

**Statement to the Pacific Fishery Management Council
by the Highly Migratory Species Plan Development Team
June 30, 2000**

1. Introduction

This progress report of the Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Plan Development Team (PDT) summarizes the work to date on the HMS fishery management plan (FMP). This is work in progress which may be revised or amended at a later date. The statement also includes several issues for which the Team seeks Council guidance; these issues are listed in bold in the document and are summarized in the last section of the PDT statement.

2. Summary of PDT Meeting

The PDT met in Astoria, Oregon from June 5 through June 7. The meeting commenced with a presentation by Dr. Chris Boggs, Western Pacific Fishery Management Council's Pelagic Fishery Management Team Chair, on the Hawaiian longline closure due to sea turtles, a discussion of its limited entry program, observers, and logbooks, a discussion of the take of sharks in the longline fishery, and discussions of seabirds and vessel monitoring systems (VMS). Steve Crooke next summarized the recent meeting of the Take Reduction Team. Elizabeth Mitchell subsequently went through the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA). Susan Smith proposed essential fish habitat designations for sharks. Michele Robinson presented an analysis of inconsistencies of state regulations for HMS commercial and sport fisheries. David Colpo, Pacific States Marine Commission, Tana McHale, American Fishermen's Research Foundation, and Dale Squires summarized the status of the economic survey of the albacore and drift net fisheries and discussed sample design for the albacore troll fishery. The PDT also went through the proposed outline for the FMP to insure consistency with the MSFCMA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to make team assignments. The PDT also evaluated the proposed time schedule for completion of the FMP.

3. Management Unit Species

Elizabeth Mitchell explained to the PDT that species can be included in an FMP in:

- (1) the management unit (actively managed species);
- (2) for data collection;
- (3) for bycatch reduction;
- (4) as prohibited species.

Species in the management unit require estimates of maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and definitions of overfishing. When species are included in the FMP for data collection purposes, they can subsequently be added to the management unit if desired. This requires a plan amendment.

The PDT developed five options for the management unit, which reflect the range of public opinions on this issue. These options are included in Appendix I. Option 1 is the PDT's preferred option. The PDT recommends that all options be analyzed in the draft EIS/FMP.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on its choice of species to include in the management unit. (All issues in which the PDT seeks guidance are highlighted in the main text and are summarized in the last section.)

4. Consistency of Regulations

Appendix II summarizes the states' current HMS regulations and identifies inconsistencies and concerns. PDT recommendations for how to address each of the concerns are provided.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Advisory Subpanel and Council on regulatory options which should be analyzed.

5. Bonito

The PDT discussed the placement of bonito in either the HMS or Coastal Pelagic Species (CPS) FMP. Bonito is not currently covered by any of the five options for the management unit in the HMS FMP and is not currently included in the CPS FMP. Bonito is not defined as a highly migratory species; however, bonito is a species with management and constituent concerns.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on whether the CPS FMP or proposed HMS FMP should include bonito.

6. HMS FMP Outline

Appendix III presents the proposed outline for the HMS FMP.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on the proposed outline.

7. Schedule

Appendix IV is the schedule of Council, PDT and other relevant HMS meetings.

The PDT discussed the proposed schedule for completion of the FMP. The schedule calls for a first draft to be presented to the Council in September 2000, approval of the draft at the November 2000 meeting, public hearings in the winter, and final action at the April 2001 meeting. The PDT observed that a first draft copy of the HMS FMP could be provided at the September meeting but that the economic section, which relies on on-going surveys, would be incomplete and inadequate for preparation of the Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) and Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) analyses. Funding for the drift net fishery economic survey

will only be received in June and the albacore survey is still waiting for Office of Management and Budget Paperwork Reduction Act clearance. The PDT expects results to be available in December 2000. In addition, the PDT is concerned that the schedule will not allow adequate time for the Council family to propose and analyze options for conservation and management, bycatch minimization, and other measures.

The PDT believes that a more realistic schedule would include approval of the draft FMP at the March or April 2001 meeting, hearings in early summer, and final adoption at the September 2001 meeting.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on the proposed schedule.

