



IPHC Fishery Regulation Proposal:

Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E (Sect. 29) - Processing Pacific halibut for eating and preservation

SUBMITTED BY: JOHN FIELDS, RECREATIONAL FISHERMAN (30 AUGUST & 6 OCTOBER 2022)

Directed Commercial Recreational Subsistence Non-directed commercial All
All Regulatory Areas All Alaska Regulatory Areas All U.S. Regulatory Areas
2A 2B 2C 3A 3B 4A 4B 4C 4D 4E

PURPOSE

To propose an exception that allows recreational fishermen in Alaska Regulatory Areas who do not return to port each day to process Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation, subject to measures to facilitate enforcement of the applicable daily bag limits (Proposal No. 1); or exclude preserved and consumed on board fish from applicable possession limits (Proposal No. 2); or create a narrow exception that allows for limited processing of a single fish per day for consumption only (Proposal No. 3).

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

This proposal is submitted on behalf of John Fields by his counsel, Matthew Krueger of Foley & Lardner LLP and Bryan Schroder of Cashion Gilmore & Lindemuth.

1. Background

Mr. Fields is a life-long recreational angler who has been taking several trips per year to Southeast Alaska with his family and friends for the last 30 years. Mr. Fields maintains his own boat in Sitka, Alaska. During the trips, which typically last about five to six days, Mr. Fields and his guests anchor out on his boat and generally return to port just once, if at all, during the trip to refuel. In all of these trips—well over 50 in total—Mr. Fields and his guests have always complied with the daily bag limits.

On these trips, Mr. Fields and his guests want to catch and eat or freeze meal-sized portions of Pacific halibut that they catch within the daily bag limit. But the International Pacific Halibut Commission’s (“IPHC”) current regulations effectively prohibit recreational anglers who, like Mr. Fields, do not return to port each day from doing so. Specifically, § 29(1)(d) of the 2022 Fishery Regulations promulgated by the IPHC provides:

In Convention waters in and off Alaska ... [n]o person shall possess on board a vessel, including charter vessels and pleasure craft used for fishing, Pacific halibut that have been filleted, mutilated, or otherwise disfigured in any manner, except that each Pacific halibut may be cut into no more than 2 ventral pieces, 2 dorsal pieces, and 2 cheek pieces, with a patch of skin on each piece, naturally attached

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (“NOAA”), which is the agency responsible for enforcement of the Fishery Regulations in Convention waters in and off Alaska, has interpreted this provision as ***prohibiting any consumption*** of sport-caught halibut while on board a vessel. See *Regulations Summary and Frequently Asked Questions for Unguided Pacific Halibut Fishing in Alaska*, NOAA FISHERIES Alaska Region (April 15, 2022), <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2022-04/ak-unguided-halibut-faq.pdf> (“Eating halibut onboard a vessel in Alaska waters is not allowed because it necessarily involves mutilating or disfiguring halibut other than in a manner allowed by the regulations.”).

Further, by limiting the number of pieces into which a fish may be cut and by requiring that a piece of skin remain attached to each piece, the current Fishery Regulations effectively prohibit recreational anglers like Mr. Fields who do not return to port each day from being able to process and preserve halibut in reasonable, meal-sized portions. The Regulations therefore impose an unreasonable hardship on all recreational anglers who, like Mr. Fields, do not return to port each day.

The hardship is not theoretical: Mr. Fields received a Written Warning from a NOAA enforcement officer who boarded his boat on September 1, 2021, and determined that Pacific halibut had been processed in a way that did not comply with 50 C.F.R. § 300.66(m) and § 29(1)(d) of the Fishery Regulations. Mr. Fields and his six guests were each licensed anglers. In total, they had only approximately eight small halibut—an amount that was well within the daily bag limit. Nonetheless, the official issued the Warning on the ground that the halibut were filleted into more than two ventral pieces and two dorsal pieces, with no skin remaining. The enforcement officer issued the Warning even though she had no trouble determining that Mr. Fields and his guests had complied with the applicable daily bag limit.

