246,307
TP3	22	102,788	50,470	17,755	22,608	18,449	212,092
TP3*	19	21,800	15,527	23,393	4,905	5,629	71,273
Total	1,915	234,661	250,737	257,491	1,276,824	35,196	2,056,824

Table 4 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1991

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1991					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	4	15	288	1,868	84	1	2,260
CSEN*	14	.	1	346	0	0	361
DRG	5	774	17	983	1,129	19	2,927
GL1*	120	46	9	679	0	125	979
GL2*	40	1	0	149	0	15	205
LH1	43	72	4	592	0	171	882
LH2	270	39	14	683	11	326	1,343
LP1	32	162	8,737	54,333	1,405	386	65,055
MSC	22	3	.	129	.	16	170
PCP1	6	9	443	5,207	37	7	5,709
PH1	1	.	.	5	.	.	6
PH2	8	0	2	402	0	.	412
PH2*	54	17	18	5,898	0	56	6,043
SEN*	110	31	30	723	2	71	967
SEN/PH2	379	21	83	5,574	8	523	6,588
SEN/TH4	85	271	20	15,817	2,352	327	18,872
TH1	10	11,985	1,279	19,304	105,847	100	138,525
TH[illegible]	4	483	30	1,666	42,230	19	44,432
TH2	12	3,902	922	12,260	49,096	86	66,278
TH2*	46	6,646	1,069	37,028	233,159	177	278,125
TH3	18	1,515	124	11,462	25,367	12	38,498
TH3*	52	6,936	604	18,487	26,508	406	52,993
TP1	24	15,010	9,432	14,829	669,850	1,333	710,478
TP2	16	35,433	16,334	16,992	108,420	4,931	182,126
TP3	19	72,138	28,461	10,983	25,539	6,224	143,364
TP3*	18	26,447	15,215	11,225	10,327	3,133	66,365
Total	1,412	181,956	83,136	247,624	1,301,371	18,464	1,833,963

Table 5 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1990

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1990					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1/LP1	6	22	78	1,648	31	.	1,785
CSEN*	5	.	.	52	.	.	57
DRG	2	3	.	31	.	1	37
GL1*	87	29	5	125	0	160	406
GL2*	27	.	.	21	.	13	61
LH1	37	145	2	340	.	115	639
LH2	227	39	7	799	7	172	1,251
LP1	23	70	4,491	34,725	264	117	39,690
MSC	13	1	.	2	.	13	29
PCP1	3	1	833	1,825	0	61	2,723
PH1	2	0	.	213	.	.	215
PH2	1	.	.	6	.	.	7
PH2*	40	5	9	4,389	1	26	4,470
SEN*	78	32	11	229	0	73	423
SEN/PH2	261	14	16	1,257	1	193	1,742
SEN/TH4	69	145	62	16,264	3,354	36	19,930
TH1	12	3,470	122	19,479	122,571	98	145,752
TH1*	3	795	154	3,232	34,281	116	38,581
TH2	9	499	27	12,995	186,505	8	200,043
TH2*	43	4,247	802	41,509	280,418	228	327,247
TH3	8	52	9	6,154	96,842	0	103,065
TH3*	47	4,861	268	16,561	45,438	263	67,438
TP1	24	3,962	3,141	11,316	808,644	90	827,177
TP2	14	20,319	17,477	23,612	78,262	4,595	144,279
TP3	16	16,057	32,768	16,727	31,008	21,045	117,621
TP3*	14	7,119	14,365	12,440	10,943	7,152	52,033
Total	1,071	61,887	74,647	225,951	1,698,570	34,575	2,096,701

Table 6 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1989

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1989					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1	1	.	.	6	.	.	6
CP1/LP1	2	.	134	137	.	13	284
CSEN*	2	.	.	3	.	.	3
DRG	2	.	.	.	.	0	0
GL1*	52	52	.	35	0	80	167
GL2*	16	.	1	7	0	5	13
LH1	32	38	0	6	.	118	162
LH2	188	41	2	398	.	137	578
LP1	17	40	3,015	12,733	275	337	16,400
MSC	13	.	0	1	0	10	11
PCP1	2	.	604	1,187	.	23	1,814
PH2*	36	1	.	27	.	53	81
SEN*	63	4	.	150	2	59	215
SEN/PH2	217	3	4	550	1	119	677
SEN/TH4	50	96	9	8,398	833	26	9,362
TH1	7	4,154	486	13,981	122,193	98	140,912
TH1*	3	475	0	861	22,533	41	23,910
TH2	8	1,082	54	11,785	47,781	4	60,706
TH2*	33	1,524	73	18,844	102,780	217	123,438
TH3	6	26	0	5,062	4,043	.	9,131
TH3*	42	3,339	825	17,409	10,784	437	32,794
TP1	16	4,026	4,148	20,763	616,697	536	646,170
TP2	14	26,292	12,334	26,997	95,061	4,581	165,265
TP3	13	8,351	12,059	7,360	27,525	7,890	63,185
TP3*	13	4,006	6,931	5,110	3,685	3,757	23,489
Total	848	53,550	40,679	151,810	1,054,193	18,541	1,318,773