8. Management Objectives

Appendix V lists the proposed management objectives for west coast HMS fisheries.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on the proposed management objectives.

9. Collaboration with the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council Team

The PDT is actively coordinating its work with the Pelagics Plan Team of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council. Dale Squires and David Au attended the May meeting of the Pelagics Plan Team, and Chris Boggs, chair of that Team, attended our June meeting. The two Teams are coordinating their definitions of overfishing, population assessments and species coverage to the extent possible.

10. HMS Advisory Panel Funding and Schedule

The PDT observes that the Advisory Subpanel is unable to schedule meetings of sufficient duration and frequency to provide the desired feedback and advice to the Council and PDT. The PDT is concerned that insufficient funding is available for the advisors to meet these obligations. The items to be discussed at the July meeting of the PDT include several issues (bycatch reduction, prohibited species, and species in the FMP) for which the PDT is seeking Advisory Subpanel input and advice.

Council Guidance: The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on the HMS Advisory Subpanel's funding and scheduling.

11. Topics of Council Guidance Summarized

The PDT seeks guidance from the Council on the following topics:

- a. Choice of species to include in the management unit;
- b. Consistency of commercial and sport regulations;
- c. Whether the CPS FMP or HMS FMP should include bonito;
- d. The proposed outline;
- e. The plan development schedule;
- f. The management objectives; and
- g. Funding and scheduling of Advisory Subpanel meetings.

Attachments:

- Appendix I. Alternatives for the Management Unit
- Appendix II. Status of State Regulations and Regulatory Options
- Appendix III. Proposed Outline for the HMS FMP
- Appendix IV. Team Meeting and HMS FMP Schedule
- Appendix V. Management Objectives for West Coast Highly Migratory Species Fisheries

APPENDIX I

OPTIONS FOR MANAGEMENT UNIT SPECIES FOR THE HMS FMP

Option	Definition/Criteria	Species	
Option 1 - <u>Preferred Alternative</u>	Include species identified in the “white paper” and approved by the Council; these species meet the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occur in the Pacific Council’s management area, and • occur in West Coast Highly Migratory Species fisheries, and • are defined as Highly Migratory Species in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or the Law of the Sea Annex I, and • have importance (moderate to high value) in the landings or to the fishery, and • are managed by the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council 	Albacore tuna Bigeye tuna Bluefin tuna Skipjack tuna Yellowfin tuna Striped marlin Swordfish	Blue shark Bigeye thresher shark Common thresher shark Pelagic thresher shark Mako shark
Option 2	Include species which meet all of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occur in the Pacific Council’s management area, and • occur in West Coast Highly Migratory Species fisheries, and • are defined as Highly Migratory Species in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or the Law of the Sea Annex I, and • have importance (moderate to high value) in the landings or to the fishery, and • sufficient data exists to calculate a biological-based MSY, and • occur in fisheries which the Pacific Council would like to actively manage 	Albacore tuna Bigeye tuna Bluefin tuna Yellowfin tuna Striped marlin Swordfish (Maximum list)	Blue shark
Option 3	Include species which meet all of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occur in the Pacific Council’s management area, and • occur in West Coast Highly Migratory Species fisheries, and • are defined as Highly Migratory Species in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or the Law of the Sea Annex I, and • have importance (moderate to high value) in the landings or to the fishery, and • sufficient data exists to calculate a biological-based MSY 	Albacore tuna Bigeye tuna Bluefin tuna Yellowfin tuna Striped marlin Swordfish	Blue shark
Option 4	Include species which meet all of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occur in the Pacific Council’s management area, and • occur in West Coast Highly Migratory Species fisheries, and • are defined as Highly Migratory Species in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or the Law of the Sea Annex I, and • have importance (moderate to high value) in the landings or to the fishery, and • possess special biological characteristics (e.g., low productivity), <u>or</u> • sufficient data exists to calculate a biological-based MSY 	Albacore tuna Bigeye tuna Bluefin tuna Yellowfin tuna Striped marlin Swordfish	Blue shark Bigeye thresher shark Common thresher shark Pelagic thresher shark Mako shark Sharks in family Hexanchidae
Option 5	Include species which meet all of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occur in the Pacific Council’s management area, and • occur in West Coast Highly Migratory Species fisheries, and 	Albacore tuna Bigeye tuna Bluefin tuna	Blue shark Bigeye thresher shark Common thresher shark