Mr. Fields filed an appeal with NOAA, asking that the Written Warning be vacated. In his appeal, Mr. Fields demonstrated that § 29(1)(d) of the Fishery Regulations is arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to law. He also proposed several alternative, less restrictive means by which he could demonstrate his compliance with the applicable daily bag limits. While NOAA agreed to vacate the portion of the Written Warning that found a violation of 50 C.F.R. § 300.66(m), it refused to vacate the portion that found a violation of § 29(1)(d). NOAA also refused to consider Mr. Fields’ proposed alternative means of demonstrating his compliance with the daily bag limits, and it directed Mr. Fields to propose any such changes to the IPHC:

To the extent that Respondent believes the IPHC should consider a change to the Annual Management Measures in this manner, an appeal of a Written Warning is not the appropriate forum to consider such changes. Instead, the respondent is able to submit these alternatives as comments and have IPHC consider the alternatives when publishing the Annual Management Measures.

Decision on Appeal of Written Warning at 6, Appeal No. AK2106039 (January 20, 2022).

Nor is the hardship limited to Mr. Fields: The 2018 IPHC Annual Meeting received five proposals to allow recreational anglers who do not return to port each day to catch and consume or process halibut. See [IPHC-2018-AM094-R](#). Following are excerpts from the proposals, which underscore the unfair burden imposed by the current regulations:

- The regulations “do not allow for proper processing and preservation of the catch” for recreational anglers who do not “return to day for processing their catch. … The result … is that any surplus

fish caught and not immediately consumed must be wasted and not kept on board to satisfy the regulations.” A. Cooper Proposal, IPHC-2018-AM094-PropC2.

- “While [the regulations] may make sense for the day fisherman who brings their catch back to port for processing and storage at their home ashore, it is impractical for the long term or full time cruiser. To minimize waste the current regulation below should be revised to permit processing and storage aboard the vessel in usable portion sizes with the skin removed.” W. Cornell Proposal, IPHC-2018-AM094-PropC12.
- “The result of these [regulations] is that any surplus fish caught and not immediately consumed must be wasted and not kept on board” vessels that do not return to port each day “to satisfy the regulations.” M. Cowart Proposal, IPHC-2018-AM094-PropC9.
- “The current IPHC regulation prevents personal use of Halibut on the boat” where the angler does not return to port each day “and prevents the proper preservation of the catch for future use.” D. Robertson Proposal, IPHC-2018-AM094-PropC6.
- “The current halibut regulations do not allow for long term preservation and storage of halibut for personal use aboard pleasure vessels. The inability to package and preserve fish in serving size portions will result in waste and therefore increase the number of halibut required to supplement a family’s diet.” L. Thompson Proposal, IPHC-2018-AM094-PropC7.

The IPHC convened a Working Group to address this issue but took no action, despite the clear and unreasonable burden the regulation places on recreational anglers like Mr. Fields. *See* IPHC-2018-AM094-R.

2. Mr. Fields’ Prior Proposal to the IPHC

In December 2021, Mr. Fields submitted a proposal to the IPHC for consideration at its 2022 Annual Meeting that took place on January 24-28, 2022. *See* [IPHC-2022-AM098-PropC1](#). The proposal asked the IPHC (1) to harmonize the Fishery Regulations across areas by eliminating the heightened restrictions that apply only to Alaska, and (2) to create an exception for recreational anglers to process halibut on board their vessels if they comply with certain logging requirements. Under Mr. Fields’ proposal, an angler would have to photograph the halibut alongside a measuring device and label any packages with the date, the sequence number of the halibut caught (*e.g.*, 1 of 2 of the daily bag limit), and a sequence letter reflecting the portion of the halibut in the package (*e.g.*, A, B, C, D, etc.). The angler would also have to keep a log recording the same information.