Table 7 Reported Catch by Vessel Class and Species in 1988

		Metric Tons of Reported Catch in 1988					
		Species					
Vessel Class	Number of Vessels	Flatfish	Other Groundfish	Pacific Cod	Pollock	Rockfish	Total
CP1	1	0	0	42	0	0	42
CP1/LP1	5	0	554	340	0	1	895
CSEN*	1	0	0	17	0	0	17
DRG	4	43	18	183	154	71	469
GL1*	63	92	6	95	0	121	314
GL2*	14	0	0	36	0	41	77
LH1	32	313	3	5	0	149	470
LH2	180	152	36	332	5	131	656
LP1	14	6	2,614	2,202	0	166	4,988
MSC	11	0	0	0	0	4	4
PCP1	2	0	710	11	0	3	724
PH2	1	0	0	11	0	0	11
PH2*	36	13	7	456	1	64	541
SEN*	65	17	25	311	1	33	387
SEN/PH2	246	2	60	1,334	4	138	1,538
SEN/TH4	58	460	81	6,139	1,343	17	8,040
TH1	7	2,946	15	7,180	86,202	12	96,355
TH1*	2	26	0	663	7,461	0	8,150
TH2	8	1,873	7	12,560	58,469	1	72,910
TH2*	26	505	72	7,103	95,603	9	103,292
TH3	5	160	0	3,505	5,851	0	9,516
TH3*	37	2,919	461	12,949	9,826	232	26,387
TP1	12	508	321	7,645	228,684	45	237,203
TP2	13	14,716	6,523	24,983	56,458	3,778	106,458
TP3	9	4,751	9,612	6,514	3,319	6,982	31,178
TP3*	9	2,196	1,584	3,189	293	2,011	9,273
Total	861	31,698	22,709	97,805	553,674	14,009	719,895

Appendix V

NMFS Implementation Plan For Groundfish and Crab

Implementation Plan
Proposed Groundfish and Crab License System

Prepared by

National Marine Fisheries Service
Alaska Regional Office
January 30, 1995

Executive Summary

Potential Number of Licenses

- Approximately 3,400 groundfish licenses with 12,000 area/ species endorsements and about 550 crab licenses with 1,800 area/species endorsements.

Agency Responsibilities

- RAM Division will determine eligibility, issue licenses, process transfers, and consider appeals.
- NMFS Enforcement and the U.S. Coast Guard will monitor compliance with the groundfish license system.
- ADF&G will monitor compliance with the crab license system.

Monitoring Species Endorsements

- The objective of species endorsements is to limit participation in specific directed fisheries.
- NMFS will monitor fishing for groundfish under species endorsements on the basis of retained catch composition in the same manner that directed fishing standards or "Retained Bycatch Amounts" (RBAs) are monitored.
- Vessel operators without species endorsements will be allowed to retain bycatch amounts of groundfish as defined by RBAs.
- Vessel operators without species endorsements must discard catch in excess of bycatch amounts as defined by RBAs. This requirement likely will increase regulatory discards.

Cost of Implementation

- $475,000 and 10 positions for general licenses with area endorsements.
  RAM 5 positions
  GCAK 4 positions
  Enforcement 1 position

- $1,495,000 and 14 Federal government position plus 20 contract positions with area and species endorsements.
  RAM 5 positions
  GCAK 4 positions
  Enforcement 5 positions + 20 contracted positions

Cost estimates do not include estimate costs for:

- monitoring compliance with the 76 percent U.S. ownership provision for license transfers, or
- expansion of the CDQ program to other groundfish.
- Monitoring/Enforcement of Crab License/Endorsements

Skipper License or Reporting System

NMFS currently does not collect information that would clearly identify hired skippers. Existing data sources such as ADF&G fish tickets, CFEC permits, and NMFS vessel logbooks are either incomplete or not easily accessible. Aspects of the skipper license proposal that link qualifications to the U.S. Coast Guard Fishing Master License need to be clarified.

No additional costs are suggested for the skipper license system because NMFS would incorporate it as an element of the overall groundfish and crab license program. The cost of the skipper license program, as with all elements of the license program, would be in terms of the implementation time necessary to incorporate each element into the overall program.

Expansion of existing data collection programs such as ADF&G fish tickets and CFEC permits should be considered rather than establishing a separate reporting system.

CDQ Program

The current pollock CDQ program is based on the allocation and harvest of a single species in a fishery with relatively low bycatch of other groundfish and prohibited species. Expansion of the CDQ program to all groundfish in the BSAI will require decisions about how bycatch of groundfish and prohibited species will be handled, the monitoring system that will be required to manage compliance with multiple quotas for individual vessels, and how additional observer coverage will be funded. Processor vessels participating in the expanded CDQ fishery will require two observers and, probably, scales to weigh groundfish catch. The cost of monitoring the expanded CDQ fishery cannot be estimated until a more clear description of the fishery is provided.

Permit Fees

Permit fees to cover the cost of issuing licenses are permitted under the Magnuson Act. Based on the RAM Division budget proposed in this document, a permit fee of approximately $50 per general license could be collected.

Introduction

This chapter contains NMFS's preliminary implementation plan and estimated implementation costs for the proposed groundfish and crab license plan for the North Pacific. Alternatives for the groundfish and crab license systems have several components:

(1) a general license and separable area or species endorsements issued to current vessel owners which would limit the areas and target fisheries in which a vessel could participate;

(2) a license issued to qualified skippers and the requirement that a licensed skipper be onboard any vessel fishing with a groundfish or crab license

OR

a mandatory skipper reporting system for information collection purposes only; and

(3) expansion of the Community Development Quota fisheries to include all groundfish and crab fisheries in the BSAI.

This implementation plan primarily addresses the license limitation program followed by a discussion of implementation of the skipper licensing or reporting options and an expanded CDQ program.

