

GULF OF ALASKA COASTAL COMMUNITIES COALITION (GOAC3)

P.O. Box 201236, Anchorage AK 99520

Phone: 907-561-7633 or 866-561-7633(in AK only) FAX: 907-561-7634

E-mail: goacc@alaska.net

www.goac3.org

“THE GULF CHANNEL MARKER”

Issue 2 July 15, 2003

Focus on: “Laws of the Sea and Oceans Reports”

Edited by

Gale K. Vick, GOAC3 Executive Director

The Gulf Channel Marker, a bi-weekly “mini-newsletter” of the Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition (GOAC3) is designed to help keep our members posted on immediate fisheries-related issues facing Gulf of Alaska coastal communities.

The Gulf Channel Marker is distributed by e-mail and by fax and by hard-copy to those members who request it. This publication is in MS Word. All newsletters will be archived but the format will vary. We encourage you to print out *The Gulf Channel Marker* and keep copies in a three-ring binder. Your questions or suggestions for issues and linkages are always welcome. See “Web Links” at the end of this document for further information. Please note that all links are subject to change.

What is in this issue?

- | | |
|--|---------|
| I. Alerts | p.2 |
| II. Important Dates | p.2 |
| III. Current Issues | p.3 |
| IV. Laws of the Sea | pp 3-9 |
| a. Alaska State Legislature | |
| b. Federal Legislation | |
| i. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Mgt. Act | |
| ii. Fisheries Quota Act of 2003 | |
| iii. Fishing Quota Standards Act of 2003 | |
| iv. Marine Mammal Protection Act Re—authorization | |
| v. The Oceans and Human Health Act | |
| vi. Country of Origin Labeling | |
| V. Oceans Reports | pp 9-15 |
| a. U.S. Commission on Oceans Policy | |
| b. Pew Oceans Commission Report | |
| c. Senate Commerce Committee Hearings on Overfishing | |
| d. Sustainable Fisheries Act Marine Stewardship Achievements | |
| e. Essential Fish Habitat | |
| VI. GOAC3 Major Initiatives | p. 15 |
| VII. Getting Involved in the Council Process | p. 17 |
| VIII. Web Links | p. 21 |

I **ALERTS**

TAKE ACTION

- The deadline for comments on NOAA Fisheries recommendations for ZERO mortality for marine mammals is September 8, 2003. For additional information call Tom Eagle at (301) 713-2322.

IMPORTANT TO KNOW

- Groundfish in the North Gulf: See North Pacific Fishery Management Council web site for current information on Council action on groundfish. The Council decided at its June Kodiak meeting not to consider individual quotas for Gulf of Alaska bottom-fish harvesters and processors. The concept of assigning shares of fish harvests to individual processing companies is particularly controversial in the seafood industry. Instead, the council will consider replacing the current race for fish with cooperatives, where groups of fishermen and processors can pool their efforts. The council will also consider "status quo" as a third management option. The council hopes to make a final decision on Gulf fisheries management by this time next year.¹
- Farmed salmon: **We highly recommend ordering the "Farmed and Dangerous" brochure in quantity and sharing this with all your friends. OR: Call us and we will send you some copies..** <http://www.farmedanddangerous.org/>
- National Standard #8 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires that the NPFMC consider the impacts on Alaska's coastal communities as part of their regulatory process for federally managed fisheries.
-

II IMPORTANT DATES

MARK YOUR CALENDAR

- North Pacific Fishery Management Council: Check the NPFMC for their 2003-05 meeting schedule and for committee meetings, etc. Next scheduled begins October 6th in Anchorage.
- Alaska Board of Fisheries – Check the BOF web site for their 2003-04 calendar
- National Marine Fisheries Service- November 13-15, 2003 Washington, DC. First fisheries-management conference co-sponsored by the eight regional fishery management councils. For more information check the NPFMC web site.
- Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition (GOAC3): Our annual meeting is in October See our web site at www.goac3.org for this and many other important fisheries dates.

III A FEW CURRENT ISSUES

¹ Laine Welch, Fish Report, *Anchorage Daily News*, June 21, 2003

➤ **SALMON PROCESSING:**

New ways to keep salmon fresh: Harvesters in the Aleutian East region are planning to use inert gas for their Aleutia brand sockeye salmon transport this summer as a way of slowing down bacterial growth.² Chignik co-op members are using liquid oxygen in their holds to keep salmon alive to point of delivery, similar to the way British Columbia fish farmers do. Injecting fish with vitamin E and other anti-oxidants could keep “just caught” taste. Phosphate is valuable for holding moisture.

> **ALASKA FISH MONIES**

Checks for Fishermen: By the June 7 deadline, the state received about 700 applications for \$5 million in direct aid to salmon fishermen. The money comes from a pool of \$50 million in federal funds designed to help revitalize the salmon industry. The \$5 million will be paid out this month to harvesters who fell below poverty guidelines last year. The money is intended to help pay for food, fuel, housing and urgent needs. Applications came from coastal communities all across the state.³

> **SALMON MARKETING EFFORT**

Alaska Governor Frank Murkowski announced a meeting with Burger King executives to push the concept of a salmon burger as part of a statewide fisheries revitalization plan.⁴ Murkowski said the meeting is one of the goals of the \$10 million international wild salmon marketing campaign - part of the \$50 million in federal funds included in the latest federal appropriations bill by U.S. Senator Ted Stevens. "The objective is to get pink salmon on McDonald's or Burger King's regular menu," The Governor said he would be meeting with Burger King executives in Florida sometime this year to discuss the proposal.

IV **LEGISLATION / LAWS OF THE SEA**

There are probably more laws governing state, federal and international waters than anyone could name, but they all hold jurisdiction in some form. *The Gulf Channel Marker* will try to keep up with the most pertinent laws, their re-authorizations or analyses, regarding the North Pacific, but we encourage folks to do their own research on any laws that might be impacting your fishery or community.

The U.S. Commission on Oceans has one of the best web sites for linking to many of the primary ocean laws: http://oceancommission.gov/documents/gov_oceans/gov_oceans.html

ALASKA LEGISLATURE <http://w3.legis.state.ak.us/home.htm>

The first session of the 23rd Alaska State Legislature adjourned in May 2003. The legislature will reconvene in January of 2004. To check status of this session's legislation, check their web

² “Keeping salmon fresh is simply a gas” Laine Welch, Fish Report, *Anchorage Daily News* June 21, 2003

³ Keeping salmon fresh is simply a gas” Laine Welch, Fish Report, *Anchorage Daily News* June 21, 2003

⁴ “AK governor to meet with Burger King to push salmon burger” By Drew Cherry, IntraFish Media, Jul. 17 2003 - The Wave News Network

site. To check all state statutes and regulations you need to know about, visit the State of Alaska official web site at <http://www.state.ak.us/>.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

THE MAGNUSON-STEVENSON FISHERY CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT ACT

(MSFCMA – or “Mag Act”) is the authorization for federal fisheries management. The last re-authorization was in 1996 and a new one is over-due in the 108th Congress.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is the principal law governing marine fisheries in the United States.⁵ It was adopted to extend control of U.S. waters to 200 nautical miles in the ocean; to phase out foreign fishing activities within this zone; to prevent overfishing, especially by foreign fleets; to allow overfished stocks to recover; and to conserve and manage fishery resources. The Act is named after the late Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington and current Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska.

