

survey instrument for collecting traditional subsistence harvest data should be left up to each individual tribe.

*Response:* NMFS has made every effort to minimize the amount of information collected on the harvest survey forms, as is required by the PRA (see response to comment 1). Identifying information about the subsistence fisher is required only to the extent necessary to prevent confusing the harvests of persons with the same or similar names. The data collected on subsistence halibut harvests will be aggregated for purposes of reporting to the public. Existing State and Federal confidentiality standards will be strictly complied with to prevent the harvests of individual fishers from becoming generally available. Commercial halibut and sport halibut harvest data are held to the same standards of confidentiality. NMFS is hopeful that further cooperation with affected fishers and explanation of the survey design and data handling techniques will demonstrate that the risk of a confidentiality breach by a cooperating State or Federal agency is low. The relative accuracy and comparability of subsistence halibut harvest estimates will be increased to the extent that the same survey methods are used comprehensively. Relying on a variety of survey instruments and methodologies, such as may happen if each tribe developed its own harvest estimation technique, would prevent comparison of subsistence halibut harvest rates among different areas.

*Comment 40:* The creation of a new subsistence halibut fishery would create another special user group with unequal rights to harvest resources that belong to all Alaskans. The fishery should be open to all Alaskans, without regards to racial origin or place of residence.

*Response:* The halibut resource is, in fact, open to all persons in some respect, and this action does not limit existing public access to the resource. For example, anyone with a State sport fishing license, may sport fish for halibut and retain two fish per day. Any U.S. citizen may participate in the commercial halibut IFQ fishery off Alaska if he or she meets the criteria and receives an IFQ allocation. Likewise, the subsistence fishing authority provided by this action may be enjoyed by anyone who is or becomes a resident in one of the rural communities with customary and traditional uses of halibut listed in this rule. The other group of persons eligible to conduct subsistence halibut fishing are members of Federally recognized Alaska Native tribes with customary and

traditional uses of halibut. Participation in the subsistence halibut fishery as a member of this group may not be possible to anyone except by chance of birth or adoption, but this is not a new user group of the halibut resource. The ancestors of this group have used this resource, among others, for sustenance for thousands of years before the first non-Alaska Natives appeared in Alaska and began to do likewise. Although this action provides for a special subsistence harvesting privilege for certain individuals and not for others, it does not create a new user group and will likely not significantly affect the harvesting privileges of other users of the resource. Essentially, this action formally recognizes the long term practice of using the halibut resource for subsistence purposes as being as equally valid a use as are the commercial and sport uses.

*Comment 41:* NMFS is commended for proposing these rules to apply in Alaska. The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act recognizes subsistence, but discriminates against Natives based on where they live and not the lifestyles they lead. The subsistence rules are a step in the right direction.

*Response:* NMFS notes this support.

*Comment 42:* The number of hooks allowed to be used by a subsistence fisher should be increased if that person is proxy fishing.

*Response:* This rule is silent on proxy fishing, a formal mechanism to allow fishing on behalf of another person. The Council purposely avoided issues pertaining to proxy fishing by providing for relatively liberal hook and harvest limits. In developing this policy, the Council understood that a subsistence halibut fisher would likely share his harvest with others and, therefore, proxy fishing was not deemed to be necessary.

*Comment 43:* The Alaska Department of Fish and Game should not play any part in the enforcement of these rules because ADF&G enforcement has demonstrated minimal sensitivity to people living in a rural setting.

*Response:* These rules, like other halibut fishery management rules, may be enforced by any authorized officer. The term "authorized officer" is defined, with respect to fishing off Alaska, to mean "...any State, Federal, or Provincial officer authorized to enforce these regulations including but not limited to, the National Marine Fisheries Service,...Alaska Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection,...[and the] United States Coast Guard..." (67 FR 12885, March 20, 2002).

## Changes From the Proposed Rule

NMFS invited public comment on the proposed rule implementing the subsistence halibut program from August 26, 2002, through September 25, 2002 (67 FR 54767, August 26, 2002). The 43 comments received are summarized and responded to above. Several of these comments made technical suggestions or pointed out errors in the proposed rule with which NMFS agrees. Hence, NMFS has changed regulatory text in this action from what was published in the proposed rule. All of these changes are of a technical nature that correct errors in the proposed rule, improve the effectiveness of the rules, or improve their parity with the Council's intent and regulations developed by the IPHC. None of these make substantive changes to the subsistence halibut management program described in the preamble to the proposed rule. These changes are identified and explained as follows.

1. The proposed rule text in several places described the general area in which subsistence halibut fishing would occur in waters in and off Alaska. Although the context in each instance varied, the implication of phrases like "Commission regulatory area" or the naming of regulatory areas was that subsistence halibut fishing could occur only in Commission regulatory areas in waters in and off Alaska and nowhere else in waters in and off Alaska. The proposed rule failed to recognize that an area closed to commercial halibut fishing in the Bering Sea is defined by IPHC regulations to be outside of any of the Commission regulatory areas that are in waters in and off Alaska (see annual management measures at sections 6 and 10 (68 FR 10989, March 7, 2003)).

Any implication that subsistence halibut fishing also should not occur in the closed area was wrong and unintentional. The Council never indicated that intent, and the IPHC regulations make clear that the closed area applies only to commercial halibut fishing. This error was pointed out in comments 16 and 33. The error was found in the proposed rule text in: the definitions of "sport fishing" and "subsistence" at § 300.61, the heading at § 300.65, § 300.65(g)(3), § 300.65(g)(4), § 300.65(g)(4)(iii), and § 300.65(h). In this rule, with one exception, the phrase "Commission regulatory area" was removed from these places. The exception is at § 300.65(g)(4)(iii) where the phrase "or the Bering Sea closed area" is added to maintain the intended context.