Implementation of Groundfish and Crab License Systems

Primary elements of the proposed groundfish and crab license system were highlighted by the Council at its December, 1994 meeting. These proposed primary elements are used as the basis for NMFS's initial description of the license system and estimates of administrative, monitoring, and enforcement costs for the program.

Implementation of the groundfish and crab license program is comprised of (1) initial licensing and processing transfers, and (2) monitoring and enforcement of the use of licenses. NMFS will issue licenses and monitor transfers for both the groundfish and crab programs. Monitoring and enforcement of the use of groundfish licenses and endorsements will be done by NMFS Enforcement and the U.S. Coast Guard. Monitoring and enforcement of the use of crab licenses and endorsements will primarily be the responsibility of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and the State Fish and Wildlife Protection Division. Discussion of the administrative and implementation costs reflect this distribution of responsibilities.

Initial Licensing and Monitoring Transfers

Licenses will be issued to current vessel owners based on the catch history of the vessel during the qualifying period. RAM Division initially will create a database combining information from the NMFS Moratorium database, the CFEC vessel license file, processor weekly production reports (WPR), and ADF&G fish tickets. The combination of these data should provide an initial indication of current vessel ownership and catch history. Bills of sale or affidavits of current ownership of undocumented vessels may also be necessary as supplemental information to establish vessel ownership.

Catch and production reports such as processor WPRs, vessel logs, and fish tickets previously submitted to NMFS will be used to determine whether the vessel met landings requirements, the area and species endorsements that the vessel owner is entitled to, and the license designations such as vessel type (catcher vessel versus catcher/processor), vessel length category, or inshore/offshore designation.

The Alaska Region can expect to issue approximately 3,400 groundfish licenses with about 12,000 area/species endorsements and about 550 crab licenses with about 1,800 area/species endorsements. These estimates do not include licenses that may be issued under the two-tired skipper license program or Community Development Licenses.

Confidential data: The two primary sources of catch history data that will be used to determine eligibility for licenses or endorsements are ADF&G fish tickets and NMFS WPR. Both of these datasets are confidential. Fish tickets records cannot be released without a waiver from the permit holder to whom the ticket was issued. This person is often not the vessel owner. Currently, NMFS releases WPRs, vessel logbooks, or observer data only to the vessel owner as recorded on the NMFS groundfish permit. NMFS will have to develop procedures for release of this data to anyone other than the vessel owner at the time of harvest.

Initial determination of eligibility for a general license or any endorsements will be made by NMFS on the basis of the catch history of the vessel. In the case of a current vessel owner who does not have control over the catch history data because he or she was not the permit holder (fish tickets) or vessel owner (WPR) during the qualifying period, NMFS could only verify that the vessel catch history met the qualification criteria. Details about the landings history of the vessel could not be released to the current vessel owner without a signed waiver from the permit holder or previous owner. This constraint may become an issue in the case of a current vessel owner who believes he or she is eligible for area or species endorsements not initially issued by NMFS. Establishing minimum landings requirements (such as 20,000 pounds) will increase the need for a more precise catch history dataset and probably will increase the number of challenges to NMFS's initial eligibility determinations.

License designations: Licenses may be designated by vessel type, vessel length category and as "inshore" or "offshore." This information should exist on records previously collected by NMFS which will be used to build the license system database.

The purpose of the inshore/offshore designations remains unclear. ADF&G has stated that this designation will be used only as a "place-holder" for future inshore/offshore landings restrictions. The current inshore/offshore allocation applies only to the processing component and only to pollock and Pacific cod in the GOA and pollock in the BSAI. The means through which 1993 inshore/offshore activity will be used to determine license designations for fishing vessels must be more specific. Some catcher vessels landed fish under both an inshore and an offshore allocation in 1993. Some vessels may not have landed any of the inshore/offshore species in 1993. In addition, the question of whether the inshore/offshore designation will be attached to the general license (as will vessel type or length) or to the species endorsements must be addressed.

Who may purchase licenses: The Council has indicated interest in restricting license transfers to individuals who are U.S. citizens and partnerships and corporations with 76 percent or more U.S. ownership. NOAA GC has stated that this restriction is inconsistent with U.S. and international law, <u>at least with regard to initial allocation</u>, and likely with regard to transfers. If initial recipients are given 'grandfather rights' <u>with regard to transfers</u>, then the assumption is they would be eligible to acquire additional licenses/endorsements. Notwithstanding the legal issues raised by GC, substantial administration and enforcement costs would be associated with investigating and verifying the citizenship of each transfer applicant, particularly if they are corporations. Staff necessary to provide this level of enforcement of the ownership provisions are not included in the current cost estimates of the license limitation program.

---

[1]The number of groundfish licenses and endorsements is based on configuration 915411 as summarized in Table 3 of Appendix VII (11/14/94). The number of crab licenses and endorsements is based on configuration 31421 as summarized on page 176 of the September 18, 1994 draft analysis.

The U.S. Coast Guard requires vessel owners to sign an affidavit of U.S. citizenship in the vessel documentation application. NMFS could implement a similar system which would require an affidavit of citizenship but would not involve specific research into the citizenship of each applicant. Investigations would be done on a case by case basis if there were indications that the applicants had falsified information on the affidavit.

Appeals: The appeals process for the license limitation program will be identical to that currently used for the halibut and sablefish IFQ program. Appeals of initial administrative determinations to deny a benefit (initial license issuance, transfers, etc.) will be considered by an appeals officer in the RAM Division.

