



159th Council Meeting March 17-21, 2014 Fiesta Resort and Spa, Garapan, Saipan Hilton Resort and Spa, Tumon Bay, Guam

Synopsis of Issues for Pelagic and International Fisheries

Economic collapse of American Samoa Longline Fishery (Action Item) A.

The American Samoa longline fishery has suffered a catastrophic economic collapse. Most vessels are no longer fishing since current catches are insufficient to cover operating costs. At the time of writing, only a couple of vessels were still operating, one conducting jig fishing (trolling) at higher latitudes for juvenile and sub-adult surface albacore and one longliner that that fishes for fresh albacore. The majority of American Samoa vessels fish for albacore that is destined for the StarKist cannery in Pago Pago.

The collapse is not confined solely to the American Samoa fleet. Fleets across the Central South Pacific from Fiji to the Cook Islands have suffered the same scale of fleet contraction, stemming from a mix of high operating costs-mainly fuel-lower prices for albacore and low longline catch rates of albacore. Interestingly, the fishery in French Polynesia has not suffered the same scale of collapse as its operations are subsidized by the Government.

An influx of Chinese longline vessels is perceived by the longline fishermen across the region to be responsible for the collapse in the fishery. Chinese vessels enjoy substantial subsidies on fuel, licensing, freight costs, vessel construction, exports, tax, loans and labor.

The influx of these vessels has caused the catch to double from around 40,000 mt in 1990 to over 80,000 mt in 2012. However, most of this catch is taken in the EEZs of Pacific Island Countries (PICs) through access agreements for foreign longline vessels. Over roughly the same period, the catch rate of the American Samoa longline catch has increased to a maximum of over 300,000 fish or about 6,000 mt in 2013 but with declining catches after 2007, and a low of 117,000 fish or about 2000 mt in 2013.

The fishery is strongly seasonal with a low period in the Austral summer between December and April. Typically, vessels experience lower catches in these months. However, even the peak of the fishing season in 2013 failed to yield sufficient catches to cover fishing expenses. Hence vessels tied up rather than continue fishing. The American Samoa albacore longline catch rate has declined by 40% on average, while the 2013 catch rate is a record low and 30% of the highest catch rate in 1996.

Hopes for a measure at the recent 10th Western and Central Pacific Commission (WCPFC) meeting were dashed in 2013 when countries such as China and Taiwan objected to a cap on high seas catches of South Pacific albacore, as well as a cap on catches of albacore in the EEZs.

15(0) Re

Papua New Guinea objected to the EEZ limits in 2012, since it has a small longline fleet, large EEZ and did not want to forgo any future opportunities for increasing its albacore catch. The current WCPFC Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) only applies to catches south of 20m deg S, and clearly has not worked.

As such there is nothing to stop the continued expansion of fishing effort for South Pacific albacore. Moreover, China has indicated that it will increase its longline fleet from 250 vessels to a total of 400 vessels which will place additional strain on the resource. It is thus hard to envisage a major improvement of the longline fisheries across the region, including the American Samoa longline fishery.

The American Samoa longline fishery at present operates under a limited entry program with vessel limits within four size classes (Class A < 40 ft, 12 permits; Class B 40.1-50 ft, 1 permit; Class C 50.1-70 ft, 12 permits; Class D >70 ft, 27 permits). There is no upper size limit on the longline vessels in the largest size class.

The original intent of the limited entry permit program was to maximize American Samoa participation in the longline fishery. However, even with the proposed modifications into only two size classes, eliminating the qualification criteria and the minimum landing requirements for vessels < 50ft, this may still have a dampening effect on participation in the fishery.

On average <30 participating vessels have operated in the fishery after 2004 when the limited entry permit program began, although there are 60 permits available. Most of this deficit is due to the collapse of the small vessels fishery in the A and B size classes which contacted to a single vessel by 2008.

It should also be noted that not all of the US EEZ (118,354 sq nmi) around American Samoa is available to the longline fishery, about 33,000 sq nmi or about 28% of the EEZ is closed to all pelagic fishing vessels > 50 ft in overall length (LOA). It may be possible to open the current large vessel area closures around the American Samoa archipelago. As these areas are unfished it is possible that albacore may have accumulated within the closure boundaries.

