

agencies, Alaska Native organizations, and individuals that contained 43 separate comments. The following summarizes and responds to these comments.

*Comment 1:* The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) strongly urges the harvest survey design to record harvest of all species from ADF&G groundfish statistical areas. This information (more detailed than harvest data based on IPHC areas) will be critical in the development of the future local area management plans and will provide management biologists with more specific information of the removals on a spatial scale each year when making in-season management decisions on commercial, sport, personal use, and State subsistence groundfish fisheries.

*Response:* The subsistence halibut harvest survey instrument was developed concurrently with the proposed rule to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (Pub. L. 104–13). Under the PRA, NMFS is obligated to minimize paperwork requirements and ensure that the affected public is not overly burdened with requests for information. The Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) oversees agency compliance with the PRA and must review and authorize each collection of information. Hence, NMFS must carefully balance its need for information from persons affected by its rules with the relative burden on the affected public of reporting that information.

The design of the subsistence halibut harvest survey instrument was guided by this balance. The survey is designed to be as unintrusive as possible to foster the cooperation of subsistence fishers and to capture the basic information needed of how much halibut was harvested, how much lingcod and rockfish was harvested incidental to subsistence halibut, generally where was it harvested, and whether it was caught in sport fishing or subsistence fishing. Collecting this much information from most of the registered subsistence fishers will vastly improve existing estimates of subsistence halibut harvest. Requesting more information and in finer detail throughout the State of Alaska could be viewed as being an excessive reporting burden. For example, NMFS would have to consider why the data on the geographic distribution of subsistence harvests of halibut should be more detailed than the geographic distribution data from sport fishing harvests of halibut, especially in light of the fact that

subsistence harvests are estimated to be less than one tenth of the sport harvests.

NMFS agrees, however, that future management questions may arise in which data on the specific locality of subsistence halibut harvests are important. To this end, NMFS intends to work closely with the ADF&G Subsistence Division, affected tribes, and community groups to refine information on the location and species composition of subsistence halibut harvests. The survey instrument may be refined for this purpose in the future. In anticipation of refinements to the survey instrument, the OMB has authorized this survey for one year as a pilot information collection program. Renewal of OMB authority to conduct the subsistence halibut harvest survey under the PRA will depend on a review of the conduct of the survey and the quality of the data produced during the first year. Efforts to refine the data collected by the survey are likely best focused in certain parts of IPHC Areas 2C and 3A where subsistence, commercial, and sport halibut harvests will be higher relative to more western areas.

*Comment 2:* The harvest assessment survey design should include the number of lingcod and rockfish retained and released as well as separating rockfish by assemblage, such as “pelagic species” and “other” (demersal and slope) species.

*Response:* Based on the experience of ADF&G Subsistence Division personnel, the vast majority of the lingcod and rockfish caught incidental to subsistence halibut will be retained. This harvest of lingcod and rockfish while subsistence fishing for halibut would be reported in the annual subsistence halibut survey. Requesting more detailed information from subsistence fishers about the species composition of their incidental rockfish harvest raises the same PRA question of balance discussed above.

*Comment 3:* The definitions of “commercial fishing,” “customary trade,” and “subsistence halibut” do not sufficiently distinguish between sale and barter for commercial or subsistence purposes. It is not clear when the exchange of halibut for money is a commercial exchange or a subsistence exchange.

*Response:* The distinction between commercial fishing for halibut and subsistence fishing for halibut should be clear. Halibut harvested in commercial fishing are intended to enter commerce. The harvest, landing, and distribution of these fish must comply with relevant IPHC, State, and Federal fishing and reporting requirements. Halibut

harvested in subsistence fishing are intended for the sustenance of the fisher, his family and community in accordance with cultural traditions of Alaska Natives and rural lifestyles. To preserve this distinction, this rule requires that subsistence halibut must not enter commerce and must not be intermixed with commercial fish, except under limited conditions in Areas 4D and 4E.

The definitions of “commercial fishing” and “subsistence halibut” were derived from the IPHC definition of “commercial fishing” which “means fishing [other than customary and traditional fishing] the resulting catch of which is sold or bartered, or is intended to be sold or bartered” (67 FR 12885, March 20, 2002). “Subsistence,” on the other hand, is defined in this rule to be “...the non-commercial, long-term, customary and traditional use of halibut.” Subsistence halibut, however, may be used in customary trade because customary trade is a customary and traditional use of halibut. Customary trade may include bartering and limited exchanges of money, but this does not mean that any bartering or exchange of money necessarily implies a commercial transaction. Exchanging halibut for items of significant value or for sale or marketing purposes likely constitute a significant commercial enterprise. Such halibut would not be used in a customary and traditional manner and therefore would not be confused with subsistence halibut.

*Comment 4:* The proposed legal gear limit of “set and hand-held gear of not more than 30 hooks” does not specify whether this limit applies per person or per vessel.

*Response:* NMFS understands that the Council’s original policy intent was for the hook limit to apply to each person engaged in subsistence halibut fishing. Although this was implied in the preamble to the proposed rule (67 FR 54767, August 26, 2002), NMFS agrees that the proposed rule language did not explicitly state whether the hook limit was to apply per person or per vessel. Therefore, NMFS changed the final rule to make this personal hook limit explicit.

*Comment 5:* The marking of buoys used in the subsistence halibut fishery should include a large “S” in addition to the fisher’s name and address to designate that the gear is being used for Federal subsistence halibut fishing rather than a State commercial fishery.

*Response:* NMFS agrees that requiring an additional “S” character on the markings of setline marker buoys would serve a justifiable purpose of distinguishing subsistence gear from