The IPHC considered Mr. Fields’ proposal during the January 27, 2022, session of the Annual Meeting. During that session, the commissioners noted that Mr. Fields’ proposal was reasonable, and they expressed an interest in modifying the regulations to allow for consumption of halibut while on board a vessel in waters in and off Alaska. However, they emphasized the need for coordination with the agencies tasked with enforcing the regulations and ultimately deferred any action until a later meeting. The final report of the 2022 Annual Meeting reflects that the IPHC “noted and deferred” Mr. Fields’ proposal pending “additional discussion with enforcement agencies.” Report of the 98th Session of the IPHC Annual Meeting (AM098), [IPHC-2022-AM098-R](#), par. 85-86.

Shortly after the conclusion of the IPHC’s 2022 Annual Meeting, Mr. Fields followed up by letter with NOAA’s Alaska Regional Office to reiterate his request that the IPHC’s regulations be amended to allow for both consumption and processing of halibut while on board a vessel in and off the waters of

Alaska. Mr. Fields requested an opportunity for further discussion with NOAA, but he did not receive a meaningful response.

3. The Current Regulation is Arbitrary and Capricious, and Contrary to Law

Section 29(1)(d) of the 2022 Fishery Regulations promulgated by the IPHC prohibits recreational anglers from cutting up Pacific halibut on board their vessels in portions that can be consumed or frozen in reasonable, meal-sized portions. In so doing, § 29(1)(d) imposes restrictions on processing Pacific halibut caught in certain areas beyond the restrictions imposed by § 300.66(m) and far beyond the purpose of the underlying Convention and Northern Pacific Halibut Act. The heightened restrictions are arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to law, both on their face and as applied to someone like Mr. Fields. This is so for several reasons.

First, on their face, the heightened restrictions effectively prohibit a whole category of recreational fishing—*i.e.*, recreational fishing by anglers who do not return to port each day—in a manner that is contrary to the express provisions of the governing Convention. The Convention makes clear in Article I, § 5 that its primary purpose is to regulate “commercial halibut fishing,” while allowing “sport fishing for halibut.” To be sure, § 5 provides that “sport fishing for halibut” is subject to IPHC “regulations and permit and licensing requirements, including the payment of fees.” But § 5 then emphasizes that besides those basic requirements, “sport fishing for halibut and other species by nationals and vessels of each Party may be conducted in Convention waters.” Section 5 reiterates: “All provisions of this Convention except this paragraph, refer to commercial halibut fishing.”

Read in context, the Convention’s main purpose is to regulate commercial fishing, not recreational anglers like Mr. Fields. The Convention contemplates that any regulations created for sport fishing would facilitate responsible sport fishing, not prohibit it. Yet, § 29(1)(d) effectively prohibits fishing by a whole category of recreational anglers—those who like Mr. Fields do not return to port each day, or do not have access to facilities where they can process and store the fish that they catch when they do return to port. Prohibiting halibut fishing by recreational anglers who do not return to port each day is a plain violation of the Convention. And it does not provide a “fair and equitable distribution of access privileges in the fishery.” *Cf.* 16 U.S.C. § 1853(b)(6) (setting forth the factors to be considered for creating a fishery management plan under U.S. law).

Second, on their face, the heightened restrictions draw an arbitrary distinction between Pacific halibut caught “[i]n Convention waters in and off Alaska,” and Pacific halibut caught in other areas, including California, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia. Only the former are subject to heightened restrictions on processing. *See* 2021 Fishery Regulations, §§ 27(3) & 28(2). That is, for regulatory areas that include California, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia, the Fishery Regulations simply provide that “no person shall fillet, mutilate, or otherwise disfigure a Pacific halibut in any manner that prevents the determination of minimum size or the number of fish caught, possessed, or landed.” *See* §§ 27(3) & 28(2). Although Mr. Fields had processed the fish in more than six pieces and removed the skin, the NOAA officer was still able to determine that the size and daily bag limits were not exceeded. Thus, the exact same conduct that led to Mr. Fields receiving the Warning would have been perfectly permissible if Mr. Fields had been fishing in waters off of Oregon, for instance, rather than waters off of Alaska.