On the other hand, as albacore are highly migratory species, and the area closures are not very large relative to the EEZ as a whole, the volumes of fish within the closure boundaries may not differ greatly from the currently open portions of the EEZ. Moreover, if opened, about 10,000 sq nmi (8% of EEZ) would remain closed due to the provisions of the Rose Atoll Marine National Monument.

American Samoa longline participants may wish to consider additional changes to the longline limited entry program:

- Maintain a limit of 60 permits but abolish the permit size classes and, without any landing requirements and allow them to be freely transferable in the same way as the Hawaii longline limited entry permits
- Abolish the limited entry program altogether and have the fishery operate as before under the Western Pacific general longline permits

Options that might be considered to modify the large vessel area closure include:

- Removing or modifying the area closure around Swains Island only
- Removing or modifying the area closure around all areas, apart from Rose Atoll MNM
- Reducing the area closure around the islands of American Samoa to 12 nm for a two year period, as requested by the Tautai O Samoa Longline & Fishing Association

At its 159th Meeting, the Council may select to take no action, select one or more of these options or develop another preferred option for regulatory action to assist the recovery of the American Samoa longline fishery.

B. Experimental Fishing Permit – American Samoa large vessel prohibited area (Action Item)

American Samoa longline fishery participants are currently experimenting with a new type of operation that involves longline and handline gear fished in association with drifting Fish Aggregation Devices (FADs) used in the tropical purse seine fishery. The Council has been notified that if the trials prove successful, fishery participants may apply for an Experimental Fishing Permit (EFP) to fish within the American Samoa Large Vessel Prohibited Area (LVPA) with a vessel(s) greater than 50 ft in length.

Under existing federal regulations applicable Western Pacific Region, there is section that pertains to Experimental Fishing Permits, including the process to follow and information required in an application (see 50 CFR § 665.17). If an EFP application is submitted, and if NMFS Pacific Islands Region Office (PIRO) deems that application to be complete, the Council will consider the information provided in the application and make a recommendation to PIRO to approve or disapprove the EFP.

Required elements of the application, include but are not limited to, the following information: a) the species (directed and incidental) to be harvested under the EFP and the amount of such harvest necessary to conduct the experiment; b) for each vessel covered by the EFP, the approximate times and places fishing will take place, and the type, size, and amount of gear to be used; c) a statement of the purposes and goals of the experiment for which an EFP is needed, including a general description of the arrangements for disposition of all species harvested under the EFP; and d) a statement of whether the proposed experimental fishing has broader significance than the applicant's individual goals.

At the date of writing, the Council has yet to receive notification of a complete application for an EFP. If no application is provided, the Council will receive a presentation on the EFP regulatory process in anticipation that a complete application may be submitted for the June 2014 meeting.

C. Modifying Hawaii Longline Fishery EPO Bigeye Tuna Catch Limit (Action Item)

Bigeye tuna in the Western Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) has been subject to over-exploitation for the past two decades from the harvesting adults and subadults and juveniles in the respective longline and purse seine fisheries.

The juvenile catch is a consequence of the proliferation of fishing around Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) in the mid-1980s, which concentrate schools of the target skipjack and yellowfin tunas, but which also aggregate substantial volumes of juvenile bigeye tuna.

Catches in the WCPO and EPO, including US longline catches, have been subject to conservation and management measures (CMMs) or resolutions promulgated by the Western and Central Pacific Fishery Commission (WCPFC) and Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)

The Hawaii longline fleet, by virtue of its location (is able to fish in both the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) and the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). Apart from one US longliner operating from California, all US longliners operating in the EPO are from Hawaii. US longline effort and Hawaii longline effort are thus more or less synonymous in the North Pacific.

Recent bigeye catch history for the EPO and for the US fleet in the EPO indicates that the bigeye resource is being fished well below the catch limits established by the IATTC, such that bigeye in the EPO is no longer considered to be experiencing overfishing. At the same time, the EPO has become an important fishing ground for the Hawaii longline fleet. Taken together, these developments indicate that the US should seek a revision of the catch limit for the Hawaii-based longline fleet which reflects this greater exploitation of EPO bigeye.