Congress passed the original Magnuson Act in 1976. It has since been amended several times. Among other things, the Act explains the role of regional fishery management councils and describes their functions and operating procedures. The Act includes national standards for management and outlines the contents of fishery management plans. In addition, it gives the Secretary of Commerce power to review, approve, and implement fishery management plans and other recommendations developed by the councils. National Marine Fisheries Service (under the Department of Commerce) is charged with stewardship of the nation’s living marine resources. With input from the regional councils and stakeholder groups, National Marine Fisheries Service provides guidance for applying the National Standards of the Act.

In 1996, Congress passed the Sustainable Fisheries Act, which revised the Magnuson Act and reauthorized it through 1999. At present, the Magnuson Act states in its “National Standards” that conservation and management measures shall:

- Prevent overfishing while achieving optimum yield
- Not discriminate between residents of different states; Any allocation of privileges must be fair and equitable
- Where practicable, promote efficiency, except that no such measure shall have economic allocation as its sole purpose
- Take into account and allow for variations among and contingencies in fisheries, fishery resources, and catches
- Minimize costs and avoid duplications, where practicable
- To the extent practicable, an individual stock shall be managed as a unit throughout its range; interrelated stocks shall be managed as a unit or in close coordination
- Take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities, consistent with conservation requirements, including prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks

⁵ The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) offers this information about the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Information is verbatim from their web site. Contact the North Pacific Fishery Management Council in Anchorage or check their web site (see list) for more specific information.

- Minimize bycatch or mortality from bycatch
- Promote safety of human life at sea

Current Status of the Magnuson Act

In 2002, the Fisheries Recovery Act (HR 2570), a package of amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act introduced by Rep. Sam Farr (CA) and backed by the 150-member Marine Fish Conservation Network, accumulated over 100 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives. It was the only reauthorization bill in Congress until April, when Rep. Wayne Gilchrest (chair of the House Fisheries Subcommittee) introduced his own, HR 4749. Neither bill was passed in the 107th Congress.

Some of the major contentious issues of Mag Act Reauthorization in the 107th Congress were

- the lifting of the moratorium on new IFQ (individual fishing quota) programs
- processor shares within an IFQ program
- conservation management

Conservation management will be a continued critical argument in any reauthorization bill introduced in the 108th Congress. "There's too much at stake for hastily crafted solutions, no matter whose they are." NCMC and its allies in the Marine Fish Conservation Network are urging Congress to reject any amendments to the Magnuson Act that might weaken existing conservation provisions."⁶

The Magnuson Act is complemented by other federal and state laws, including the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. International agreements and organizations, such as the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and the United Nation's Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, also play a role in shaping management of U.S. fisheries.

Check out the NOAA/NMFS link web sites for background information and updates on the Mag Act. Also check the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives subcommittees on Resources on a regular basis. You can sign up to get on their e-mail lists.

Check out http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/fact_sheets.htm for some very good information on this process and on NOAA's proposals for re-authorization.

WATCH FOR THIS The moratorium on new IFQ programs has been lifted by default when the deadline passed in September of 2002. A re-authorization could re-instate the moratorium or allow it with specific requirements. The Government Accounting Office (GAO) came out with a report on IFQs in 2000. Another report is pending. A future issue of *The Gulf Channel Marker* will discuss this in depth.

⁶ "NCMC Urges Lawmakers to Stand Behind Existing Conservation Rules While Awaiting Results of Ocean Commission Studies" updated 5/9/03 National Coalition for Marine Conservation, 3 North King Street, Leesburg, VA 20176

WATCH FOR THIS The issue of PROCESSOR SHARES has been hotly debated for a long time, but specifically so since the proposed BSAI crab rationalization plan was adopted by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council in June of 2002. Watch for this as an issue during the Congressional re-authorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

HOT NEWS!

NEW BILLS IN CONGRESS:

S. 1106 – FISHERIES QUOTA ACT of 2003 **WATCH FOR THIS**

On June 26th, U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation marked-up S.1106, a bill sponsored by Senators Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) and John Kerry (D-Mass.) which seeks to create national guidelines for the implementation of individual transferable quotas (ITQs).⁷ Sen. Snowe is seeking national standards for IFQs, excluding processor quotas. Sen. Gordon Smith (R- Ore.) is expected to introduce language regarding the inclusion of processor quota shares in any ITQ legislation. The National Fisheries Institute (NFI) also wants processor quota language. If the bill passes in committee it goes to the floor to be debated on by the full Senate.

H.R.2621 – “FISHING QUOTA STANDARDS ACT of 2003” **WATCH FOR THIS**

In news dated 6/30/03 via the Marine Fisheries Conservation Network (MFCN) “Congressmen Bill Delahunt and Tom Allen move to conserve fish and fishermen: Responding to urgent calls for conserving fish and pleas from fishermen to protect their livelihood, Representatives Tom Allen (D-ME) and Bill Delahunt (D-MA) yesterday introduced a bill, H.R. 2621, designed to rescue threatened fish populations while protecting fishing communities. The proposed law deals with Individual Fishing Quotas, known as IFQs, which until recently were banned because of concerns about their impact on fish populations and on fishermen in coastal communities. The Allen-Delahunt bill, the “Fishing Quota Standards Act of 2003,” would set explicit legal standards that fishery managers would have to follow when using IFQs. “Frankly, the idea of unregulated IFQs scares fishermen who are already worried about their future and the future of fish populations. We know we’ll be left on the docks, while the large industrial fishing fleet gets allocated all of the catch,” explains fisherman Ray Kane from Cape Cod, Massachusetts.”

Congress had prohibited the creation of new IFQ programs under a six-year moratorium that expired on September 30, 2002. Since then Rep. Allen, who is co-chair of the bipartisan House Oceans Caucus, Rep. Delahunt, and other congressional leaders have worked together to create legislation that will protect America’s fishing communities while insuring that any new programs protect marine resources. The new bill would require IFQ programs to:

- Promote the conservation of ocean fish by providing additional and substantial conservation benefits.
- Limit the duration of IFQ programs and quota shares to seven years.
- Provide for a fair and equitable initial allocation of quota shares.