Option	Definition/Criteria	Species	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are defined as Highly Migratory Species in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or the Law of the Sea Annex I, and have importance (moderate to high value) in the landings or to the fishery 	Skipjack tuna Yellowfin tuna Striped marlin Swordfish	Pelagic thresher shark Mako shark Sharks in family Hexanchidae Dolphinfinh

APPENDIX II

STATUS OF STATE REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY OPTIONS

RECREATIONAL FISHERY

Licenses

Currently, a recreational fishing license is not required to fish for albacore tuna off Washington; however, a recreational fishing license is required in Oregon and California. In addition, California requires an “ocean fishing enhancement stamp” south of Point Arguello. Changes in licenses require state legislative action.

Team Recommendation: The Team recommends that Washington consider adding albacore tuna to its existing recreational fishing license with a catch record for data purposes.

Seasons

Fishing is open year-round coastwide with minor exceptions in specific areas off Oregon (i.e., Pyramid Rock, Three Arch Rocks, Whale Cove) and off California. California has several marine reserves and preserves, some of which prohibit fishing; as such, these areas may be closed to bluefin tuna and thresher shark harvest. Changes to season structure require action by each state’s respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Daily Bag Limit

Washington does not have a daily bag limit for HMS species; Oregon has a daily bag limit of 25 fish in aggregate. California has a 20 finfish bag limit with no more than 10 fish of any one species. In addition, the following sublimits apply in California within the 20 fish aggregate limit:

- marlin - 1
- swordfish - 2
- blue shark - 2
- shortfin mako shark - 2
- sixgill shark - 1
- sevengill shark - 1
- thresher shark - 2

There are no limits on albacore, bluefin and skipjack tuna in California. Changes to daily bag limits require action by each state’s respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and does not believe that there is a biological basis for a daily bag limit for albacore tuna. The Team is not recommending any changes.

Possession Limit

There is no possession limit in Washington (since there is no daily bag limit). The possession limit in Oregon is 2 daily bag limits and the possession limit in California is up to 3 daily bag limits, depending on the duration of the trip and filing of a multi-day declaration. Changes to possession limits require action by each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Minimum Size Limit

There are no minimum size limits for HMS fisheries coastwide. Changes to minimum size limits requires the action of each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Fishing Gear

HMS recreational fishing gear is comparable coastwide—with troll and hook-and-line gears used in each state. "Mousetrap gear" is specifically prohibited in California. Changes to legal fishing gears requires the action of each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Prohibited Species

The taking of white sharks and basking sharks is prohibited in California. Prohibiting species requires action by each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The white shark is primarily taken incidental to other fisheries and occasionally by recreational anglers. It is not abundant or productive enough to sustain any directed fishery, but is considered potentially vulnerable because of its value in trade or as a trophy fish. Biological information indicates that white sharks occur in the Eastern Pacific North to Grays Harbor, Washington. The Team recommends that Oregon and Washington prohibit the take of white sharks.

Logbook Program for Charter Boats

California has a mandatory logbook requirement for charter boats and Washington has initiated a voluntary logbook program this year.

Team Recommendation: The Team recommends that Oregon consider a voluntary logbook program.

COMMERCIAL FISHERY

Licenses

Currently, in Washington a salmon troll fishing license or a non-salmon delivery permit is required to deliver HMS into Washington. A Washington fishing license is not required to fish for albacore tuna.

In Oregon, a commercial fishing license is required to fish for or land HMS into Oregon (Oregon also has an albacore tuna landing license which may be used in lieu of a commercial fishing license when landing only albacore tuna).