Catches of bigeye in the EPO are taken principally with purse seines and longlines, with small volumes (< 0.1%) caught by other methods. Catches from 1983 to 2002 varied between 100,000 to 200,000 mt with a means of about 150,000 mt. After 2002, catches have declined steadily to about 100,000 mt in 2012. Both purse seine and longline fisheries show catch declines from 2002 onwards, however, the decline in longline catches is particularly marked with a decline of about two thirds between 2002 and 2012.

The scale of the longline bigeye tuna decline is apparent when evaluated against the catch limits established for the four Asian longline fleets (China, Korea, Taiwan and Japan) in Resolution C-13-01 These catch limits are based on recommendations of the IATTC scientific staff and collectively amount to about 54,000 mt of bigeye, of which just over 19,000 mt or 35% was caught in 2012 by the four Asian longline fleets.

Catches by the Hawaii fleet remained lower than 500 mt until 2005. However, between 2004 and 2006, the Hawaii longline fleet was subject to a catch limit of 150 mt stemming from a 2004 IATTC Resolution (IATTC 2004). From 2007 onwards the Hawaii-based longline fleet has been subject to a 500 mt bigeye catch limit (IATTC 2006). This initially applied to all longline vessels but in 2009 (IAATC 2009) the catch limit was set for longline vessels > 24 m which comprise 15% of the US longline fleet based out of Hawaii.

From 2005 onwards, the Hawaii longline fleet has caught increasing amounts of bigeye tuna in the EPO, with catches exceeding 1,000 t in 2008 and 2000 mt in 2013. In 2013, NMFS closed the fishery on November 11, when it judged that the 500 mt limit had been reached by US Hawaii-based longline vessels > 24 m in length.

The Hawaii-based longline fleet continues to catch the majority of its bigeye in the WCPO, and subject to a WCPFC-established catch limit. Between 2006 and 2008, the WCPO bigeye limit for the Hawaii-based fleet was 4,121 mt, the total caught in 2004. This was modified to 90% of the 2004 bigeye longline catch in the WCPO or 3,763 mt, and remained in place from 2009-2013. This catch limit will be reduced by a further 10% in two 5% increments between 2014 and 2017 to 3,297 mt.

The WCPFC and EPO have been closed to catching bigeye tuna at various times on account of the Hawaii fleet exceeding its WCPFC or IATTC allotted catch limits. The Hawaii-based fleet is capable in a given year of catching upwards of 5,500 mt of bigeye tuna. As such, the EPO and WCPO catch limits are a major management burden on the Hawaii-based fleet, although vessels < 24 m may continue to fish in the EPO following a closure.

The most recent stock assessment that the bigeye stock in the EPO is likely not overfished and that overfishing is not taking place. In fact, the current exploitation is very close to the MSY target reference points. Likewise, interim limit reference points have not been exceeded under the current model.

The Council is exploring a range of options for modifications of the US EPO longline bigeye allocation. These options are not intended for amending the Council's Pelagics Fishery Ecosystem Plan (PFEP), but for the US to advocate for inclusion in the next IATTC Resolution for a Multiannual Program for the Conservation of Tuna in the EPO and include the following.

- No Action (maintain 500 mt for longline vessels > 24 m)
- Limit of 2000 mt for longline vessels > 24 m in length
- Limit of 5,000 mt for vessels > 24 m
- Limit of 5,000 mt for all vessels
- No limit for Hawaii longline fleet

At its 159th Meeting, the Council may select to take no action, select one of these options or develop another preferred option to be communicated to the US Delegation to the IATTC.

D. Bigeye Tuna Movement Workshop

At its October 2013 meeting, the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed management of bigeye tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). Longline fisheries in the WCPO are regulated by catch limits stemming from Conservation and Management Measures from the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).

In this context, the SSC noted that results from extensive tagging of bigeye tuna throughout the central and western equatorial Pacific do not support the movement of bigeye from the equatorial areas to northern central Pacific waters where the Hawaii longline fishery operates.

SSC Members commented that knowledge of the geospatial origins of Hawaii bigeye tuna are not well understood, but that a substantial amount of movement information has been gained from tagging studies in other regions.