Third, the heightened restrictions are also arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to law, as applied to a person in Mr. Fields’ particular circumstances. The restrictions’ obvious purpose is to facilitate enforcement of the daily bag limits for Pacific halibut. But when applied to a recreational angler who has only a small number of Pacific halibut on board his boat at any given time, the restrictions serve no purpose

other than effectively to prohibit the recreational angler from either eating or freezing the fish that he has caught without first returning to port. The result is that recreational fishermen who take multi-day trips without returning to port, or who do not have access to facilities for processing and storing fish other than on their vessels, face an unfair choice: They must either forgo fishing for Pacific halibut altogether or know that any halibut they catch will necessarily go to waste. *See* 2018 Regulatory Proposals cited above.

4. Mr. Fields' Renewed Proposals and the Improvements They Offer

As detailed above, Mr. Fields has raised his concerns regarding the hardships that § 29(1)(d) of the IPHC's Fishery Regulations impose with both NOAA and the IPHC. Mr. Fields' concerns echo those that caused the IPHC to convene a working group on this issue more than four years ago, yet § 29(1)(d) remains unchanged, despite the commissioners' stated interest in modifying the Regulations to ease these hardships. To bring renewed attention to this issue, Mr. Fields is resubmitting his previous proposal to amend the Fishery Regulations to remove the unlawful prohibition on the ability of recreational anglers who do not return to port each day to consume and preserve halibut. He is also submitting for consideration a second proposal that offers an alternative means of accomplishing the same goal, and a third proposal that carves out an even narrower exception for consumption only.

A. Proposal No. 1 (Logging of Processed Halibut)

Mr. Fields' first proposal has two features. First, the proposal would amend § 29(1)(d) to make the restrictions on processing fish in Alaska consistent with the processing restrictions in other IPHC regulatory areas. Second, the proposal would further amend § 29(1)(d) to provide a new exception for recreational fishers to further process fish if they comply with certain logging requirements.

i. Harmonize Alaska's Restrictions with Other Regions' Restrictions

The first feature would eliminate the heightened restrictions that apply only to recreational anglers in Convention waters in and off Alaska by amending § 29(1)(d) so it is consistent with the restrictions that apply to recreational anglers in regulatory areas 2A (California, Oregon, and Washington) and 2B (British Columbia). As noted, the provisions that govern regulatory areas 2A and 2B neither specifically limit the number of pieces into which a Pacific halibut may be cut nor require that a patch of skin remains naturally attached to each piece. Instead, the restrictions governing regulatory areas 2A and 2B simply provide that “no person shall fillet, mutilate, or otherwise disfigure a Pacific halibut in any manner that prevents the determination of minimum size or the number of fish caught, possessed, or landed.” 2022 Fishery Regulations, §§ 27(3) & 28(2). The proposal would make the same restrictions that apply in areas 2A and 2B also apply in Alaska.

This feature brings appropriate consistency to the IPHC regulations and removes an unreasonable distinction between the enforcement regime in Alaska versus other regions. This feature would also give recreational anglers in Alaska some additional flexibility in how they process Pacific halibut for eating or preserving on board their vessels. At the same time, the proposal would maintain the same safeguards that the IPHC has deemed sufficient to allow effective enforcement of bag and possession limits in other regulatory areas.

Standing alone, however, the proposed restriction still could be read to prohibit recreational anglers like Mr. Fields from cutting halibut into small pieces for eating and meal-sized processing, to the extent doing so prevents authorized officers from determining the number and size of fish caught. Further, standing alone, the proposed restriction does not give clear instructions to recreational anglers like Mr.