Interim licenses: Interim licenses and endorsements may have to be issued when a legitimate appeal cannot be resolved prior to the initiation of fishing under the license limitation program. It is likely that most of these appeals will involve catch history data and eligibility for area or species endorsements. However, regulations must specify the circumstances under which interim licenses or endorsements will be issued to assure that frivolous appeals are not filed or delayed in order to obtain an interim license or endorsements.

Monitoring and Enforcement

Monitoring and enforcement of fishing under the groundfish and crab licenses which will be done by NMFS Enforcement, the U.S. Coast Guard, NOAA General Counsel, and the State of Alaska (crab). The appropriate licenses and endorsements must be onboard the vessel at all times. In-season transfers or after the fact endorsement transfers to cover catch composition overages will not be allowed.

Species endorsements are the element of the groundfish license system which has the most influence on implementation complexity and costs. Monitoring area endorsements would require that a vessel fish only in specific areas, but would not limit the directed fisheries in which they could participate (other than existing limitations). Compliance with area endorsements could be verified by aerial surveys and by observer reports. However, species endorsements will require that NMFS monitor the target fisheries in which a vessel is participating. In other words, the catch of all vessels will have to be monitored to assure that vessels are "targeting" only on those species groups for which they hold a species endorsement.

Monitoring Licenses with Species Endorsements: Species endorsements would be used to identify which vessels could participate in a directed fishery for a particular species or species group. At its December meeting, the Council highlighted two options (A00000 and B00000) that would provide for separable species endorsements. Option A00000 specifies the species groups by FMP sub-areas. Option B00000 specifies the subareas to Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands, Western Gulf, Central Gulf, plus West Yakutat, and East Yakutat and Southeast Outside.

The general groundfish license would be issued with endorsements for the FMP subarea and species endorsements for:

BS and AI	EG, CG, and WG
pollock	pollock
Pacific cod	Pacific cod
Atka mackerel	Atka mackerel
rockfish	rockfish
yellowfin sole	deep-water flatfish
rock sole	shallow-water flatfish
other flatfish	flathead sole
Greenland turbot	
squid (fixed gear only)	
sablefish (trawl only)	

Note that **gear specific** species endorsements would be issued for two species - squid and sablefish.

NMFS will monitor species endorsements on the basis of retained catch composition in a manner similar to that currently used to monitor directed fishing standards (DFS) or "Retainable Bycatch Amounts" (RBA). The RBA is used to determine the amount of a species or species group that can be retained onboard a vessel if the directed fishery for that species is closed. They are used primarily to slow the harvest of certain species or species groups as harvests approach total allowable catch levels. Catch in excess of the RBA must be discarded. NMFS monitors RBAs for catcher vessels on the basis of landed catch weight and for processor vessels on the round weight equivalent of processed product as determined by standard product recovery rates.

Vessels with species endorsements may retain any amount of the particular species or species group subject to all other regulations on fishing activity. Vessels without species endorsements for a particular species or species group must operate as if the RBAs apply even when a directed fishery is open.

To minimize the complexity of the species endorsement regulations, RBAs and species endorsement standards must be the same for a particular species or species group. For example, if the RBA that defines bycatch amounts for a particular species is 20 percent of the retained catch onboard the vessel, then the species endorsement standard should also be 20 percent. In other words, if the vessel owner does not have a species endorsement, his or her retained catch may be comprised of no more than 20 percent of this particular species.

Harvests of species or species groups in excess of the species endorsement standards must be discarded (as is required under directed fishing standards) so that the vessel's catch composition remains within the constraints of the species endorsements they hold. Species endorsements could, therefore, lead to an increase in regulatory discards if vessel operators regularly harvest fish in excess of species endorsement allowances.

An example: Tables 1 and 2 show an example of the area/species endorsements that would be issued to a particular trawl catcher/processor based on an assumed catch history. An "X" indicates the retained species in each area during the qualifying period. All TAC species are listed on the table, separated into two sections. First, is the list of TAC species that are also species endorsement categories under option A00000 and B00000. Second, is the list of TAC species that are not included on species endorsement lists.

---

[2]In the proposed regulatory revisions to directed fishing standards, NMFS is attempting to eliminate the use of the terminology "Directed Fishing Standard(s)" and replace it with "Retainable Bycatch Amount" (RBA) which more clearly identifies that the percent in question refers to the amount of bycatch that may be retained onboard a vessel when directed fishing for a particular species is closed.

Table 1. Example of groundfish species retained by a trawl catcher/processor in Gulf of Alaska fisheries by FMP sub-area, zone, and species or species group. "X" indicates retained catch by area and species.

	WG	CG		EG	
TAC species or species group	610	620	630	640 (WY)	650 (EY+SEO)
ON ENDORSEMENT LIST					
Pollock					
Pacific cod	X	X	X		
Deep-water flatfish		X	X		
Shallow-water flat.			X		
Atka mackerel	X	X			
Flathead sole		X	X		
Rockfish	X	X	X		
NOT ON ENDORSE. LIST					
Rex sole		X	X		
Sablefish	X	X	X		
Arrowtooth flounder		X			
Other species					

Table 2. Example of groundfish species retained by a trawl catcher/processor in Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands area fisheries by FMP sub-area, and species or species group. "X" indicates retained catch by area and species.

