

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council, SSC, and AP

FROM: Clarence G. Pautzke
Executive Director

DATE: December 1, 2001

SUBJECT: Staff Tasking

ESTIMATED TIME
2 HOURS

ACTION REQUIRED

- (a) Review staff tasking and provide direction as necessary.
- (b) Receive status report on inter-agency initiative to collect socio-economic data.

BACKGROUND

(a) Staff Tasking

Item D-2(a)(1) is an updated summary of current Council projects, revised to reflect your direction from the October meeting. Item D-2(a)(2) is a copy of the three-meeting outlook for reference. As I expressed in October, we will not be able to take on any new projects between now and February, and we may need to re-assess a couple of items that are currently scheduled for February. Significant outside contract help will be required to get the items completed that we already have scheduled for February/April. We also need to take into account Council staff involvement next year in the EFH EIS, the BSAI crab FMP EIS, the Steller sea lion trailing amendment package, and once again the programmatic groundfish SEIS.

The outlook for Council staff's role in completing the EFH EIS is not completely clear at this time, though we do know it will fully subscribe David Witherell's and Cathy Coon's time between now and February, and certainly be a major project for them through 2002. The outlook for completing the programmatic groundfish SEIS is even more unclear, but is the subject of a staff meeting scheduled for next week. And, some of David and Cathy's time needs to be allocated to the SSL trailing amendment package for review in April or June.

Mark Fina will be fully subscribed through at least the end of February on the Crab rationalization project, finalizing the analysis for public review after the February meeting and synthesizing a report to Congress from that analysis. After that we still have involvement, with NMFS and ADF&G, to complete the EIS for the crab FMP, in which the rationalization program will presumably be the Preferred Alternative. Mark will also be involved in coordinating various other Council analyses and contract work.

Jane DiCosimo is working on several issues as well, including final touches to the halibut GHM document for Secretarial review; finalizing the charter IFQ analysis for Secretarial review; finalizing the halibut subsistence analysis for Secretarial review (assuming Council action at this meeting); addressing additional issues related to the IFQ program for halibut and sablefish; completing the shark/skate/other species amendment package for initial review in February or April; preparing a discussion paper on Gulf of Alaska rationalization; and, coordinating with NMFS on the TAC-setting process amendment package for review in April. Regarding GOA rationalization, we would like some Council feedback and clarification of expectations for the discussion paper scheduled for review in February. Item D-2(a)(3) is a brief summary of the history and direction of this initiative, including staff's thoughts on the practicable scope of a discussion paper for February.

Between now and February Nicole Kimball will be working to finalize the community QS purchase amendment and the CDQ Policy amendment package (pending direction on the timing of that decision), as well as coordinating the Observer Committee and an associated regulatory amendment package for review in February. She is also the staff person assigned to the BSAI Pacific cod pot split amendment tentatively scheduled for final action in February. Regarding the P. cod pot split amendment, you tentatively scheduled that for final action at the February meeting, while awaiting Secretarial approval of Amendment 67. That Amendment has been approved, but we still have a couple weeks of work on the Pacific cod pot split amendment package to respond to Council and SSC input we received on the initial draft. I recommend we schedule the P. cod pot split for final action in April, which should not affect the implementation timeline.

Elaine Dinneford continues to provide the necessary database support to complete most of these analyses, for Council and agency analysts as well as contractors. She is also working on long-term database development projects, including close coordination with the AKFIN project, which is assimilating the myriad state and federal databases into a central, comprehensive data warehouse for use by Council and other agency analysts. Diane Provost continues to manage our ever-growing computer and networking systems.

We do have a new staff economist joining us in January, Jon McCracken, and we expect him to be able to provide immediate and welcome assistance to a variety of projects. We also have another position, NEPA Specialist/Fisheries Analyst, which will likely start in February or March. Chris Oliver will review the entire list of projects in the attached table, update you on the status of each, and seek direction and/or clarification on a few specific projects, in addition to the ones already mentioned above.

(b) Initiative to Collect Socio-economic Data

As most of you are aware, in addition to working on selected Council projects Darrell Brannan is working for the Alaska Fisheries Science Center on a project to re-initiate collection of socio-economic data (including cost, earnings, and employment information). Previous attempts at voluntary data collection have been largely unsuccessful, and our ability to conduct meaningful cost/benefit analyses is severely compromised by lack of these data. Our own SSC has continually noted this deficiency and stressed the need for routine collection of these data. The proposal under Item D-2(b) details these problems and contains a protocol for a mandatory data collection program. This proposal, developed by representatives of the Council, NMFS, ADF&G, and the CFEC, underscores the need for multi-agency endorsement of this approach. The proposal also contains data-sharing provisions among the agencies, and mechanisms to ensure the confidentiality of the information collected.