In California, a commercial fishing license is required to fish for or land HMS into California. In addition, the following permits are also required in California:

- Permit to land California-caught fish at points outside California
- Permit for sharks or swordfish using drift gillnets (limited entry license) and a gillnet/trammel net permit
- Permit to fish for broadbill swordfish (harpoon)

Changes in licenses require state legislative action.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Seasons

HMS fishing seasons are open year-round in all three states with a few exceptions in California: California does not allow commercial fishing for marlin; and the drift gillnet season is from May-Aug 14 offshore (outside 75 miles) and Aug 15-Jan inshore (to within 3 miles, where designated). Changes to season structure requires the action of each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

Fishing Gear

All three states allow the use of troll gear, or hook-and-line gear. Washington and California prohibit the use of drift longlines.

In Washington, the use of gillnets in Pacific Ocean waters is prohibited; sharks may be caught with otter trawl, beam trawl, set lines, bottomfish pots, commercial jig, and troll lines. It is unlawful to use bottomfish trawl gear in state waters (0-3 miles).

In Oregon, legal gears are handline, pole and line, longline, seines, and spears. Set nets for groundfish is legal south of 38°N latitude (Pt. Reyes, CA). It is unlawful to use gillnets for thresher shark.

In California, legal gears are gill nets, drift gill nets, and trammel nets; set lines are legal in Districts 6, 7, 10, 17, 18, and 19; set lines cannot be used for shortfin mako, thresher, swordfish, or marlin.

Team Recommendation: The Team has identified the following management concerns:

- A California drift gillnet-permitted fisher can fish off of Washington (outside 3 miles only and only if not licensed by Washington), Oregon (outside 3 miles only), and California, but can land only in California.
- Drift longlines (pelagic longlines) can be used off of Washington (outside 3 miles only and only if not licensed by Washington), Oregon, and California (outside 3 miles only and only if not licensed by California), but can only land in Oregon.
- An Oregon- or California-licensed longline fisher can fish in the area located North of Hawaii which is closed to Hawaiian longline fishers and deliver into Oregon or California.
- A Hawaiian longline fisher (not licensed by WA, OR, or CA) can fish off the West Coast (outside 3 miles) and deliver into Washington or Oregon.

Most of these concerns can be best addressed through state and/or federal action and coordination with the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Species-Specific Regulations Including Prohibited Species

Oregon prohibits the use of gillnets to take thresher shark; however, incidental catches of thresher shark taken in the swordfish gillnet fishery are permitted.

California prohibits the taking of white shark and basking shark in its commercial fisheries; bluefin tuna weighing less than 7 ½ pounds cannot be canned; and incidental catches of swordfish or marlin by gillnet or trammel net must be delivered to CDF&G.

Team Recommendation: The white shark is primarily taken incidental to other fisheries and occasionally by recreational anglers. It is not abundant or productive enough to sustain any directed fishery, but is considered potentially vulnerable because of its value in trade or as a trophy fish. Biological information indicates that white sharks occur in the Eastern Pacific

North to Grays Harbor, Washington. The Team recommends that Oregon and Washington prohibit the take of white sharks.

Wastage and Shark Finning

It is unlawful to waste or destroy food fish in all three states. California specifically prohibits the landing or possession of “any shark fin or shark tail or portion thereof that has been removed from the carcass.”

Washington indirectly prohibits shark finning by WAC 220-20-010 which states that it is “unlawful to take, fish for, possess or transport for any purpose food fish, shellfish or parts thereof, in or from any waters or land over which the state of Washington has jurisdiction, or from the waters of the Pacific Ocean....”

Oregon indirectly prohibits shark finning by OAR 635-006-0210 which states that fishing receiving tickets need to include the pounds of each species received; pounds are to be determined by taking the actual round weights of the fish unless a conversion from dressed weight has been established in the OARs.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

FAR OFFSHORE FISHERY

All three states have regulations for far offshore fisheries which are similar. Washington’s far offshore regulations pertain to bottomfish only, which includes sharks. Oregon’s far offshore regulations also pertain to bottomfish and have a specific exception for albacore and swordfish. California’s far offshore regulations pertain to all fish.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

EXPERIMENTAL, EMERGING, OR DEVELOPMENTAL FISHERY

Currently, all three states have regulations pertaining to experimental, emerging, or developmental fisheries.

In Washington, an experimental fishery cannot be conducted on a species managed under a federal FMP; however, trial commercial fisheries can be conducted on federally managed species, but the number of participants cannot be limited.