Fields regarding exactly how much they can process Pacific halibut. We therefore also propose adding the second feature, a limited exception for recreational anglers.

ii. Add a New Exception for Recreational Fishers Who Log Catches

The second feature would add an exception for recreational fishers who are on board a pleasure craft used for fishing that would permit them to cut Pacific halibut into smaller pieces and remove the skin for consumption or preservation, provided they comply with specific procedures. Those procedures would require the angler to take a photograph of the halibut alongside a measuring device so the authorized officer could determine the size of the halibut. The angler would also be required to label any packages with the halibut according to the date, the sequence of the fish caught (e.g., 1 of 2 of the daily bag limit), and with a sequence letter to reflect the portion of the fish in the package (e.g., A, B, C, D, etc.). For example, if an angler processed the first halibut he caught that day into 9 pieces, each package would be labeled with the date, the number “1,” and a letter going from A to I. Finally, the angler would be required to keep a log that recorded the same information.

This proposal would allow an authorized officer easily to compare the required photograph showing the size of the fish to the log and to each portion of packaged fish on board the vessel, quickly determining if the packages correspond to what the log and photograph represent. If the vessel had more fish than what was represented, the authorized officer could determine that the size or daily limits were violated. Critically, this proposal still leaves in place a prohibition on processing fish in ways that prevent the determination of the minimum size or number of fish caught so that if an angler did not comply with each requirement of the exception, the angler could still be held accountable for violating daily bag and size limits. This proposal is also limited in scope, applying only to pleasure craft and not applying to charter vessels.

We considered including with this proposal a reporting requirement for an angler who intends to use the exception. Specifically, the angler could be required to notify an authorized officer before embarking on a trip of the angler’s intended length of trip, areas of travel, and names of licensed anglers. Upon finishing the trip, the angler could be required to submit a copy of the photographs and log to the authorized officer. This reporting requirement would allow the IPHC to track how many recreational anglers are making use of the new exception so that the IPHC could evaluate its impact and make modifications in future years. In addition, the requirement could enhance awareness and increase compliance among anglers who would otherwise face enforcement if they did not report their activities.

We opted not to include the above-described reporting requirement, however, for two reasons. First, we are mindful that implementing such a requirement would impose additional record-keeping burdens on authorized officers. Second, we believe that a reporting requirement is likely unnecessary, given the lack of evidence that recreational anglers who do not return to port each day are responsible for any significant number of violations. Nonetheless, we stand ready to amend our proposal to include a reporting requirement if doing so would give the IPHC additional comfort in adopting a new exception.

By adopting this proposal, the IPHC would be removing an unreasonable hardship that has led to recurring complaints by recreational anglers like Mr. Fields—a hardship that the IPHC recognized in 2018 by forming a working group. The proposal would give recreational anglers in Alaska who do not return to port each day the ability to enjoy the halibut they catch for consumption and for processing in meal-sized portions. The proposal offered here would also remedy the unlawfully arbitrary and capricious nature of the current regulations.

B. Proposal No. 2 (Exception for Preserved Halibut)

Mr. Fields' second proposal would leave § 29 unchanged while amending § 3 (Definitions) to add a new subsection specifying that, as used in § 29 (governing Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4C, 4D, and 4E), the terms "possess," "possession," "possessed," and "possess on board" refer only to unpreserved fish and do not include preserved fish or fish that is consumed on board a vessel. The new subsection would define "preserved fish" as fish prepared in such a manner as to remain fit for human consumption after 15 days. The proposed new subsection would ease the restrictions that § 29 imposes in two narrow but important ways. First, it would allow for both consumption of halibut and processing of halibut for later consumption while leaving intact § 29(1)(d)'s general prohibition against "possess[ing] on board a vessel ... Pacific halibut that have been 'filleted, mutilated, or otherwise disfigured in any manner.'" Second, it would allow sport fishermen who do not regularly return to port to possess on their vessels more than two daily bag limits, notwithstanding § 29(1)(c), provided that the fish have been preserved in the manner specified in the new subsection.