TAC species or species group	Bering Sea	Aleutian Islands
ON ENDORSEMENT LIST		
Pollock		
Pacific cod	X	
Atka mackerel	X	
Yellowfin sole	X	
Other flatfish	X	
Rock sole	X	
Greenland turbot	X	
Rockfish	X	
Sablefish (trawl only)	X	
Squid (trawl only)		
NOT ON ENDORSE. LIST		
Flathead sole		
Arrowtooth flounder		
Other species	X	

If the catch distribution of retained catch shown in Tables 1 and 2 were used to determine eligibility under option A00000, this vessel would receive:

(1) a general license for GOA/BSAI, and

(2) the following 17 area/species endorsements:

Western Gulf: Pacific cod, Atka mackerel, and rockfish

Central Gulf: Pacific cod, deep-water flatfish, shallow-water flatfish, Atka mackerel, flathead sole, and rockfish

Bering Sea: Pacific cod, Atka mackerel, yellowfin sole, other flatfish, rock sole, Greenland turbot, rockfish, and sablefish

Under the license limitation program, the vessel would have to comply with the following:

1. when the fisheries for which they received species endorsements are **open for directed fishing**, this vessel could retain an unlimited amount of any of these species;

2. when arrowtooth flounder is **open for directed fishing**, this vessel could retain an unlimited amount;

3. when fisheries not in (1) or (2) are **open for directed fishing**, this vessel could retain only bycatch amounts of any of these species subject to RBA (or DFS).

   For example, the vessel does not have a species endorsement for pollock in the BSAI, so they may retain pollock up to 20 percent of any other species that is open for directed fishing and for which they have an area/species endorsement. Any pollock catch beyond bycatch amounts must be discarded even if pollock is open for directed fishing;

4. when any fishery is closed to directed fishing (on bycatch only status) the vessel must comply with RBAs (DFSs) for the closed fisheries.

There are four TAC categories that are not addressed in either the species endorsement list or the text of alternative A00000 or B00000 - they are sablefish in the GOA, rex sole in the GOA, flathead sole in the BSAI, and "other" species in the GOA and BSAI.

1. **"other species"** could be handled like arrowtooth flounder in that any vessel with an endorsement in a particular area could retain unlimited amounts of "other species" as long as the directed fishery were open.

2. **sablefish** is on bycatch only status for trawl gear in the Eastern Gulf by regulation. In the Western and Central Gulf the Regional Director is authorized to place sablefish on bycatch only status but is not required to do so. The effect of not issuing a species endorsement for sablefish is to expand the bycatch status of sablefish for trawl gear to the entire GOA.

[3] "other species" are sculpins, smelt, eulachon, capelin, shark, skate, octopus, and squid (GOA only). Squid is a separate TAC category in the BSAI.

3. **rex sole and flathead sole** are two existing TAC categories that are not addressed by the species endorsement list. The discussion below for these two species also will apply to any other species that are separated from a species group in the future.

   Rex sole was separated from the deep-water flatfish complex in the GOA in 1994 and flathead sole was separated from the other flatfish complex in the BSAI in 1995.

   Not issuing species endorsements for these two species, or for other species split out from species groups in the future, will result in no directed fisheries being allowed for the particular species. In other words, without an endorsement, no vessel will be authorized to catch more than bycatch amounts of these species.

   If the Council wishes to continue to allow directed fishing for rex sole or flathead sole, or for any species separated from the species group in the future, there are two options:

   (1) separate species endorsements could be issued for rex sole and flathead sole under the current license limitation proposal, or

   (2) directed fishing for these species could be authorized under the area/species endorsement for the species group of origin. For example, directed fishing for rex sole in the GOA could be authorized for all vessels holding species endorsements for deep-water flatfish and directed fishing for flathead sole in the BSAI could be authorized for all vessels holding species endorsements for "other" flatfish. Vessels that did not hold these species endorsements would be allowed to retain deep-water flatfish, rex sole, other flatfish, and flathead sole based on the RBAs (DFSs).

   The choice of which option to use must also consider the procedure that Council wishes to use for species that are separated from species groups after implementation of the license limitation program.

Effective enforcement of retainable bycatch amounts (RBAs) and species endorsements require both at-sea and dockside monitoring to verify landings records for catcher vessels and processed product reports by processor vessels. The U.S. Coast Guard currently boards vessels and checks logbook records against product inventory. With species endorsements, fishermen should expect both the frequency and duration of boardings to increase. NMFS Enforcement believes that substantially increased dockside monitoring will be necessary to provide adequate monitoring of catch composition requirements under species endorsements. The dockside monitoring effort will focus on verifying the accuracy of catcher vessel landings reports (fish tickets) and will monitor offloading of processed product from processor vessels to verify logbook records.

Species endorsements and full retention requirements: Species endorsements would limit the directed fisheries in which a vessel could participate as defined by retained catch composition, while full or improved retention is intended to require retaining all groundfish except that which must be discarded under RBAs or fishery closures. However, species endorsements combined with a requirement that all groundfish catch be retained may result in a legal conflict because vessel operators would have to chose between violating full retention requirements by discarding groundfish or violating the species endorsement by retaining groundfish in excess of the RBA. The Council previously addressed this potential conflict when debating whether to base DFSs on total catch composition or retained catch composition. At that time, the Council decided not to recommend regulations that would hold a fishermen responsible for their overall groundfish catch composition before it was brought onboard the vessel. If the Council reconsidered this position, under some full retention requirements, vessel operators would be required to retain and process groundfish harvested in excess of their species endorsements.

Permit Fees

The Magnuson Act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to collect fees to cover administrative costs incurred in issuing permits. For example, based on a $195,000 annual budget for RAM and 4,000 groundfish and crab general licenses, approximately $50 per permit could be charged to recover administrative costs.