These discussions led to the following recommendations:

The SSC recommends that the bigeye otolith stable isotope study be completed and published. Similar studies helped resolve spatial distribution and connectivity of Hawaii yellowfin tuna. Further, the bigeye study should be expanded to include sampling of otoliths from other locations not yet sampled (e.g. northwestern Pacific).

The SSC recommends that the Council convene a workshop on bigeye movement and distribution, with the objective to design a collaborative study of bigeye movements in the Pacific and the data requirements to support such a study.

For these reasons, the Council is convening a Workshop on Bigeye Movement and Distribution between April 22 and 24, 2014. About 20 participants will meet over the two days to review what is known about bigeye spatial distribution and connectivity in the Pacific, and identify the research needed to fill knowledge gaps.

This has direct relevance to the international management of bigeye by the two tuna regional fisheries management organizations (tRFMOs), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). Both organizations have conservation measures for tuna, and both have taken measures for longline and purse seine fisheries, but have included spatial elements for purse seine but not for longliune fisheries. For example, in the WCPO, purse seine measures apply only between 20 deg N and 20 deg S. In the EPO, there is an area closure for skipjack, bigeye and yellowfin inside which fishing is prohibited between September 29 and October 29.

The Western Pacific Council would like to see more nuanced management measures for longline fisheries in the WCPO. These could include for example, latitudinal limits similar to purse seines, since 90% of the fishing mortality for bigeye tuna occurs within the equatorial waters between 10 deg N and 10 deg S. As such, the current longline catch limits are a very blunt tool, especially where they apply to sub-tropical fisheries like that in Hawaii, which catches bigeye predominantly at high latitudes (15-30 deg N), away from the zone of high fishing mortality. Moreover, the stock assessments for all the tropical tunas are spatially disaggregated so why not craft management measures the same way?

A key to understanding the potential for spatial management of bigeye is the degree of connectivity between the different segments of the population. This is especially critical for bigeye catches in Hawaii since the fishery catches bigeye in the WCPO and EPO and is thus subject to differing management measures depending on where it fishes. However the eastern and western limits respectively of WCPO and EPO bigeye are unknown and will be one of the issues discussed at the April 2014 meeting.

E. Disproportionate Burden Workshop

The Western Pacific Council is convening a 3-day workshop tentatively scheduled for May (21-23) on the impacts to Small Island Developing States (SIDS) from Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) promulgated by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), in particular the CMM for tropical tunas. The meeting will be cochaired by Dr. Dale Squires of the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, with the other co-chair to be identified.

The concept of disproportionate burden (DB) stems from Article 24 of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement which makes it an obligation on the parties to take into account the need to ensure that conservation and management do not result in transferring a disproportionate burden of conservation actions on to developing States. Similar text appears in the WCPFC Convention, the Conventions for the South Pacific Regional Fishery Management Organization (SPRFMO) and South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO), and the FAO Port State Measure.

The first attempts to operationalize the concept appear in various WCPFC CMMs, most recently CMM 2013-7 (see <u>http://www.wcpfc.int/conservation-and-management-measures</u>).

The SIDS indicate that they must absorb a disproportionate share of the management burden for measures that limit purse seine sets around fish aggregating devices or FADs in an effort to protect juvenile bigeye tuna. FADs are used to aggregate skipjack and yellowfin, but at the same time aggregate large numbers of overfished juvenile bigeye tuna. It is believed that there are likely downstream impacts of harvesting juvenile and small bigeye upon longline fisheries that harvest mature and larger bigeye. The SIDS indicate that FAD set limits to reduce or eliminate juvenile bigeye overfishing have a much greater relative impact on their small economies, which depend heavily on purse seine catches and access fees, than on the economies of metropolitan distant water fishing nations.

The foundation and magnitude of this claim has never been subjected to any rigorous economic analysis, even though the WCPFC Convention clearly specifies a responsibility to insure that Conservation and Management Measures do not transfer a disproportionate burden onto SIDS. As such, the Council will convene a workshop for the purpose of fully accessing the concept of disproportionate burden as it relates to the claims of small island economies in the Pacific.

Although focused upon this particular issue, the workshop results are likely to have substantial relevance for all international fisheries, not just tunas, because of Article 24 of the United Nations Fish Stock Agreement and similar concerns in the Atlantic, Indian, and Eastern Pacific Oceans.