⁷ Senate committee marks up ITQ bill today By Dan McGovern Jun. 26 2003 - The Wave News Network

- Ensure that IFQ programs and shares are reviewed and renewed only if they are meeting or exceeding the conservation requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, if not, they must be revised or revoked.
- Define and prohibit the excessive consolidation of quota shares. If Congress does not act to establish national standards similar to those contained in the Allen-Delahunt bill, the Marine Fish Conservation Network believes that it should renew the IFQ moratorium.

Find the bill, H.R. 2621 at <http://www.conservefish.org/site/catch01>

MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT RE-AUTHORIZATION: HOT NEWS

In a press release Date July 16, 2003 regarding a “Senate Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee hearing on the Marine Mammal Protection Act Senator Ted Stevens said that Congress must develop a statute that defines the harassment of marine mammals or he will oppose legislation to reauthorize the Act. Stevens noted a recent decision by a California court which interpreted the Marine Mammal Protection Act to mean that any action that has the potential to disturb even the most sensitive marine mammal in a population, is deemed a violation of the Act. "I will oppose the bill unless we find a way to define harassment so it will be understandable by the courts, the administration, and everyone else that joins us in trying to protect ocean mammals," said Senator Stevens. "We want to protect marine mammals, but we want to protect them with common sense legislation that everybody can understand." ...Stevens went on to discuss background. “When the Marine Mammal Protection Act became law in 1972 it followed a moratorium on the taking of marine mammals. The Act was passed to protect certain marine mammals that are in danger of extinction or depletion; help restore the reproduction capability of mammals if they fall below their optimum sustainable level; and achieve a better understanding of the ecology and population dynamics of marine mammals. However, like many of our marine resource laws, the threat of costly, time-consuming environmental litigation hangs over this Act like a black cloud. Marine mammals cannot properly be managed because researchers are not permitted to go near them. The permitting process is so arduous that scientists in Alaska are often times denied or are significantly delayed in acquiring permits needed to perform research to protect and manage the species.

NOAA needs to look closely at its process for issuing research permits to make sure that it properly considers the unique environments that exist in areas like Alaska. We have a small window of reasonable weather when research can be conducted. The Administration's proposed bill adds a new section (119A) that allows the Departments of Commerce and the Interior to enter into harvest management agreements with Alaska Native tribes in order to conserve both depleted and non-depleted stocks of marine mammals. The provision would authorize Alaska Natives to design, implement and enforce management plans within the MMPA. There is merit in allowing harvest management agreements to be developed for non-depleted stocks of marine mammals. However, the Alaska marine mammal commissions currently authorized in the Act are the best organizations to receive this authority, not the 227 tribes now recognized in Alaska. Had a pre-depletion co-management agreement been in effect in Cook Inlet, we could have likely avoided the dramatic decline that led to a depleted listing for that family of Beluga whales. Alaska's Native commissions already have proven success in the co-management of marine mammals. The Nanuuq Commission's work on the polar bear, the Alaska Native Harbor Seal Commission, the Alaska Sea Otter and Steller Sea Lion Commission, the Eskimo Walrus Commission, the Alaska Beluga Committee, and the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission all

work well with their respective federal agencies on the management and study of marine mammals throughout Alaska. The co-management agreements under the MMPA should remain with the various Alaska marine mammal commissions.

This past December, the National Academies found that diminished food supply is not the cause of decline for Steller sea lions in Alaska. I asked the Academy to scrutinize this theory as part of the law Congress passed to secure better science on the causes for sea lion decline. I believed that better science and research would show that fishing was not the cause of this decline. The National Academy of Sciences study noted the greatest threat to the weakened population of sea lions was likely from impacts such as killer whale attacks and the overall oceanic and climatic shift in the North Pacific. However, the good news is the National Marine Fisheries Service released results from an aerial survey that showed for the first time in two decades an overall increase of 5.5 percent in the Steller sea lion population from 2001-2002. The focus and funding that was given to Steller sea lion research was critical to beginning to understand why this complex species is declining and what can be done to correct this trend. Harbor seals and sea otters are potentially the next marine mammals to experience weakened population trends similar to Steller sea lions. A recent Washington Post article reported that eleven killer whales consumed about half the harbor seals in Hood Canal in Puget Sound, roughly 700 seals, in eight weeks. I hope the Steller sea lion crisis reminded us that predation of other creatures of the seas often has much more to do with a species decline than man's actions. Congress should address the Harbor seal issue in this Act before the environmental community attacks our fishermen with their next debilitating lawsuit.”⁸

HOT NEWS

In related news, NOAA/NMFS is seek ZERO mortality rate goal for Marine Mammal bycatch.⁹ “NOAA Fisheries has published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking related to the Zero Mortality Rate Goal (ZMRG) contained in the Marine Mammal Protection Act. The Act states that commercial fisheries shall reduce incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals to insignificant levels approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate. Although the ZMRG has been a part of the Act since it was first enacted in 1972, there has been no clear or consistent guidance on how much mortality and serious injury amounts to insignificant levels. In the notice, NOAA Fisheries describes three quantitative options for insignificant levels of mortality and serious injury for population stocks of marine mammals and seeks comments on these options. NOAA Fisheries also requested comments on the consideration of available technology and economics of fisheries into evaluating whether or not fisheries had achieved the Act's mandate by April 30, 2001. The deadline for comments is September 8, 2003. For additional information call Tom Eagle at (301) 713-2322.

S.1218 THE OCEANS AND HUMAN HEALTH ACT WATCH FOR THIS

The Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee on June 27th approved by voice

⁸ Senate Press Release, Sen. Ted Stevens, July 16, 2003

⁹ NOAA Fisheries “Fish News” July 11, 2003

vote, S. 1218, the Oceans and Human Health Act. Senator Hollings (D-SC) introduced the bill on June 10, 2003.¹⁰ The Ocean and Human Health Act would establish a federal research program that examines ocean resources and their applications to human health. The bill would establish a federal interagency Oceans and Human Health initiative coordinated through the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC), and it would create an Oceans and Human Health initiative at the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). This legislation would also direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coordinated public information and outreach program with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the states to provide information on potential ocean-related human health risks and benefits from the consumption of seafood.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING (COOL)

WATCH FOR THIS

Meatpacking industry leaders are crying foul on COOL, or "country of original labeling" which would require products to bear the origin of the country they were made in.¹¹ The debate is over country-of-origin labeling legislation, which Congress inserted in the 2002 farm bill because of concerns over increased foreign food imports. It requires country-of-origin labels on all beef, lamb, pork, fish, produce and peanuts sold in the United States.

