

Therefore, NMFS may refine the survey instrument to serve this purpose.

*Comment 19:* Subsistence harvesters should be required to possess a registration certificate while conducting subsistence fishing to provide enforcement staff with a means to directly verify the eligibility of a fisher on the water.

*Response:* NMFS agrees that the term "possess," as used in the proposed rule at sections 300.65(h) and section 300.66(e), did not clearly indicate if a subsistence fisher would be required to have his or her registration certificate physically present while conducting subsistence halibut fishing. Therefore, this rule clarifies the meaning of "possess" by requiring a registration certificate to be made available for inspection by an authorized officer during a subsistence halibut fishing trip (see response to comment 12).

*Comment 20:* Allowing subsistence halibut in a commercial buying or processing plant presents an unacceptable risk of subsistence fish getting into the commercial market. Subsistence halibut should not be allowed on the premises of commercial fish buyers, with the exception of the existing practice of landing small halibut with Area 4D and Area 4E CDQ fish and landed within a port in those areas.

*Response:* The risk of subsistence halibut getting into the commercial market also was a concern of the Council's in developing its subsistence policy. As discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule, the Council recommended prohibiting customary trade of subsistence halibut on the premises of commercial fish buying operations. The preamble discussion of this issue noted three exceptions to this prohibition. One was the exception noted in the comment. Another was an exception for a commercial fish buyer who is eligible to harvest subsistence halibut. And the third was an exception for using commercial fish processing facilities to process subsistence products. A related Council recommendation was to prohibit subsistence halibut that was exchanged in customary trade from entering commerce at any point. That is, subsistence halibut given away or bartered by the fisher who caught it, could not be subsequently sold or otherwise enter the commerce market. Due to the significance of this risk, NMFS specifically requested comments on how best to give effect to the intention of preventing movement of subsistence halibut into the commercial sector.

Neither of these prohibitions were explicitly stated in the proposed rule prohibitions. Language in proposed section 300.66(j), however, was designed to incorporate both of the Council's recommended prohibitions by stating that it would be unlawful to "retain or possess subsistence halibut for commercial purposes, cause subsistence halibut to be sold, bartered or otherwise enter commerce or solicit exchange of subsistence halibut for commercial purposes". The exception for Area 4D and Area 4E fishers to land small halibut with harvests of CDQ halibut is included in the prohibitions section 300.66(h). This regulatory language likely will be sufficient to enforce against the movement of subsistence halibut into commerce without complicated exception language.

*Comment 21:* The proposed subsistence program is significantly more permissive than is currently allowed under existing regulations. Hence, the rule would allow subsistence harvesters to significantly increase their fishing power which will likely lead to greater subsistence harvests than occur at present. This underscores the need for effective monitoring programs and more comprehensive reporting than is presented in the proposed rule.

*Response:* Previously, without the provisions of this rule, subsistence halibut harvesting fishing could occur legally only under authority of IPHC sport fishing regulations which allow a daily catch limit per person of two halibut (annual management measures section 24(2), published at 67 FR 10989, March 7, 2003). Alternatively, subsistence halibut may have been taken illegally or taken as commercial harvest. In any case, information about subsistence halibut harvests was likely biased because subsistence fish may have been double counted as subsistence and sport halibut harvest, counted as commercial harvest or not reported at all because it was harvested illegally. Hence, the presumption that subsistence harvests of halibut will be significantly increased under this rule because it allows fishers to harvest up to 20 fish per day instead of two fish per day is not necessarily correct.

The subsistence fishery is expected to be self limiting because subsistence fishers typically harvest no more than they need to satisfy food needs. To harvest more than that simply because they can would be wasteful of the resource, their time and effort. Allowing subsistence fishers to harvest more fish in a day than they would be able to legally under current sport fishing rules will allow subsistence fishers to be more

efficient, spending fewer days fishing to satisfy food needs, and will foster compliance with fishery management regulations. Although it is true that legal subsistence fishing power will be enhanced by this rule, NMFS does not assume that this enhancement will automatically lead to significantly larger subsistence harvests. The subsistence harvest of halibut is expected to be roughly one percent of the total take of halibut by all sources of fishing mortality, substantially less than the sport harvest of halibut. Of course, effective monitoring of this harvest, like any authorized harvest of halibut, is important. The monitoring system that NMFS intends to implement will be sufficiently comprehensive to monitor the relative magnitude of this fishery, and will likely produce far more reliable information about the total subsistence harvest of halibut in Alaska than is currently available.

*Comment 22:* Commercial fishing for halibut will be harmed by the subsistence rules. If only 10 percent of the people eligible to do subsistence fishing for halibut take their daily quota of 20 fish twice a year, then about 15 million pounds of halibut will be taken by subsistence fishers. The 30-hook limit will likely take between one-third and one-half of the IPHC Area 2C commercial catch limit. Please consider reducing the hook limit to eight and reconsider the rules if the subsistence harvest exceeds a given percentage of the commercial catch limit.

*Response:* The purpose of this action is to authorize a fishery for the customary and traditional use of halibut. Although in certain localized parts of the IPHC regulatory areas, subsistence fishing for halibut may compete with commercial and sport fishing for halibut, this action is not intended to constitute a large-scale allocation of the halibut resource away from either the commercial or sport fisheries to the subsistence fishery. Such an allocation is not likely because subsistence fishers are not likely to harvest all of the halibut permitted under these rules. The subsistence halibut fishery is expected to be limited more by the amount of halibut that can be used in a customary and traditional manner than by the catch and hook limits imposed by this rule.

Of course, the subsistence halibut harvest also will not likely be evenly distributed, and some areas may experience higher subsistence harvest rates than others. These areas are likely to be near the larger communities in IPHC Areas 2C and 3A. In response to these concerns, the Council, in April 2002, adopted recommendations to