In Oregon, a developmental fishery can be conducted on a species managed under a federal FMP and the number of participants can be limited.

In California, an emerging fishery cannot be conducted for a fishery with a federal FMP in which the catch is limited within a designated time period.

Changes to experimental fishery regulations require action by each state's respective Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Team Recommendation: The Team has not identified any management concerns and is not recommending any changes.

APPENDIX III

OUTLINE

Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Pacific Fishery Management Council

COVER SHEET

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Need for and Scope of the FMP
- Proposed Actions
- Rationale for the Proposed Actions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF REQUIRED CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 What's in the FMP
- 1.2 Complexity of HMS Management
- 1.3 History of the FMP
- 1.4 Purpose and Need for the FMP
- 1.5 Management Context
 - 1.5.1 MHLIC
 - 1.5.2 IATTC and Implementing Legislation
 - 1.5.3 UN Implementing Agreement
 - 1.5.4 U.S.-Canada Albacore Treaty
 - 1.5.5 Western Pacific FMP
 - 1.5.6 Other Fishery Management Plans (Atlantic)
 - 1.5.7 Relationship to Existing HMS Fishery Management
 - 1.5.8 Description of Treaty Rights
 - 1.5.9 Other (SCTB, ISC)
- 1.6 Scoping
- 1.7 Problems and Issues
- 1.8 Management Objectives
- 1.9 List of Preparers
- 1.10 Public Review Process and Schedule
- 1.11 Agencies and Organizations Consulted

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERIES (ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT)

2.1 Description of the Domestic Fisheries and Fishing Gear (commercial, recreational and charter)

2.2 Characteristics of the Domestic Fisheries

2.3 Characteristics of Support Industries and Communities

2.4 Limited Entry Considerations for Control Date Sectors

2.5 International Fisheries

2.6 Issues

3.0 STATUS OF FISH STOCKS (BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT)

3.1 Species Addressed by the FMP

3.1.1 Management Unit Species (Actively Managed)

3.1.2 Species Included for Data Collection Purposes

3.1.3 Species Which are Bycatch in HMS Fisheries

3.1.4 Prohibited Species

3.1.5 Protected Species Interacting with HMS Fisheries

3.2 Overfishing Criteria

3.3 Status of Management Unit Stocks

4.0 ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT (PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT)

4.1 Identification of EFH

4.2 Description of EFH

4.3 Threats to EFH and Recommended Conservation Measures

5.0 CURRENT MANAGEMENT

5.1 State Regulations

5.2 Federal Regulations

5.3 International Management

5.4 Tribal Management

5.5 Research and Data Collection Programs

5.6 Issues

6.0 PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

7.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

7.1 Framework Procedures

7.2 Conservation and Management Measures (e.g., permits, reporting requirements, input/output controls)

7.3 EFH Protection Recommendations

7.4 Standardized Reporting of Bycatch and Measures to Minimize Bycatch

7.5 Measures to Minimize Mortality of Fish Released Alive During Recreational Fishing

7.6 Protected Species Conservation

7.7 Research and Data Needed for Management

- 7.8 MSFCMA Specifications (DAH, DAP, JVP, TALFF)
- 7.9 Limited Entry
- 7.10 Provisions for Temporary Weather Adjustments

8.0 IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS (Including requirements of EIS, FIS, RFA, RIR)

- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Biological and Ecological Impacts
- 8.3 Economic and Social Impacts
- 8.4 Degree to Which Objectives Are Met
- 8.5 Consistency with MSFCMA and National Standards
- 8.6 Fishery Management Costs
- 8.7 Equitable Allocation of Harvest Reductions

9.0 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS AND DIRECTIVES

- 9.1 NEPA
- 9.2 E.O. 12866 (Regulatory Impact Reviews)
- 9.3 Regulatory Flexibility Act
- 9.4 Paperwork Reduction Act
- 9.5 Marine Mammal Protection Act
- 9.6 Endangered Species Act
- 9.7 Coastal Zone Management Act
- 9.8 E.O. 12962 (Recreational Fisheries)
- 9.9 E.O. 12612 (Federalism)
- 9.10 International Obligations