Meatpackers and grocers are claiming it is going to cost them too much to implement. The department estimates that the labeling could cost the food industry as much as \$2 billion to put into effect, which is supposed to happen in September 2004. The House Appropriations Committee last week approved a one-year delay in the law. The full House will consider the delay when Congress returns from the July 4 recess. Consumers and farm groups back the legislation, citing food safety right-to-know issues. ...Labeling is not a new idea. Florida requires it of imported fruits and vegetables.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION / NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE (NOAA/NMFS) www.nmfs.noaa.gov. Check out the current action: NOAA Fisheries Strategic Plan for 2003-2008 **FOR COMMENT / DATED***

V OCEANS REPORTS

If you listen to the doom and gloom of recent oceans reports, you could easily lose sight of a central point – the North Pacific is actually in fairly good shape whereas the rest of the world's oceans and fisheries are likely not. How is that? The short reason is that we have managed well and we don't have the industrialization (dams, water pollution, etc.) that many other places have. The long answer – everything is relative. There are many serious issues within the North Pacific and we all need to be part of the answers. But we could very well be the leaders to the rest of the world.

¹⁰ Senate Press Release, Committee Approves Oceans and Human Health Act, June 27, 2003, Washington DC

¹¹ "Country-of-origin labeling meeting resistance in Congress; House to consider delay in implementation" By Kansas City Star, Jul. 3 2003 - The Wave News Network

Many of the reports are strongly suggesting that our local small boat fleets might be the key for low-impact, sustainable fisheries. This is a central theme that should resonate well with coastal communities. But protecting this theory will be the major challenge.

*****BE CAUTIOUS***** The overall agenda of many of some reports is to completely restructure our fisheries management system by largely negating or by-passing the role of the eight management councils and creating a single national board which would be triggered by “eco-systems” management. If there is any scenario that would shut out the small boat fleet – this is it.

Whatever the state of our oceans, it is critically important to protect our fishery management process in the North Pacific as being the primary tool coastal communities have in mitigating the impacts of regulatory issues while educating ourselves and participating in the solutions.

IMPORTANT TO KNOW Only the **U.S. Commission on Oceans Policy** report will likely be of primary interest to Congress, but all the reports will have impacts on the public in general. The Nation’s response could very well have long-range implications for the North Pacific.

*****BE CAUTIOUS**** The **PEW Oceans Commission** 144-page report came out in June. The Commissions 18-member panel of politicians, scientists, fishermen and others, includes former Alaska Gov. Tony Knowles and is chaired by former White House Chief of Staff (Clinton Administration), Leon Panetta. The panel urges Congress to create a new federal agency to corral the mishmash of agencies that have some say in regulating oceans, and to set up new, conservation-minded regional councils to govern commercial fishing and other activity, specifically:

- a. Formation of a new oceans agency to take over the Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and marine-related programs run by departments of Interior and Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- b. A White House oceans council and a network of "regional ocean ecosystem councils" to participate in the regulation of farmland and urban runoff into oceans.

Alaska’s Congressional delegation blasted the report in no uncertain terms¹² even though it praised fishery management in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska, which serve up half the nation’s commercial catch. They said the Pew panel was too quick to junk the existing system of fishery management in favor of a new, Washington-centered bureaucracy. Alaska Republican Sen. Ted Stevens, chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee and author of some of the foremost federal fishery laws, said "I believe the Pew report is tainted by the millions of dollars they spend on environmental litigation aimed at stopping commercial fishing." Sen. Lisa Murkowski, said other activities such as recreational boating and fishing, and mineral interests "could be greatly restricted or wholly prohibited" by the Pew proposals.

¹² “Alaska lawmakers pan report on oceans/ Stevens troubled by criticism of councils “ The Associated Press, June 6, 2003

Jerry Fraser, Editor in Chief of *The National Fisherman*, noted in his “Editor’s Log” of August 2003, that “the Commission went to great lengths to hear from people in the grass roots... but it responded by proposing a two-tiered federal bureaucracy – an oceans agency and an executive council – as if to ensure that management becomes even more contentious than it is now and that coastal communities are all but locked out of the process.”¹³

The Pew study was funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, a multibillion-dollar Philadelphia-based foundation established by the family of Sun Oil Co. founder Joseph Pew.

www.pewoceans.org

WATCH FOR THIS **THE U.S. COMMISSION ON OCEANS POLICY** report is due out this fall. This is the group commissioned by Congress and their report is expected to get the most attention in Congress. In 2002 they released a preliminary report entitled: “Developing A National Ocean Policy: A Midterm Report from the U.S. Commission on Oceans.” Ed Rasmussen of Anchorage, newly appointed to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, has been a member of this Commission. For details check out their web site at www.usoceancommission.gov/

GOAC3 TESTIMONY TO THE U.S. OCEANS COMMISSION August 22, 2002

My name is Gale Vick. I am a small boat salmon fisherman¹⁴ in Prince William Sound and the Executive Director of the Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition or GOAC3 for short. We thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

The GOAC3 is a non-profit, membership-driven organization representing people who have made their living from the sea for millennia. There are 43 viable communities in the Gulf of Alaska with a population of over 44,000 people. These communities are almost totally marine-dependent. This includes commercial, subsistence and recreational fishing, tourism, transportation, and off-shore mineral development.

We are largely good stewards of our marine environments. While we do not have the extreme problems that face coastal communities around the nation, we share the essential problem of how to continue making a decent living so that the fabric of our communities does not unravel.

In the interest of time, I have a few brief recommendations as you consider your report:

Have clear definitions. Paranoia abounds from undefined terminology that could have the ultimate power to trump any local concern. “Eco-systems,” for instance, is such a vague concept that it cannot truly garner the support it needs until the term itself is better defined *and* until the processes by which we apply eco-systems approaches are clearly defined. We all believe in the intent, we just need to define the application.

¹³ Read Jerry’s full editorial in the August 2003 *The National Fisherman*

¹⁴ Women who commercially fish in Alaska generally prefer the generic term “fisherman” as it connotes an occupation and not a gender

Beware of any use of “burden of proof” that is not equally applicable to user, researcher, policy maker or litigant. Alaska’s coastal communities and fisheries have suffered the extreme form of “burden of proof” on the Steller sea lion issue. We are bearing the price of being guilty until we prove ourselves innocent. We have not had the resources nor the science to fight litigation which is immune from its own premise. Just because we can “control” people and not the resource or the weather or naturally occurring dramas and fluctuations, does *not* make this a good reason to put stakeholders out of business, thereby making fishing communities extinct. The safety and socio-economic price of being really wrong about Steller decline should make every pseudo-scientist bow their head in shame. There is no such “burden of proof” on the litigants in this issue.

The *intent* of “no harm”, of course, should always be expected but the process of *proving* “no harm” *before* we utilize a resource should never be the standard that conducts our use of a resource. If we use this standard, we will all be out of compliance, including the scientists. No one has the money, not to mention time, to prove “no harm” as it might be applicable to any lawsuit. Instead, we must focus on improving our science all the time so that we can make better common-sense decisions.