F. International Fisheries

1. WCPFC 10

The tenth regular session of the Western and Central Pacific Fishery Commission met in Cairns, Australia between December 2-6, 2013 (WCPFC 10). The major accomplishment of this meeting

was the adoption of a multi-year replacement conservation and management measures (CMM) tropical tuna measure. The last comprehensive measure was CMM 2008-01, which covered fishing between 2009-2011, and which was effectively rolled over in 2012 and 2013. A prominent feature of these deliberations at WCPFC 10 was the insistence by the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) through their representative organization the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) that compliance with measures created a disproportionate burden for them. As such, this should be compensated by the metropolitan distant water fishing nations (DWFNs), a perspective that was not received with unalloyed enthusiasm by the DWFN countries.

A working group met every day of the week to reconcile the several proposals on tropical tunas and the many alternative provisions within some of the proposals. Issues that were especially contentious included the FAD restrictions, purse seine effort limits on the high seas, and longline bigeye catch limits, and all of these were related to the FFA members' perception of disproportionate burdens on PICs stemming from the FAD restrictions.

Ultimately the Commission adopted a measure that is applicable from 2014 through 2017, but many provisions of which are dependent on further Commission decisions. In 2014 purse seine fleets will follow either a four-month FAD closure or specified limits on FAD sets. In 2015 and 2016 countries will have the choice of a five-month FAD closure (combined with a FAD set limit) or a specified FAD set limit, but only if the Commission agrees in 2014 to arrangements to avoid disproportionate burdens on SIDSs.

High seas purse seine fishing effort will be capped at specified levels for each fleet -1,270 fishing days per year for the US fleet. Longline fleets will take further bigeye tuna catch cuts from 2014 through 2017. The limits for the US fishery will start in 2014 at the current level, 3,763 mt, followed by a reduction to 3,554 mt in 2015 and 2016, and 3,345 mt in 2017. The measure also includes purse seine and longline capacity limits and some provisions for yellowfin tuna and for fleets other than purse seine and longline.

These reductions may have a small benefit for WCPO bigeye but are likely to have significant economic consequences for both fisheries. In 2010, the Hawaii longline fishery was closed for 40 days in November and December, a peak time for bigeye demand, with losses to the fishery of millions of dollars and impacts to over 200 jobs in the local seafood industry.

The reductions in US high seas purse-seine catches will likely be around 800 to 1,000 fishing days, which is estimated to have a value of approximately \$50 million. Also, there will be a negative impact on the American Samoan economy, since most of the fish caught on the high seas is landed and processed in American Samoa. Importantly, reductions in high seas catches were not recommended by Commission scientists and will not benefit the bigeye stock since it is not FAD fishing that is being reduced but all purse-seine fishing, including that which does not impact bigeye tuna. So this is not a conservation measure but an economic decision, and one that favors other countries to the detriment of the United States.

Although some other countries' fleets will be affected by the 2013 tropical tuna measure, none will be negatively impacted to the same degree as US fisheries. One reason for this is that the Commission has no mechanism to ensure compliance, and there is no reason to believe that the many countries involved in the fisheries are strictly following the measures. However, US

authorities are vigilant in enforcing the Commission's rules against US vessels, so there is not a level playing field. Similarly, unlike catches by other countries, US catches of all fish are scrupulously monitored and reported. Many other longline fleets do not even provide the required reporting information to the Commission or its scientists.

There has been a dramatic increase in South Pacific albacore catches in the last few years. Some of the FFA members proposed revision of the existing CMM for SP albacore – extending the scope of the measure north to the equator and complementing the existing vessel number limits with catch limits. Two FFA members, PNG and Kiribati, were noticeably missing from the list of proponents, reflecting difficulties among the FFA members in their internal discussions to formulate zone-based catch limits. In the course of negotiating the proposal, those two members were brought on board by excluding all EEZs not wholly south of the equator.

In response to the United States' and Canada's assertions that troll fisheries are not part of the problem, the proponents also agreed to the catch limits to just longline fisheries. The United States and a few other CCMs had serious concerns about the lack of high seas limits for PICs and Pacific Territories like American Samoa, but the proponents were unwilling to yield on that issue. Ultimately however, China was unwilling to accept any changes whatsoever to the existing CMM. It cited a recent domestic decision to halt expansion of its South Pacific longline fleet, but stated that it could not agree to any further limits until all the vessels still under construction are able to enter the fishery.