Notably, the proposed modifications to § 3 of the Fishery Regulations generally track the language of the Alaska Administrative Code and the provisions of the Code that regulate possession of sport-caught fish. *See* 5 AAC 75.010(b) ("A person may possess only the limit of fish allowed for the water on which that person is fishing."); 5 AAC 75.995(a)(20) & (21) (defining "possession limit" and "preserved fish"). This proposal thus has the benefit of adopting an approach that has already been implemented and proven workable in Alaska.

C. Proposal No. 3 (Exception for Consumption Only)

Mr. Field's third proposal would leave § 29 largely unchanged while adding a narrow exception to allow recreational anglers to process a single Pacific halibut per day for consumption only while on board a pleasure craft. To ensure that authorized officers are able to enforce daily bag limits, the proposal would require a recreational angler who processes a halibut for consumption while on board a pleasure craft to maintain one quarter of the fish with the skin naturally attached. This proposal would not fully eliminate the hardship imposed on recreational anglers who do not return to port each day, in that these anglers would still be prohibited from processing halibut for preservation and later consumption. However, it would mitigate that hardship with minimal changes to the current regulation.

4. Potential Negative Impacts

The above proposals would not create any negative impacts. In explaining its unwillingness to recommend changes, the 2018 IPHC Working Group stated that § 29(1)(d) is "necessary for the enforcement of the bag and possession limits among sport fishermen," and that it had not received "a consistent, easily verifiable option that would ... still allow effective enforcement of the bag and possession limits." [IPHC-2018-IM094-INFO2](#), Appendix I, at p. 3.

Each of Mr. Fields' proposals leaves in place the general prohibition against mutilating or disfiguring Pacific halibut in a way that prevents enforcement of the daily bag limits while carving out narrow exceptions for the small class of sport fisherman who, like Mr. Fields, do not return to port each day and want to be able to consume or preserve for later consumption the Pacific halibut they catch. Mr. Fields' first proposal offers a consistent, easily verifiable method for authorized officers to enforce the size and daily bag limits for recreational anglers who do not return to port each day. Mr. Fields' second proposal adopts an approach that is currently being used in Alaska with no significant issues. Finally, Mr. Field's third proposal takes an even more conservative approach by allowing an exception for consumption only.

Notably, we are not aware of, and the 2018 IPHC Working Group did not cite, any data indicating that fishing by recreational anglers who do not return to port each day contributed to a significant amount of halibut catches or violations of the size or daily bag limits. Indeed, that is highly unlikely to be the case because there are relatively few recreational anglers who do not return to port each day. The current regulations—and the 2018 IPHC Working Committee’s position—apply a blunt, broad tool against recreational fishers who, given the lack of evidence, when combined with common sense, appear to have a de minimis effect on the fishery. So far, NOAA has provided no evidence of harm, only unsupported speculation. We offer here a scalpel to address the issue properly, without harming all of the recreational anglers who do not return to port each day and fish responsibly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Commission:

- 1) **NOTE** fishery regulation proposal IPHC-2022-IM098-PropC1 Rev_1, which adds an exception that allows recreational fishermen in Alaska Regulatory Areas who do not return to port each day to process Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation, subject to measures to facilitate enforcement of the applicable daily bag limits (Proposal No. 1); excludes preserved and consumed on board fish from possession limits applicable to recreational fishermen in Alaska Regulatory Areas (Proposal No. 2); or adds an exception that allows recreational fishermen in Alaska Regulatory Areas to process a single Pacific halibut per day for consumption while onboard a pleasure craft, so long as they preserve a quarter with skin to allow for verification of bag limits by enforcement officials (Proposal No. 3).

APPENDICES

[Appendix A](#): Suggested Regulatory Language.

