

**PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION**  
58th Annual Meeting - Alaska

**ISSUES/QUESTIONS 2005**

9/14/2005

**1.** Does the Commission support the Science & Statistical Committee (SSC) recommendations outlined in the Stevens Staff Working Draft? Those include, SSC appointed by the Council (Commission has supported this in the past); that SSC set "not to be exceeded total allowable catch"; SSC formal peer review options.

PSMFC Commission approved the recommendations.

**2.** Does the Commission support training for Council Members as outlined in the Stevens Staff Draft?

PSMFC Commission approves the training, approves as mandatory BUT would not stop a member from voting if training was unavailable.

**3.** Does the Commission support the NEPA sufficient process as outlined in the Stevens Staff Draft?

PSMFC Commission supports the Council Chair's position under NEPA.  
(CA voted No)

**4.** Does the Commission support the concept of Ecosystem Management, but like the Council Chairs, does not think the Act should be amended to specifically include it?

PSMFC Commission supports the Councils in recognizing Eco-based Management, but it should not be in the Act.

**5.** Does the Commission support the Cooperative Research Program as outlined in the Stevens Staff Draft?

PSMFC Commission supports the Draft and seeks clarification with the inclusion of NGO's and treaty Tribes and that these funds should focus on fishing industry participation.

**6.** Does the Commission support the Bycatch Reduction Program as outlined in the Stevens Staff Draft?

PSMFC Commission supports the program, but only with a 12 month timeframe.

**7.** Does the Commission support the Cooperative Enforcement Program elements as outlined in the Stevens Staff Draft?

PSMFC Commission supports the Stevens Draft and wants to include "treaty tribal" and ALL (Idaho) regulators who set on regional management councils.

**8.** Does the Commission support the Council Chair's recommendation on overfishing and rebuilding? (End overfishing in one year and rebuilding period should be as short as possible and delete the "not to exceed 10 years")  
PSMFC Commission supports the Council Chair's position. Rebuilding plans should be part of the plan to end overfishing in one year.

**9.** Does the Commission support the Stevens Staff Draft on Limited Access Programs?  
PSMFC Commission supports the authority in the Stevens Draft but the details to be worked out at regional council levels - want authorization of a tool box without being told how they are to use the tools. Oregon votes NO.

**10.** Does the Commission support the *Stevens Staff Draft* on Data Reporting, Confidentiality Standards and Protection for Specific Data Types?  
PSMFC Commission supports increase in data protection and supports authorization of collection of data and implementation at a regional level.  
CONFIDENTIALITY - Commission recommends STRONG SUPPORT for strong confidential protections.

**11.** Does the Commission continue to support proposed amendments to the MMPA that include research for non-lethal deterrents and gear development grants?  
PSMFC Commission supports.

**12.** Does the Commission agree with the Council Chair's position on amending the MSA and National Marine Sanctuary Act to insure that management authority for fish shall be under the jurisdiction of the RFMC (regional fishery management councils)?  
PSMFC Commission supports.

**13.** Does the Commission continue to support it's position on continuation of authority provided to the states to manage Dungeness Crab?  
PSMFC Commission supports.

**14.** Does the Commission support the Administration's Aquaculture Bill?  
PSMFC Commission does NOT support the current version of the bill.

**15.** Should the Commission seek to clarify State vs. Federal jurisdiction under "state management authority" for Dungeness Crab in the Magnuson-Stevens Act Reauthorization?  
PSMFC Commission supports.

**16.** Should the Commission support West Coast "Robust Marine Mammal Species/Predation Monitoring" program funding restoration (status quo = \$750,000)?  
PSMFC Commission supports.

**17.** Should the Commission support Fish Passage Center at full funding and functions level?

PSMFC Commission supports. PSMFC Staff to write letter of support.

**18.** Should the Commission seek increases in PacFIN and RecFIN program funding due to serious erosion through same-level funding over the past 10 years? (Level funding is a cut. Adequate data collection and management funding is not adequate for current needs.) Should the Commission seek reconciliation of the MSA, NEPA, APA, etc., in the interest of a more efficient process?

PSMFC Commission wants AKFIN added, and then supports.

**19.** Should the Commission seek to change the definition of "overfishing" to acknowledge natural impacts?

PSMFC Commission supports.

**20.** Should the Commission support federal funding of VMS or GMDSS deployment requirements, as necessary and improved data sharing with State management and enforcement authorities?

PSMFC Commission supports the Alaska position: "Yes for Federal funding and data sharing requirements. RFMC should maintain control of implementing VMS requirements, which includes a Cost/Benefit analysis."

**21.** Should the Commission send a letter to the Northwest Region of the Fish and Wildlife Service requesting the agency's plan for implementing mass marking, an estimation of the costs of the program, and the agency's priorities for using available resources to best meet the objectives for mass marking?

PSMFC Commission agreed that each State should write their own letter and the issue should be a topic of next year's Annual meeting.

**22.** Should the Commission work to prevent Data Quality Act infringement on RFMC use of science for management?

PSMFC Commission supports.

**I-1** – Should the Commission support adding language to Section 110h(2) to allow Idaho to be eligible in the cooperative enforcement agreement?

Issue resolved under vote on #7.

**I-2** – Should the Commission support clarifying the language that section 16(2) ensures that any technical correction made retains current state eligibility for funding under the PCSRF?

PSMFC Commission request that IDAHO be recognized as a participant and approved by unanimous vote.

**C-1** – Continue supporting the Capital Construction Fund reform.  
PSMFC Commission approved.

**W-1** – Mitchell Act Funding.  
PSMFC Commission supports prior Commission position.