The Commission's CMM for sharks was revised to include non-retention of silky sharks, along with oceanic white-tip sharks. Both the FFA and the European Union have been advocating for a ban on wire leaders on longline gear, in order to promote the escape of incidentally captured sharks. However, the US remains opposed to this measure since among other considerations, the use of wire leaders has a strong safety element, where the parting of monofilament under tension with a lead weight has caused serious injury and death.

The EU and FFA have also proposed changes to the current shark measure to require fins attached, which is currently the US requirement for shark landings

Other WCPFC business included Compliance Monitoring Scheme, Unique Vessel Identifiers, Record of Fishing Vessels, Eastern High Seas Pocket, Port State Measures, Special Requirements of Developing States and Territories and Pacific Bluefin Tuna. The full report of the meeting is available at: <u>http://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/10th-regular-session-commission</u>.

2. International Scientific Committee

The work program of the ISC for 2014 will be outlined by the ISC Chair, Dr Gerard DiNardo. The most recent report from the ISC can be found at: <u>http://isc.ac.affrc.go.jp/reports/isc/isc13_reports.html</u>

3. North Pacific Regional Fisheries Commission

The next meeting of the NPRFC will be held in Tokyo on March 21, 2014 and will be preceded by the Scientific Committee (March 17-18, 2014) and Technical and Compliance Committee (March 19-20, 2014). The Science Committee meeting will be focused on species such as pelagic armorhead, saury and squids.

4. South Pacific Regional Fisheries Organization

The second meeting of the Commission of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization was held in Manta, Ecuador, from 27 to 31 January 2014.

In relation to jack mackerel, the report recommends that 2014 catches remain at or below 440,000 tonnes to ensure the rebuilding of the stock. The Commission accepted this recommendation. In accordance with Article 8(m) of the Convention, the Commission provided guidance to the Scientific Committee regarding their work program.

10. The Commission made extensive efforts to achieve a consensus on the *Conservation and Management Measure for Trachurus murphyi*, CMM 2.01 (Annex G). After all efforts at reaching a consensus had been exhausted it was agreed to proceed to a vote. CMM 2.01 was adopted by a vote of 8 to 1. Delegations agreed that the fact that a vote had been necessary on this occasion was not to be seen as a precedent for the future. The circumstances of this particular occasion were unusual and it was anticipated that similar decisions in the future would be able to be achieved by consensus. The Commission also adopted the Proposed Jack Mackerel Rebuilding Plan.

The Commission adopted the Conservation and Management Measure for the Management of Bottom Fishing in the SPRFMO Convention Area, CMM 2.03, the Conservation and Management Measure for minimizing bycatch of seabirds in the SPRFMO Convention Area, CMM 2.04), the Conservation and Management Measure for the establishment of the SPRFMO Record of Vessels authorized to fish in the Convention Area, CMM 2.05, the Conservation and Management Measure for the Establishment of the Vessel Monitoring System in the SPRFMO Convention Area, CMM 2.06 (and the Conservation and Management Measure on Minimum Standards for Inspection in Port, CMM 2.07. With respect to the last of these measures, CMM 2.07, the delegation of China noted that at the present time they had some difficulty in fully implementing the measure but expected to be able to do so in the future.

The Commission requested that the Secretariat explore the possibility of a memorandum of understanding on data exchange with the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels.

G. Longline Fisheries Quarterly Reports

- 1. Hawaii
- 2. American Samoa

The 2013 fourth quarter and annual report for the Hawaii longlimne fishery and the 2013 first and second quarters for the American Samoa longline fisheries will be summarized and presented to the SSC and Council

H. Advisory Group Recommendations

Any pelagic fishery recommendations arising from the Advisory Panel, Plan Team and REAC meetings held immediately prior to the Council Meeting will be presented for Council consideration and action.

I. SSC Recommendations

Any pelagic fishery recommendations arising from the SSC meeting held immediately prior to the Council Meeting will be presented for Council consideration and action.