Encourage universal protocols and clearing-house units which will allow scientific and lay institutions to share knowledge and information, thereby improving all our efficiencies.

Be as definitive about socio-economics as environmental impact assessment. Impacts on stakeholders should never be dismissed and should be an intrinsic part of how we approach any regulatory scheme. Stakeholders must be consulted and included in determining what socio-economic factors should be considered.

Get the stakeholders more directly involved. You have heard many references to utilizing “anecdotal” and “traditional” information. I would like to take that one step further. Our organization has recently submitted a Salstonstall-Kennedy grant application for a project called Alaska Coastal Communities Observer System, or ACCOS. The basic premise of this project, supported strongly by our Senator Murkowski, is to create a corollary database to existing statistical models which can incorporate the incredible knowledge and observational ability that our communities have. We envision a pilot project within the Gulf of Alaska that can ultimately be applied around the nation. We believe this system will create much better awareness on both sides, better dialogue, and immense educational opportunity for everyone, including regulators, teachers, scientists, students, fishermen and the general public. This program would align with existing information systems for maximum utilization. I have attached a copy of the grant narrative with this written testimony.

Maximize the utilization of Local Area Management Plans (LAMPs.) There are several currently being proposed in Alaska to provide local solutions to user

conflicts. This is a very important tool toward building consensus and cooperation for conversation measures and conflict resolution at the community level.

Keep regulatory processes close to the bone: A system that removes the proximity to local stakeholders or does not account for massive regional differences will be a system that will ultimately be the demise of our coastal communities and fisheries and will serve no good purpose.

Finally, don't throw the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. Strengthen our regional councils so that they can do what they were designed to do. In the overall scheme of things, the twenty-five years since the implementation of the Magnuson Act is minute. Regional councils are the best system we can have provided they have the tools they need. A national oceans policy is one thing but a national oceans *board* will remove regional and local efforts and actually – as we know by experience in Alaska – create greater environmental and socio-economic problems. The more effectively we use local involvement, the greater the opportunity for correcting problems and preventing future ones.

In the North Pacific, our process *is* working but it is also a work *in* progress. We have historically shown that we can be responsive to community, industry and environmental needs. No system is perfect and we may have our own internal battles but we all know each other so it is tough to hide from unintended consequences. This helps keep us in balance. Give this process full due as it evolves toward even greater accountability to both environmental measures and community protections.

Thank you again for your time. We will be submitting more detailed testimony in writing at a later date. Your work will have great significance to all of us and we wish you well in your deliberations.

IMPORTANT TO KNOW

SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON OVERFISHING: During recent Senate Commerce committee hearing on global fisheries management and the problems of overfishing, Senator Olympia Snowe (Maine), Chair of the Oceans, Fisheries and Coast Guard Subcommittee, spoke of injecting “a good dose of common sense into the debate over science and how to balance environmental and social concerns.”¹⁵ “...”In recent weeks, America's eyes have opened to the challenges facing the state of our oceans and their fisheries resources. Beyond the long overdue exposure to marine conservation issues, I hope this new attention will actually lead to balanced and constructive debate on domestic and international resources. “The truth is, despite some shortcomings, domestic fisheries management are succeeding in rebuilding and sustaining our fisheries is working....Unfortunately, international fishing management has been much less effective,”

Sen. Snowe mentioned the successes of current fishery management.” For example, over the past five years 20 species have been removed from the overfished list and overfishing has been eliminated for 25 species. In New England, the groundfish complex has increased by more than

¹⁵ “Let's talk about good ol' common sense in debate over int'l fisheries management” By John Fiorillo, Jun. 13 2003 - The Wave News Network

150 percent in 5 years, and scallop fisheries are thriving," Some suggestions for better international management:

- Strengthen Commitment to International Commissions
- Encourage Global-Level Agreement
- Limit Industrial Fishing Subsidies
- Facilitate International Coordination

ACHIEVEMENTS IN MARINE STEWARDSHIP SINCE PASSAGE OF THE SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES ACT OF 1996

The passage of the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996, reauthorizing the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act, marked a significant change in the agency's legislative mandate to manage living marine resources. It provided NOAA Fisheries with strengthened management authority to address human impacts on the marine environment. The new authority resulted from a greater recognition of the need to prioritize essential fish habitat, bycatch reduction, fishing communities and fishing vessel safety. The Act also brought substantial changes in the management of marine fisheries in the U.S., with more stringent requirements to rebuild overfished fisheries and prevent overfishing.

NOAA Fisheries has approved rebuilding programs for almost all the overfished stocks. The challenge will be to develop effective plans for the remaining overfished stocks, to stay on course with rebuilding plans that are working, and to refine those plans that need amending to better achieve the purposes of the Sustainable Fisheries Act. Although some stocks remain overfished, the general biological trend for the status of the nation's stocks continues to be positive.

Over the period of 1997 to 2002, overfishing has been corrected a total of 26 times, and stocks have been rebuilt above their biomass thresholds a total of 20 times. The success stories include many valuable commercial or recreational species such as Atlantic (Acadian) redfish, Georges Bank winter flounder, Atlantic swordfish, sandbar shark, blacktip shark, Pacific sardine, Pacific (chub) mackerel, Snohomish River summer/fall chinook salmon, Strait of Juan de Fuca coho salmon, and Pacific coast chum salmon.

These and other fisheries management successes are highlighted in a new publication produced by NOAA Fisheries, *Implementing the Sustainable Fisheries Act: Achievements From 1996 to the Present*.

ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT (EFH) AND HABITAT AREAS OF PARTICULAR CONCERN (HAPC)

The Magnuson-Stevens Act mandates that any Fishery Management Plan (FMP) must include a provision to describe and identify essential fish habitat (EFH) for the fishery, minimize to the extent practicable adverse effects on such habitat caused by fishing, and identify other actions to encourage the conservation and enhancement of such habitat. Essential Fish habitat has been broadly defined by the Act to include "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity."

Future issues of *The Gulf Channel Marker* will have specific information on Essential Fish Habitat.

Check the NPFMC web site for all EFH updates and linkages.

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS (MPA)

BE CAUTIOUS

There are six categories of recognized Marine Protected Areas ranging from strict nature reserves to managed resource protected areas. MPAs should be designed for specific objectives, one of which can be to protect fishing opportunities and benefits to communities.

GOAC3 is participating with the State of Alaska on developing guidelines for MPAs in state waters so that they are (a) considered only with sound science, and (b) do not impact our local fisheries without good rationale and local input. Our state management system could already be considered a form of MPA, making Alaska one of the few, if not the only, state with a built-in design to protect habitat. Check out the federal and state MPA web sites for further information.