Skipper License System or Reporting System

Skippers of groundfish and crab vessels are considered in three elements of the proposed license limitation program. First, there is an option to grant licenses to permit holders, many of whom would also be skippers. Secondly, Skippers for Equitable Access (SEA) has proposed a "two-tiered" skipper license program. Third, the general provisions include a proposed requirement for NMFS to collect information on skippers in the fleets to build a database for possible future allocations under an ITQ program. This discussion focuses only on the latter two.

Two-tiered Skipper (or Captain's) License System

SEA proposes that a category of licenses be created for vessel captains. A licensed captain would be required to be onboard any vessel participating in the fisheries under the groundfish and crab license limitation program. Eligibility criteria include (1) a Coast Guard Fishing Master License, (2) at least three documented landings per year in the subject areas and fisheries for a minimum of three years. NMFS Captain's Licenses may be transferred only to individuals who meet the above eligibility criteria and may be leased in cases of "emergencies" and for the purpose of training crewman working toward the position of Captain.

Several issues arise in initial analysis of the SEA proposal:

1. **Identifying hired captains is difficult.**

It is difficult to estimate the number of hired captains in the groundfish and crab fleets. This lack of information makes it difficult to provide the Council with meaningful analysis of the SEA proposal and is also the primary source of costs that will be associated with implementation of this proposal.

NMFS currently does not collect information specifically about vessel captains. There are two possible sources of information among the data currently collected by NMFS, neither of which is complete or easily accessible:

Fish tickets - Fish tickets are required for all groundfish harvested or processed in State waters and for all crab harvests regardless of their location. Each fish ticket must include an imprint of a CFEC permit card which is issued to individuals. The combination of fish ticket landings information and the CFEC permit card provides documentation of an individual's participation in a fishery. There are two difficulties with using fish tickets to determine the number of hired captains:

(1) the permit holder may be the vessel owner, the hired captain, or any other crewperson. Comparison of the vessel owners social security number with the social security number associated with the person filling out the fish ticket would provide a list of people who made landings but were not vessel owners. However, it does not mean that all these people were hired captains.

(2) fish tickets are not required for groundfish harvested or processed outside State waters so this source of information on potential hired captains would not be available for many catcher/processor vessels.

Vessel logbooks - All catcher/processor vessel operators submit vessel logbooks to NMFS which must be signed by the "owner, operator, or representative". Several difficulties arise in using logbooks to identify hired captains:

(1) signatures do not identify whether the person is the captain or another authorized individual;

(2) signatures are often illegible and are not accompanied by any other information through which to identify an individual such as a social security number (making comparison of names with vessel ownership files much more difficult);

(3) the name of the person signing the document has not been entered into any computer database.

For these reasons, NMFS would not use vessel logbooks as a primary source of information to identify potentially eligible hired captains. The logbooks could be used by applicants as supporting documentation, however, confidentiality waivers would have to be obtained from the vessel owners for release of the logbooks pages bearing the captain's signature.

If the Captain's license proposal were approved by the Council and the Secretary of Commerce, NMFS would attempt to identify as many hired captains as possible through fish ticket records, CFEC permits, letters to vessel owners, and other means of public notice. However, it is possible that a some hired captains would not be identified by NMFS's primary data sources. Hired captains who believed they met eligibility criteria would be asked to apply for a skipper's license and provide supporting documentation such as U.S. Coast Guard Sea Service Forms or vessel logbooks.

2. **The requirement that all skippers hold a Coast Guard Fishing Master License may mean that hired captains of vessels less than 200 gross tons would not meet eligibility criteria.**

The U.S. Coast Guard issues Fishing Master Licenses for vessel classes ranging from 100 gross tons (gt) to 1,600 gt and above. Master Licenses are required for operators of vessels 200 gt and above and optional for vessels between 100 and 200 gt. Although there is no direct relationship between vessel length and gross tonnage, in general, vessels 125 feet and over could be 200 gt or greater and vessels less than 125 feet are likely to be less than 200 gt. In the groundfish fleet, approximately 135 vessels are 125 feet and greater length overall. In other words, the majority of the 4,000 groundfish fishing vessels that may be eligible for general licenses are likely to be less than 200 gt and, therefore, not be required to have licensed masters.

3. **Skipper license transferability requirements need to be clarified.**

The SEA transferability requirements state that Captain's license can only be transferred to other qualified Captains, implying that these qualified Captains must have a U.S. Coast Guard Fishing Master License and have met landings requirements. However, it is likely that the NMFS licensed captain will want to record all groundfish and crab landings under their name because of the possibility of future allocations under ITQs. If that is the case, it may be difficult for mates or other crew to establish the minimum landings requirements necessary to purchase a NMFS skipper's license.

A less clear problem is the possibility that the existence of a NMFS Captains license, which restricts the individuals allowed to be captains or masters of fishing vessels participating in the groundfish and crab fisheries, may make it more difficult for individuals to get the sea time necessary to qualify for U.S. Coast Guard Fishing Master License which is, in turn, necessary to be eligible to purchase the NMFS Captains license. In other words, will the NMFS Captains license make it more difficult for masters and mates to get the sea time necessary to advance in the U.S.Coast Guard Fishing Masters License categories?

Implementation costs for the two tiered skipper license proposal: Gathering data, determining eligibility, issuing captain's licenses, and monitoring transfers would be the responsibility of RAM Division. These tasks would have to be accommodated under the overall budget for the groundfish and crab license limitation program. Implementation costs are less if the burden is placed on the applicants to provide supporting documentation not readily available to NMFS through existing databases. However, regardless of the design of the two-tiered skipper license proposal, additional time will be required in the implementation phase of the license limitation program to identify potential eligible applicants, process and review applications and their supporting documentation, and monitor license transfers. If NMFS staff is required to research hired captain's eligibility in vessel logbooks, substantial time could be added to the implementation period.

