



STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

September 14, 1977

Mr. Jim Branson
Executive Director
North Pacific Fisheries
Management Council
P.O. Box 3136 DT
Anchorage, AK 99510

Dear Jim:

I have examined the proposed Model Charter for Advisory Panels that was circulated by the National Marine Fisheries Service. I find there are several things wrong with the model plan which was developed for the Western Pacific Fisheries Management Council and do not necessarily fit into the scenario of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. I will attempt to go through the model charter and identify those areas that I think should be changed to better meet our particular needs.

C. Objectives and Duties - There are listed four items; I would like to add an additional item -- (e) U.S. consumer potential for utilizing various species.

I would like to comment that under item C.4., where it states that the Panel members are charged with advising the Council on particular fisheries, with particular reference to socio-economic implications of managing those fisheries, that the word "socio-economic" doesn't go far enough, and the word "biologic" implications should be included. My basis for this is that simple biological information in the form of what these fishermen are actually catching that comes directly from the fishermen themselves is extremely important and shouldn't be given second place to purely socio-economic implications.

D. Members and Chairman - The idea of having 50 members doesn't fit into the system for the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, and in our case, 25 members appears to be sufficient; I recognize the language states "not more than 50 members," so it probably is not significant.



Mr. Jim Branson
September 14, 1977
Page 2

In paragraph D.2., "The Panel shall be composed of persons who are either actually engaged in the harvest of, or are knowledgeable and interested in, the conservation and management of, the fisheries to be managed.", this language should have language added to it that also reflects marketing and processing.

In paragraph D.4., I see no reason why the Chairman of the Advisory Panel should be appointed by the Chairman of the Council, although this might be open for discussion. This is a change from the existing method, and I suspect there are valid reasons why it would be better for the Advisory Panel to choose its own Chairman.

E. Administrative Provisions - I am particularly concerned with the second portion of paragraph where they say, In accordance with Section 10(f) of FACA, a designated officer or employee of the Federal Government must also approve the meeting request and the proposed agenda." This would make the long-in-advance provision of an agenda necessary, and this just isn't possible if the comments of the Advisory Panel are to be timely and to fit the agenda of the Council. Further, I can't see any reason why the federal officer should be involved at all. Additionally, I would like to comment that there really doesn't appear to be any need for the Panel to meet as a whole at least once a year as suggested.

F. Subpanels - The requirement of a subpanel to be of approximately 10 members is somewhat unrealistic, particularly on our smaller Advisory Panel consisting of only 25 members. I do think there is a great deal of merit in having several permanent Advisory Subpanels, but can't see that there should be any rigid structure.

Again, under paragraph F.2., I can't see that subpanels should require the concurrence of the Director of NMFS to establish or abolish such subpanels. The Council should retain authority to direct and manage the Advisory Panel.

In paragraph F.4., I object to the requirement for the federal officer to be involved.

In paragraph F.5., the subpanel should report to the Chairman of the Advisory Panel instead of the Chairman of the Council.

In paragraph F.6., the suggested list of subpanels might be salmon, crab, bottomfish, marketing and processing.

Best regards,

Keith Specking

Keith Specking

KS:re