VI GOAC3 MAJOR INITIATIVES UPDATE

IMPORTANT TO KNOW

The Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition (GOAC3) specifically seeks to retain the maximum sustainable amount of fishing effort – harvesting, processing, tourism, subsistence, etc., within our coastal communities. We believe that rebuilding our fishing communities will also help us re-build markets and increase economic opportunities now and for future generations.

The GOAC3 is involved in many issues but there are key initiatives that we have helped to develop and that we promote as part of our mission. These include (but are not limited to)

COMMUNITY PURCHASE OF HALIBUT AND SABLEFISH

This initiative was approved by the North Pacific Council in April of 2002. It has since been reviewed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in Juneau for regulatory language. It should be heading to Washington, DC, soon for further regulatory and legal review. It will then be published in the *Federal Register* as “proposed rule.” It will have a 30-day commentary period and then it will go back through the review process to be approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce and to be published as “final rule.” What does this mean to potential application of this program for 2004. “Cautiously possible.”

What should we be doing in the meantime?

- look for funding sources
- start the development of community-based non-profits for the administration of the community purchase program
- develop recommendations for uniform protocols

HALIBUT CHARTER IFQS COMMUNITY SET-ASIDE

In April of 2001, the NPFMC approved a “community set-aside” within the proposed halibut charter IFQ system. The IFQ proposal is currently being reviewed by the National Marine Fisheries Service before being considered for publication in the *Federal Register* as “proposed rule.” Please see NPFMC web site, “Halibut Issues” for details.

One of the reasons the program may be in jeopardy is the use of data from log books required by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game during the qualifying years. A report requested by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council regarding this issue is available on the ADF&G web site.

LAMPS (LOCAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS)

The GOAC3 has actively pursued Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) options for our Gulf communities. We have initiated the Kodiak Island LAMP, which is before the Alaska Board of Fisheries. We have also encouraged residents of Prince of Wales Island to develop a template for a LAMP, especially regarding dive and mariculture issues.

LAMPS have many potential benefits, not the least of which is to help keep decision making local and to encourage cooperation among user groups when it comes to gear-conflicts, habitat protection and other near-shore issues.

The Sitka Sound Local Area Management Plan is the only active LAMP , developed because of near-shore depletion of halibut stocks - and results seem to be favorable. User groups including commercial, sports and subsistence users worked hard on the plan. The Sitka Sound plan may be reviewed through the NPFMC web site.

GOA PROPOSED GROUND FISH IFQ COMMUNITY OPTIONS

Currently before the North Pacific Council are options for analysis for a proposed groundfish IFQ program in the North Gulf. GOAC3 has taken a very strong position in support of analyzing a wide variety of community options so that our communities are not artificially restricted from harvesting and processing opportunities. Check out the items for analysis at the NPFMC website.

RESEARCH

The GOAC3 is working actively with research groups to provide as much *applied science* (science applicable to the needs of our fishing communities and industry) as possible to help all of us make the best decisions we can about fisheries and habitat management. In addition, the GOAC3 feels strongly about research on *socio-economic* impacts of regulatory decisions.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

- GOAC3 Technical Team members or Board of Directors are active members of the following organizations as part of our initiatives development:
- North Pacific Fishery Management Council Advisory Panel
- North Pacific Research Board Advisory Panel
- Alaska Legislative Salmon Task Force
- Prince William Sound Science Center Board of Directors
- United Fishermen of Alaska, Executive Board
- Alaska Board of Fisheries Marine Protected Area Committee (GOAC3's involvement is to help the state define criteria on whether or not we need MPAs and to provide community protections)
- International Pacific Halibut Commission Conference Committee

A future issue of *The Gulf Channel Marker* will discuss the GOAC3 initiatives for a community-based marine observation system.

Find further information at our website - www.goac3.org - or the North Pacific Fishery Management Council <http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/>

JOIN US: SOMETHING YOU CAN DO NOW

As you can see, the marine-related issues facing our coastal communities are multiple and complex. The Gulf of Alaska Coastal Communities Coalition (GOAC3) is a 501(c)6 non-profit, working hard to protect Gulf of Alaska communities' *sustainable* access to adjacent marine resources in perpetuity. We can't do this without the help of our members and many other organizations. We are one piece of the puzzle, but an important piece.

Please join us in this effort. Contact us directly or through our web site at www.goac3.org. Eligible VOTING members of the GOAC3 include Gulf of Alaska boroughs, cities, ANCSA regional and village corporations and tribal councils. NON-VOTING membership is open to everyone for an annual fee of \$100.00.

YOU REALLY SHOULD GET INVOLVED IN THIS!!!!

VII HOW TO GET INVOLVED IN THE COUNCIL PROCESS¹⁶

Why Get Involved?

Different people have different reasons for getting involved in the fisheries management process. Many groups are concerned about fisheries, including commercial fishermen, fishing families, recreational fishers, environmentalists, tribal members, consumers, scientists, the tourism industry, and local communities. Whatever their background or motivations, these groups share the common desire to ensure the health of fish populations and the marine ecosystems they depend on.

If you are a member of the commercial fishing community or if your business serves recreational fishers, the best reason to get involved is because this is the process that controls your livelihood. You may not have control over the weather, ocean conditions, or market prices, but if you get involved in the Council process you can have some input into the decisions that affect your business.

¹⁶ The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) offers the following information about the participating in the Council process. It is the most thorough explanation that we have found and we thank them for borrowing this information. Information in blue is verbatim from their web site. For information related to "contact the Council", contact the North Pacific Fishery Management Council in Anchorage or check their web site (see list)

Getting involved means commitment and hard work. It may mean reading documents, talking to people you don't know, going to meetings, speaking in public, writing letters or emails, joining or forming an association, or joining an advisory subpanel.

Ten Ways to Get Involved

Many members of the fishing community and the public do not have the time or resources to attend Council meetings. Luckily, there are ways to get involved in management without having to leave the comfort of your home or boat. Many of the suggestions below come from the publication *Fish or Cut Bait*, a guide to fisheries management written by anthropologists Bonnie McCay and Carolyn Creed (1999).

- Learn:
 - The first step to getting involved in the Council process is to learn about it. Learn how the Council system operates; learn about the context of the problem you are interested in. Learn how Council members see things, and why. Learn what terms and acronyms like “CPUE” and “optimum yield” mean (see list of acronyms). That way you will be more comfortable providing input, and your input will be more valuable. Some ways to learn
- Other websites related to fisheries management
- Get on a mailing list. The Council maintains extensive mailing lists of organizations and individuals who wish to receive meeting notices, agendas, newsletters, statistical documents, FMPs and proposed regulations.
- Visit the Council office
- Read the Council newsletter to learn about recent issues and decisions.
- Read other resources about how fisheries management works.
 - Who is responsible for managing our marine fish?
- Attend a Council, team or advisory group meeting. (Check the Council web site for upcoming meetings.)
- Join a group. There are groups organized around environmental issues, fishing gear types, fisheries, communities, and other interests. There are also groups that cut across interests and gear types. Join a group that represents your interests. If you can't find a group, create one. Joining a group will give you a greater voice, more motivation, and a larger pool of knowledge to draw from.
- Make informed comments Your comments will be most effective if they show that you know about the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the “National Standards” used to evaluate fishery management plans. Try to frame your comments and objections in these terms. Whether writing or testifying, make sure that your comments are relevant to whatever the Council is discussing at the moment.