Multi-agency support for this project will be necessary in order for it to have any chance of success. At some point this would come back to the Council for review and approval, in the form of a regulatory amendment package, after further development by agency analysts, including review and approval of the plan by the major agencies involved. At this time we are informing you of the initiative, and seeking the Council's support for further development of the proposed data collection program.

Council Staff Tasking Summary Updated November 28, 2001

Mandated Actions	Projected Weeks	Council/ NMFS %	Comments
Programmatic Groundfish SEIS	?	10/90	Discuss in December/February
FMP Updates	2	90/10	Requires Council staff work in late 2001/ early 2002 (David/Jane)
AFA EIS/Proposed Rule	0	10/90	Review in December
AFA Report to Congress (final)	1	100/0	Finalize in December (Darrell)
Develop RFP's/SOWs for AFA funds	1	70/30	Partially Complete - see below (Chris)
SSL Measures (Committee & Analysis)	0	40/60	Complete for now
EFH EIS	?	40/60	Major project for late 2001/ 2002 (David/Cathy)
Crab FMP EIS	8	20/80	Will dovetail with crab rationalization after April

Additional Council Priorities *Bold =Highest priority

BSAI Crab Rationalization*	15	90/10	Major project through February (Darrell, Chris, Mark + contract help)
Halibut Subsistence/LAMPs (new reg amendments/BOF mtgs)*	1	95/5	Action in December. Further work required (Jane)
Community based QS (GCCC buy in proposal)*	1	90/10	Initial review in December - Action in February 2002 (Nicole)
Groundfish processing s/b, IR/IU, HMAP*/ bycatch discussion	3	80/20	Initial review in April 2002. Primarily outside contract w/ AFA funds. Initiated.
CDQ Amendment (policy committee)*	5	50/50	Initial review in December. Further work required (Nicole)
SSL Trailing Amendment*	5	30/70	Review in April or June (Dave/Cathy, plus contract assistance)
SR/RE retention*	2.5	80/20	Not started. (Jane/NMFS)
Halibut Charter IFQ	2	100/0	Prepare SOC Document (Jane)
BSAI pot cod split	2	100/0	Final Action in February or April (Nicole)
Observer Program (short-term changes/Committee)	2	10/90	Initial review in February (Nicole and Chris)
Other Species(Shark/Skate) FMP amend. and CDQ aspect	4	90/10	Review in February or April. Further staff discussion required (Jane)
CDQ Regulatory Amendment (Administrative and other)	1	10/90	Final Action in December
GOA Rationalization (through February)	4	90/10	White paper in February (Jane)
Seabird avoidance measures	1	10/90	Action in December. Finalize for SOC review.

Other Projects Previously Tasked (In order of Priority)

P. Cod sideboards (Prichett proposal)	6	100/0	Initial review in April. Contract with AFA funds, not yet initiated.
Trawl LLP recency discussion paper	3	100/0	Review in February. Contract with AFA funds. Initiated.
AFA single geographic location change	3	100/0	Review in February (T) Contract with AFA funds, not yet initiated.
GOA Salmon bycatch reduction measures (Discussion Paper)	2	100/0	Review in February (Cathy)
HAPC Stakeholder Process	?	90/10	Part of larger EFH process
TAC Setting Process	2	10/90	Review in April (Council/NMFS) Staff meeting in January
Opilio VIP	2	50/50	Tasked in February - Not started
Catch/bycatch disclosure (vessel level)	1	70/30	Discussion paper in December (Elaine) - Postponed
Scoping paper on fee/loan program for IFQ Charter (NMFS?)	1	10/90	Sometime in 2002
F40 Review	2	50/50	SSC direction in December. Review in 2002

Potential New Projects

Differential gear impacts (zonal approach)	?	?	Council direction in December
AFA s/b caps to quotas	8	80/20	Pending further Council direction
IFQ amendments	?	90/10	Pending Staff availability
Charter IFQ Community Set-Aside	4	90/10	Pending Council Direction