APPENDIX A**SUGGESTED REGULATORY LANGUAGE**

Proposal No. 1: Amend § 29(1) (governing IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E) to be consistent with § 27(3) (governing IPHC Regulatory Area 2A) and § 28(2) (governing IPHC Regulatory Area 2B), and add an exception that allows recreational fishermen on pleasure craft to process Pacific halibut for eating and/or preservation, subject to measures to facilitate enforcement of the applicable daily bag limits, as follows:

29. Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E

(1) In Convention waters in and off Alaska:

...

- (d) No person shall possess on board a vessel, including charter vessels and pleasure craft used for fishing, Pacific halibut that have been filleted, mutilated, or otherwise disfigured in any manner; ~~except that each Pacific halibut may be cut into no more than 2 ventral pieces, 2 dorsal pieces, and 2 cheek pieces, with a patch of skin on each piece, naturally attached.~~ that prevents the determination of minimum size or the number of fish caught, possessed, or landed; except that any person who, while on board a pleasure craft used for fishing, may further fillet or otherwise process Pacific halibut for immediate consumption or preservation for later consumption if the person does all of the following:
 - (i) Maintain on board the pleasure craft and available for inspection by an authorized officer a photograph of each Pacific halibut caught. The Pacific halibut must be photographed alongside a measuring device that allows an authorized officer who inspects the photograph to determine the length of the Pacific halibut. Each photograph must be accompanied with information indicating the date and approximate time at which the Pacific halibut in the photograph was caught.
 - (ii) For each Pacific halibut processed for later consumption, store the Pacific halibut in a package or packages labeled with (A) the date and approximate time at which the Pacific halibut was caught, (B) the length of the Pacific halibut, (C) a sequence number corresponding to the daily bag limit (i.e. 1 of 2), and (D) a sequence letter corresponding to a portion of the Pacific halibut in the package (i.e., A, B, C, etc.).
 - (iii) Maintain on board the pleasure craft and available for inspection by an authorized officer a log of each Pacific halibut caught. The log must specify (A) the date and approximate time at which each Pacific halibut was caught, (B) the length of each Pacific halibut, (C) the sequence number corresponding to the daily bag limit (i.e., 1 of 2), and (D) an indication of the portions of the Pacific halibut packaged for later consumption (i.e., A, B, C, etc.).

Proposal No. 2: Amend § 3 (Definitions) to add subsection (o) (all following sections to be re-lettered in order) as follows:

3. Definitions

(1) In these Regulations,

...

(o) For Recreational (Sport) Fishing in IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E, governed under §29, “possess,” “possession,” “possessed,” and “possess on board” means unpreserved fish that a person has on a vessel. Preserved fish are not considered possessed or possessed on board. Fish consumed on board are also not considered as possessed or possessed on board. “Preserved fish” means fish prepared in such a manner, and in an existing state of preservation, as to be fit for human consumption after a 15-day period, and does not include unfrozen fish temporarily stored in coolers that contain ice or dry ice or fish that are lightly salted;

Proposal No. 3: Amend § 29(1) (governing IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E) to add an exception that allows recreational fishermen on pleasure craft to process Pacific halibut for consumption, as follows:

29. Recreational (Sport) Fishing for Pacific Halibut—IPHC Regulatory Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E

(1) In Convention waters in and off Alaska:

...

(d) No person shall possess on board a vessel, including charter vessels and pleasure craft used for fishing, Pacific halibut that have been filleted, mutilated, or otherwise disfigured in any manner, except that each Pacific halibut may be cut into no more than 2 ventral pieces, 2 dorsal pieces, and 2 cheek pieces, with a patch of skin on each piece, naturally attached. Notwithstanding the prior sentence, while on board a pleasure craft used for fishing, a person may further fillet or otherwise process one Pacific halibut per day for immediate consumption, provided that the person maintains at least one quarter of that Pacific halibut with a patch of skin, naturally attached.