- Know what stage of the process the Council is in. For example, are there important deadlines approaching? What political pressures are influencing this decision?
- Get to know someone. Getting to know someone is one of the best ways to make sure your voice is heard. Get to know your Council representative, other Council members, Committee members, and staff. If possible, get to know your fish and game department's local port biologists and discuss issues with them.
- Talk informally. One of the best ways to interact with the Council is simply to call up a Council member or staff. This provides a more personal way to discuss issues that concern or interest you. When calling, explain who you are, what your question or problem is, and ask for help in understanding what's going on. Ask for a list of the committees and key council members responsible for your fishery, and ask whom you should call to get more background or advice. You can also talk at meetings and hearings, in the halls during meetings, or at the Council offices. Be sure to attend informal events associated with Council meetings. You may also want to talk with state agency staff and your federal and state representatives.
- Attend a meeting All regular Council meetings and subcommittee or advisory meetings are open to the public. Subcommittee meetings are generally more informal than full Council meetings, and may be a better opportunity to express your opinions and ideas. (North Pacific Fishery Management Council meetings are generally held in Anchorage, Kodiak, Sitka, Seattle or Dutch Harbor.)
- Testify. Members of the commercial and recreational fishery, the environmental community, and the public are encouraged to testify at Council meetings and hearings. This involves speaking in a formal public forum. At Council meetings, the Council members and staff generally sit in a "U" formation and everyone else sits in chairs at one end of the room. You will have to walk up to a microphone to make your comments. Because of time constraints, public comment is limited to five minutes for individuals and ten minutes for representatives of groups. If comments are supplied to the Council two weeks before the meeting date, they are included in the packet of information (called a Briefing Book) that is distributed to each Council member at least a week before the Council meeting. It is best to be well prepared and as calm as possible when providing testimony. Read up on Council decisions related to your topic of interest and make sure that your comments are organized and relevant. Sign-up sheets are provided at the entrance of the meeting room for people who wish to address the Council. For more tips, see the sample testimony below.
- Write: The Council reads and considers all letters and emails that arrive before the briefing book deadline, two weeks before a Council meeting. Generally, letters are addressed to the Council Chair or the Executive Director. However, depending on the situation and the stage of the decision-making process, you may write letters or emails to a specific Council member, the Regional Director of NMFS, or others.
 - Make sure your letter is legible, either by typing or writing very clearly.

- When writing, be sure to identify the FMP, amendment, proposed rule, or other measure you are commenting on. Then state your position or opinion. Explain who you are and why the reader should pay attention to what you are saying. (For example, talk about your fishing experience or the group that you represent).
- Use short, clear sentences to state your position and explain why you feel the way you do.
- Whenever you can, be specific about how a proposed rule would affect you. Try to show how your personal interests relate to public or national interests. (For a sample, check the Pacific Fishery Management Council web site.)
- Letters must arrive prior to two weeks in advance of a Council meeting in order to be included in the Council members' briefing books.
- You can also write letters to trade magazines like National Fisherman or Pacific Fishing, which many managers read. Since the National Marine Fisheries Service reviews all Council decisions, it is also effective to write or call the Northwest or Southwest Region of NMFS.

- Serve: Interested citizens may serve on an advisory or committee panel¹⁷. If you are interested in serving, talk to the Executive Director and the key staff person for the fishery.
- Get involved in research efforts. Often, calls go out for vessel owners to charter their vessels for research efforts. While this is not a direct way to get involved in the Council process, it does help create connections with scientists and managers, and it allows vessel owners and scientists to learn more about each others' methods. It can also provide some extra income. (These efforts are publicized on the Northwest Fisheries Science Center website and the Heads Up! website.)

Will It Really Make a Difference? Involvement can range from writing a letter to serving on an advisory subpanel or team. No matter what level of involvement you choose, your views will have more weight and influence if you learn about the context of the decisions being made, the timeline for the decision making process, and the best ways to communicate with Council members and advisory subpanel members. As a member of a fisheries association said, "If you want to get involved in fisheries management, you should be willing to go to meetings and become an active participant, be willing to listen to others' views, and communicate clearly your own ideas."

You can get more information at the Pacific Fishery Management Council web site at www.pcouncil.org/operations/involved.html

VIII WEB LINKS AND WHERE TO GET OTHER INFORMATION

- LEXICON (OR: that strange fishery code) Does the jargon of fisheries management confuse you? You aren't alone. There are several hundred, probably thousands, of acronyms that are used in fisheries management. We've tried to keep current with most of them. You can request comprehensive list of acronyms from our office.

¹⁷ The GOAC3 is a member of the Advisory Panel to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council

CONTACTING YOUR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

- Senator Ted Stevens
 - <http://stevens.senate.gov/>
 - Anchorage Office 907-271-5915
 - Washington DC Office 202-224-3004
- Senator Lisa Murkowski
 - <http://www.senate.gov/~murkowski/>
 - Anchorage Office 907-271-3735
 - Washington DC Office 202-224-6665
- Congressman Don Young
 - <http://www.house.gov/donyoung/>
 - Anchorage Office 907-271-5978
 - Washington DC Office 202-225-5765
- On-line <http://congress.org/congressorg/home/>
- “Congress at Your Fingertips” Capitol Advantage© 108th Congress, via Capitol Advantage Publishing, www.capitoladvantage.com

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ON THE GULF OF ALASKA

- Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development
<http://www.dced.state.ak.us/>
- Alaska Regional Development Organizations (ARDORs)
www.dced.state.ak.us/cbd/ardor/ardor
 - Prince William Sound Economic Development Council
 - Southeast Conference
 - Southwest Alaska Municipal Conference (SWAMC)
- Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Alaska-Anchorage. <http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/>
- North Pacific Fishery Management Council <http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/>

WEB SITE TO CHECK ON A REGULAR BASIS

- The ALASKA Report <http://www.alaskareport.com/>
- North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC)
<http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/>
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/>
- Alaska Board of Fisheries
<http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/boards/fishinfo/bofhome.htm>
- State of Alaska - Department of Fish & Game
<http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/adfghome.htm>
- State of Alaska - Department of Fish & Game Division of Commercial Fisheries
- International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC)
<http://www.iphc.washington.edu/halcom/default.htm>