Mandatory Skipper Reporting System

Captains of many groundfish and crab vessels currently document sea time on the U.S. Coast Guard Sea Service Form and many of them fill out fish tickets using their CFEC permit card. Specific options for the skipper reporting system have not been explored in depth by staff. The objective appears to be to design a system that would record the catch history of a particular captain. If this is the case, one option may be to require (or suggest) that all hired skippers purchase CFEC permit cards and fill out fish tickets for all landings made by the vessel when they were on duty. This would essentially reinstate the collection of fish tickets for processor vessels and catcher vessels delivering outside State waters. This option would allow NMFS to take advantage of an existing data collection mechanism rather than developing a new system to collect information on skipper participation.

Community Development Quotas

Expanding the CDQ program to all groundfish and crab in the BSAI is an element of the current groundfish and crab license proposal. The expanded CDQ program could be folded into the existing pollock CDQ program in terms of the procedures used to apportion the overall CDQ among the eligible Western Alaska community groups. However, the monitoring program for the pollock CDQ program may not be adequate to monitor expanded CDQs.

The pollock CDQ is primarily harvested in mid-water pollock fisheries which have relatively low levels of groundfish or prohibited species bycatch. This would not necessarily be true of CDQ fisheries for other groundfish species such as Pacific cod or many flatfish species. Groundfish bycatch that occurs in the pollock CDQ fisheries accrues against the open access quotas for these species groups. For example, Pacific cod caught as bycatch in the CDQ fisheries is counted against the open access trawl TAC for cod. Halibut bycatch accrues against the open access mortality limit for the pollock/Atka mackerel/other species category. However, once the halibut mortality limit is reached, only bottom trawl fisheries close. Mid-water pollock fisheries continue so neither the pollock CDQ fisheries or the open access pollock fisheries are completely closed when the halibut mortality limit is reached.
The proposal for the expanded CDQ program needs to specify how other groundfish bycatch and prohibited species catch would be accounted for in the CDQ fisheries. Some of the questions that need to be addressed include:

1. How would each CDQ group and their partner processors and vessels be allocated groundfish quotas sufficient to cover directed fishing and bycatch needs?

2. Would separate PSC mortality limits be set for the CDQ fisheries?

3. Would vessels be required to stop fishing once they had reached any one of these catch limits or would overage and underage provisions be made?

4. What would be required to adequately monitor the catch of all species in order to assure that none of these quotas had been exceeded? Would all catch accounting be based on observer information? Even with two observers on each vessel, could existing sampling procedures provide the information necessary to enforce catch, bycatch, and PSC catch limits on an individual vessel?

On this last question, NMFS believes that the current catch estimation procedures used in the mid-water pollock CDQ fisheries will not be adequate to provide the data necessary to manage individual vessel catch, bycatch, and PSC limits. First, the pollock CDQ fishery requires individual vessel monitoring of the target species only, not monitoring of all groundfish species. Second, the catch composition of the mid-water pollock fisheries is usually between 95 percent and 98 percent pollock which minimizes the difficulty of estimating and accounting for other groundfish catch.

NMFS requires two observers and certified bins for volumetric estimates of catch in the pollock CDQ fisheries. Because the catch is nearly all pollock, a standard density factor is applied to convert total groundfish catch weight to pollock catch weight. However, in mixed species groundfish fisheries, determination of a density factor to apply to total groundfish catch estimates is much more complicated because of the variation in the species composition of the catch. The primary problem is providing the observer with a large enough sample of the fish to reliably estimate the density of fish in the bin. Although observers currently are applying density factors to volumetric estimates of catch in the open access fisheries, the reliability of these procedures in determining individual vessel catch by species is unknown. However, catch estimates using these procedures currently are aggregated and used to determine fleetwide quotas and closures - not to stop an individual vessel from fishing. The potential problems with volumetric estimates of catch weight are the primary reason NMFS has recommended at-sea weighing of groundfish catch rather than volumetric estimates.

In order to implement an expanded CDQ program, NMFS needs to evaluate current catch estimation procedures and determine the changes in equipment or procedures used by the vessel operators or the observers that will be necessary to provide data adequate to monitor individual vessel quotas in the mixed species fisheries. Additional in-season management and possibly observer program staff will be required to monitor expanded CDQ fisheries. This additional staff is not included in the implementation costs provided in this document.

CDQ observer coverage under the Research Plan: The Magnuson Act authorizes NMFS to collect fees of up to 2 percent of the value of fish and shellfish to fund observer coverage. However, the Magnuson Act does not authorize NMFS to collect additional funds from any processor or vessel to pay for additional or voluntary observer coverage. In other words, if the Council or NMFS determines that additional observer coverage is needed to monitor the CDQ fisheries, this coverage currently must be provided through the 2 percent fee assessment of the entire fleet. Processors or vessels participating in the CDQ fishery cannot pay extra to fund the second observer. A Magnuson Act amendment would be required to establish a supplementary fee collection program based on the cost of an observer day for vessels participating in programs such as the CDQ fishery.

The 1994 pollock CDQ program required approximately 470 observer days to cover the second observer on processor vessels. The additional number of observer days that would be necessary to cover an expanded CDQ program has not been estimated. However, based on the quantity of fish that would be included in an expanded CDQ program, the number of additional observer days may approach that needed for the current pollock CDQ program.