10.0 PROPOSED REGULATIONS

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

- A. Life History Accounts and Essential Fish Habitat Descriptions
- B. Plan Development Team Meeting Summaries
- C. Cetacean Take Reduction

APPENDIX IV

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES PLAN DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

Adopted by
Pacific Fishery Management Council
on
March 9, 2000

DATE	ACTIVITY	LOCATION
✓ Dec. 8-9, 1999	Plan Development Team meeting	NMFS-SWFSC La Jolla
✓ Jan. 31 - Feb. 2, 2000	Team meeting	NMFS-Pacific Fisheries Environmental Group Pacific Grove, CA
✓ Feb. 14-17, 2000	Pelagic Shark Workshop	Asilomar, Pacific Grove, CA
✓ March 6-10, 2000	Council meeting (March 9) - progress report - consider control date Advisory Subpanel meeting (March 8)	Sacramento Red Lion Hotel
✓ March 13-15, 2000	Team meeting	Holiday Inn - SeaTac Seattle, WA (206-248-1000)
✓ April 3-7, 2000	Council meeting	Portland Doubletree Hotel - Columbia R.
✓ April 12-19, 2000	MHLC	Honolulu
✓ April 26, 2000	Team video conference	NMFS offices in La Jolla, Long Beach, Portland, Seattle
✓ May 9-11, 2000	Pacific Offshore Cetacean Take Reduction Team	NMFS - Long Beach
✓ May 15-19, 2000	IATTC Meeting	La Jolla
✓ May 22-25, 2000	Tuna Conference	Lake Arrowhead, CA
✓ June 5-7, 2000	Team meeting	Port of Astoria 1 Port Way Astoria, OR (541-325-4521)
✓ June 7-17, 2000	IATTC meeting	San Jose, Costa Rica
June 26-30, 2000	Council meeting (June 30) - Team progress report Advisory Subpanel meeting (June	Portland Doubletree Hotel - Columbia R.

	29)	
July 17-20, 2000	Team meeting	NMFS - SWFSC La Jolla
August 14-18, 2000	Team meeting	NMFS - SWFSC La Jolla
August 21 - ??	MHLC - final round	Fiji
Sept. 11-15, 2000	Council meeting - present first draft FMP Advisory Subpanel meeting?	Sacramento Red Lion Hotel
Sept. 25-27, 2000	Team meeting	Portland
Oct. 30-Nov. 3, 2000	Council meeting - adopt draft FMP for review Advisory Subpanel meeting?	Portland
Nov. 13-17, 2000	Team meeting	NMFS - SWFSC La Jolla
Jan. 8-10, 2001	Team meeting	NMFS - SWFSC La Jolla
Feb. - Mar., 2001	Public hearings	Various locations (TBA)
March 5-9, 2001	Council meeting	Portland Doubletree Hotel - Columbia R.
April 2-6, 2001	Council meeting - adopt final FMP Advisory Subpanel meeting?	Sacramento Red Lion Hotel
April ?, 2001	Team meeting to finalize documents	TBA

HMSPDT/LDS
06/12/2000

APPENDIX V

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES FOR WEST COAST HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES FISHERIES

- Ensure or contribute to the long-term conservation and sustainable use of highly migratory fish stocks through relevant provisions of international law.
- Provide viable and diverse commercial and recreational fisheries for highly migratory species within the Exclusive Economic Zone under the Pacific Council's jurisdiction.
- Implement harvest strategies which achieve optimum yield for long-term sustainable harvest levels.
- Participate in cooperative international, inter-Regional Fishery Management Council, and interstate management of highly migratory species fisheries.
- Minimize conflicts among federal and state regulations for highly migratory species fisheries.
- Minimize bycatch and avoid discard—implement measures to adequately account for total bycatch and discard mortalities.
- Prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks.
- Acquire biological information and develop a long-term research program.
- Promote effective monitoring and enforcement.
- Minimize gear conflicts.
- Maintain, restore, or enhance the current quantity and productive capacity of habitats to increase fishery productivity for the benefit of the resource and commercial and recreational fisheries for highly migratory species.