- Heads Up! -- <http://www.heads-up.net/>

MARKET INFORMATION RESOURCES

- The ALASKA REPORT is one of the most useful web sites for Alaska's commercial fishermen. <http://www.alaskareport.com/>
- Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) <http://www.alaskaseafood.org/> The mission statement of the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute: "To increase the worldwide consumption of Alaska Seafood and promote the quality and superiority of Alaska seafood products."
- Alaska Seafood Marketing Board (PENDING)
- Salmon Marketing Information Service
<http://asmi.safeshopper.com/34/cat34.htm?17>
- Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation (AFDF) <http://www.afdf.org/>
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/>
- North Pacific Fisheries Management Council (NPFMC)
<http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/>
- *National Fisherman* <http://www.nationalfisherman.com/>
- *Pacific Fishing* <http://www.pfmag.com/>
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC) <http://www.cfec.state.ak.us/>
- Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification: Check out their web site for how this helps market sustainable Alaskan wild stock. <http://www.msc.org/>

STAT PACKS: Looking for the latest statistical information on your fishery? Check out

- the National Marine Fisheries Service <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/>
- *Pacific Fishing Year Book 2003* March 2003 <http://www.pfmag.com/>
- Salmon Market Information Service
www.alaskaseafood.org/fishingprocessing/bulletin

RESEARCH

- The North Pacific Research Board (NPRB) met May 20th in Anchorage. A newly-appointed 10-member Advisory Panel met the day before.
<http://www.nprb.org/npmri/>
- University of Alaska-Fairbanks <http://www.uaf.edu/>
- University of Alaska – Southeast <http://www.uas.alaska.edu/>
- Kodiak Fish Tech Center
- Office of Fisheries Development
<http://www.dced.state.ak.us/cbd/seafood/seafood.htm>
- The Prince William Sound Science Center. <http://www.pwssc.gen.ak.us/frames/>
 - Oil Spill Response Institute (OSRI) www.pwssc-osri.org/
- Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council (EVOS/TC) <http://www.oilspill.state.ak.us/>
 - Gulf Ecosystem Management (GEM) <http://www.oilspill.state.ak.us/>

- Prince William Sound Regional Citizen’s Advisory Council (PWS/RCAC) <http://www.pwsrcac.org/>
- Cook Inlet Regional Citizen’s Advisory Council (CI/RCAC) <http://www.circac.org/>
- Alaska SeaLife Center) <http://www.alaskasealife.org/>
- Arctic Institute of the North <http://www.ucalgary.ca/aina/>
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration / National Marine Fisheries Service NOAA/ NMFS - main web site – www.nmfs.noaa.gov–

ENVIRONMENTAL

- Alaska Marine Conservation Council (AMC2) <http://www.akmarine.org/>
- Tidepool <http://www.tidepool.org/>
- Prince William Sound Regional Citizen’s Advisory Council (PWS/RCAC) <http://www.pwsrcac.org/>
- Oil Spill Response Institute (OSRI) www.pwssc-osri.org/
- Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council (EVOS/TC) <http://www.oilspill.state.ak.us/>
- Gulf Ecosystem Management (GEM) <http://www.oilspill.state.ak.us/>
- The North Pacific Research Board (NPRB) <http://www.nprb.org/npmri/>
- The Prince William Sound Science Center. <http://www.pwssc.gen.ak.us/frames/>
- The Federal MPA Committee <http://mpa.gov/mpabusiness/fac.html>
- The State of Alaska MPA web site is http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/geninfo/special/mpa/mpa_home.htm
- IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas website:
 - http://www.unep-wcmc.org/protected_areas/categories/eng/
- Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC) <http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc/Committees/EFH/efh.htm>

SUBSISTENCE:

- UFA Subsistence web site: www.subsistmginfo.org/
- Alaska Department of Fish & Game’s subsistence web at <http://www.state.ak.us/local/akpages/FISH.GAME/subsist/subhome.htm>.
- The federal subsistence web is located at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: www.r7.fws.gov/asm/home.html

MARINE MAMMALS

- NMFS Steller sea lion site: <http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/protectedresources/stellers.htm>
- The Alaska Department of Fish and Game’s SSL page: http://www.state.ak.us/adfg/geninfo/special/ssl/ssl_com.htm
- The North Pacific Fishery Management Council
- National Marine Mammal Laboratory (NMML) Report to Congress <http://nmml.afsc.noaa.gov/>
- The North Pacific Universities Marine Mammal Research Consortium– UBC <http://www.marinemammal.org/>

OTHER WEB LINKS OF INTEREST

- United Fishermen of Alaska <http://www.alaska.net/~usag/ufa/>
- Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation (AFDF) <http://www.afdf.org/>
- Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) <http://www.alaskaseafood.org/>

- Alaska Seafood Marketing Report <http://asmi.safeshopper.com/34/512.htm?783>
- Alaska Symphony of Seafood <http://www.symphonyofseafood.com/>
- Alaska Department of Community & Economic Development
<http://www.dced.state.ak.us/>
- Fishing For The Future <http://www.fishingforthefuture.org/>
- Fish Expo & Work Boat Northwest-- <http://www.fishexposeattle.com/>
- International Boston Seafood Show <http://www.bostonseafood.com/>
- National Fisheries Institute <http://www.nfi.org/>
- Marine Fisheries Conservation Network (MFCN) <http://www.conservefish.org/>
- International West Coast Seafood Show <http://www.westcoastseafood.com/>
- At-Sea Processors Association (APA) <http://www.atsea.org/>
- Pacific Seafood Processors Association (PSPA) <http://www.pspafish.net/>
- Saltonstall Kennedy Grant Program <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ocs/skhome.html>
- State of Alaska - Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Health's seafood page <http://www.state.ak.us/dec/deh/>
- United Salmon Association <http://www.ptialaska.net/~usalmon/>
- University of Alaska Fishery Industrial Technology Center, Kodiak
<http://www.sfos.uaf.edu/fitc/>
- University of Alaska School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences <http://www.sfos.uaf.edu/>
- University of Alaska Sea Grant College Program <http://www.uaf.edu/seagrant/>
- University of Alaska Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program <http://www.uaf.edu/map/>
- USDA Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) <http://www.fas.usda.gov/>
- Wild Salmon Center (Visit for more information on the 2001 Pacific Rim Wild Salmon and Steelhead Conference, Nov. 5-6.) <http://www.wildsalmoncenter.org/>
- World Trade Center Alaska <http://www.wtcaak.org/>
- FishLink.com www.fishlink.info/fishlink/
- Comfish at www.ComFish.org
- Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) <http://www.ams.usda.gov/COOL>.
- Anchorage-based Phoenix Food Consulting,