CDQs for crab: The Council has briefly discussed the difficulties associated with determining CDQs for crab fisheries that operate with GHLs rather than a specified TAC. However, monitoring and enforcement of harvests

[4]NMFS currently is preparing draft regulations to require scales to weigh total groundfish catch in the pollock fisheries, which would include the pollock CDQ fisheries.

in the crab fisheries are the responsibility of the State of Alaska and NMFS would defer to the State to develop the appropriate monitoring plan and estimated costs to present to the Council.

Community Development Licenses: Providing that the Council specified qualification criteria and established the procedure by which CDLs for groundfish or crab would be issued, these licenses would be incorporated with all other types of licenses that would be issued and monitored by NMFS or the State of Alaska and included in the cost estimates provided in this document.

Estimated Annual Cost of
Groundfish and Crab License Limitation Program

Fisheries Management Division

Preparation of proposed and final regulations and subsequent amendments will be accomplished with existing staff.

Restricted Access Management Division

Total: 5 positions	**$195,000**
Database development and support (1 position)	$ 60,000
Design applications and instructions, hold workshops, answer phone calls and correspondence, mail out applications and instructions, review applications, records research, etc. (2 positions)	$ 70,000
Monitor transfers (1 position)	$ 35,000
Secretary (1 position)	$ 30,000

NMFS Observer Program

The current proposals do not call for increases in observer coverage levels or changes in observer duties as a direct result of the license limitation program. Therefore, no additional costs to the Observer Program are estimated at this time.

NMFS Enforcement

Additional Enforcement Officers will be required for the License Limitation Program.

Area endorsements only will require 1 additional officer at $80,000 per year.

Species endorsements will require 5 additional Enforcement Officers (Federal government employees) and 20 Enforcement Aides (contracted positions) to provide dockside monitoring of catcher vessel deliveries and processor vessel offloads to verify compliance with catch composition limitations. The Enforcement Officers will cost approximate $400,000 per year and the contracted Enforcement Aides $700,000 per year for a total of **1,100,000 per year**.

U.S. Coast Guard

The U.S. Coast Guard expects that enforcement of general licenses with area and species endorsements will require a 20 percent increase in cutter days to maintain the current level of vessel boardings and expect contact with the fleet. This increase in cutter days will be carried out with existing staff and budget.

NOAA General Counsel

An additional two fishery management attorneys, a paralegal and administrative assistant would be required to handle this litigation, at an expected annual cost of **$200,000**. This estimate includes salary and benefits, office space and furnishings, training, computer hardware and software, telephone, and supplies. Hiring and relocation costs are not included in this estimate.

Total Estimated Implementation Costs:

With area endorsements -	10 positions and $475,000 per year
With species endorsements -	14 Federal government positions, 20 contract positions and $1,495,000 per year.

SUMMARY
Implementation Plan
Proposed Groundfish and Crab License System
Revised June 7, 1995

Potential Number of Licenses

- Approximately 3,500 groundfish licenses with non-separable area endorsements and about 550 crab licenses with 1,800 area/species endorsements.

Agency Responsibilities

- RAM Division will determine eligibility, issue licenses, process transfers, and consider appeals.
- NMFS Enforcement and the U.S. Coast Guard will monitor compliance with the groundfish license system.
- ADF&G will monitor compliance with the crab license system.

Cost of Implementation

- $525,000 and 10 positions for the general licenses with area endorsements.
  RAM 5 positions
  GCAK 4 positions
  Enforcement 1 position

Cost estimates do not include estimated costs for State of Alaska monitoring/enforcement of the crab license system. Implementation of expanding the CDQ fisheries is discussed on the following page.

Permit Fees

Permit fees to cover the cost of issuing licenses are permitted under the Magnuson Act. Based on the RAM Division budget proposed in this document, a permit fee of approximately $60 per general license could be collected.

Estimated Annual Cost of
Groundfish and Crab License Limitation Program

Fisheries Management Division

Preparation of proposed and final regulations and subsequent amendments will be accomplished with existing staff.

Restricted Access Management Division

Total: 5 Positions	**$245,000**
Database development and support (1 position)	$ 60,000
Design applications and instructions, hold workshops, answer phone calls and correspondence, mail out applications and instructions, review applications, records research, etc. (2 positions)	$ 70,000
Monitor transfers (1 position)	$ 35,000
Secretary (1 position)	$ 30,000
Travel and contractual	$ 50,000

NMFS Observer Program

The current proposals do not call for increases in observer coverage levels or changes in observer duties as a direct result of the license limitation program. Therefore, no additional costs to the Observer Program are estimated at this time.

NMFS Enforcement

Additional Enforcement Officers will be required for the License Limitation Program.

Area endorsements will only require 1 additional officer at $80,000 per year.

U.S. Coast Guard

The U.S. Coast Guard expects that enforcement of general licenses with area and species endorsements will require a 20 percent increase in cutter days to maintain the current level of vessel boardings and expect contact with the fleet. This increase in cutter days will be carried out with existing staff and budget.

NOAA General Counsel

An additional two fisheries management attorneys, a paralegal and administrative assistant would be required to handle this litigation, at an expected annual cost of $200,000. This estimate includes salary and benefits, office space and furnishings, training, computer hardware and software, telephone, and supplies. Hiring and relocation costs are not included in this estimate.

Total Estimated Implementation Costs:

With area endorsements - 10 positions and $525,000 per year