DRAFT NPFMC Three Meeting Outlook

December 3, 2001 Anchorage	February 4, 2002 Anchorage	April 8, 2002 Anchorage
Groundfish Forum report on Halibut Excluder Device Research		
Right whale critical habitat: Discuss	BSAI pot cod split (Amendment 68): Final Action (T)	Processor s/b IR/IU/HMAP: Initial Review
Community QS purchase: Initial Review	Community QS purchase: Final action	Alternative Bycatch measures: Discuss
Ecosystem Committee: Provide direction	GOA Rationalization: Review white paper	P.cod s/b proposal: Initial Review (T)
Review IFQ Committee Report	Shark/Skate other species FMP: Initial Review (T)	Shark/Skate other species FMP: Final Action (T)
AFA Extension: Review discussion paper	LLP Recency: Review Discussion Paper and data	LLP Recency: Discussion /Direction
AFA EIS/Proposed Rule: Review and comment	AFA SGL change: Initial Review	AFA SGL change: Final Action
AFA: Review initial coop agreements/reports	AFA: Final review coop agreements/reports	AFA S/B caps to quotas: Progress Report/Discussion
CDQ Policy Amendments: Initial Review	CDQ Policy Amendments: Final Review	
4E/4D CDQ Amendment: Final Action	Observer Program: Initial Review on reg amendments	Observer Program: Final Action on Reg Amendments
Programmatic SEIS: Status Report	General Salmon Bycatch info: Review	SR/RE Retention: Initial Review (T)
Differential gear impact analysis: Provide direction	SSL Trailing Amendments: Discuss	SSL Trailing Amendments: Initial Review (T)
Catch and bycatch disclosure: Review discussion paper (T)		TAC-setting process: Initial Review (T)
Crab Rationalization amendment: Preliminary Review	Crab Rationalization amendment: Initial Review	Crab Rationalization amendment: Final Review
Halibut Subsistence Amendments: Final Review		
Groundfish Specifications for 2002: Final Recommendations	FMP Updates: Initial Review (T)	FMP Updates: Final Action (T)
Seabird avoidance measures: Final Action	GOA salmon bycatch: Review and Discuss	
EFH: Discuss alternatives for designating EFH/HAPC	EFH: Discuss alternatives for mitigating fisheries impacts	EFH: Review Progress

*NOTE: This tentative timeline will be updated periodically, particularly after each Council meeting, as the Council works through its decision process.

TAC - Total Allowable Catch
 IFQ - Individual Fishing Quota
 AFA - American Fisheries Act
 HAPC - Habitat Areas of Particular Concern
 LLP - License Limitation Program
 PSC - Prohibited Species Catch
 QS - Quota Share

MSA - Magnuson Stevens Act
 SGL - Single Geographic Location
 SSL - Steller Sea Lion
 GHF - Guideline Harvest Level
 SEIS - Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
 CDQ - Community Development Quota
 GCCC- Gulf Coastal Communities Coalition

SAFE - Stock assessment and fishery evaluation
 CV - Catcher Vessel CP- Catcher Processor
 SR/RE - Shortraker/Rougheye
 MSST - Minimum Stock Size Threshold
 FMP - Fishery Management Plan
 (T) Tentatively scheduled

GOA Rationalization - Scope of Discussion Paper for February

The GOA Rationalization Committee met three times in 2000/2001 to develop recommendations to rationalize the GOA groundfish fisheries. It developed three problem statements for Council consideration on: 1) GOA rationalization; 2) elimination of latent licenses; and 3) effects of parallel State water fisheries on rationalizing Federal fisheries. The committee reviewed an analytical strawman but did not agree on what type of rationalization program or for which species; however, it 1) recommended compilation of tables of GOA Pacific cod, pollock, rockfish, and flatfish fisheries for 1995-2001 to eliminate latent licenses; 2) discussed but did not reach consensus on the different tools to allow industry to develop co-ops: a) gear allocations for each fishery; b) PSC and bycatch allocations for each fishery; c) sideboards between GOA and BSAI. The committee requested that the Council provide additional guidance on its goals and objectives before the committee could proceed further.

Dating back to June 2000, the Advisory Panel recommended that staff compile tables of 1995-2000 GOA Pacific cod, pollock, rockfish, and flatfish fisheries to implement further license limitation program species endorsements. In June 2001, it recommended that the Council initiate an analysis of 6-pages of elements and options for rationalizing just the Pacific cod fishery, plus options from the Committee's rockfish strawman proposal, the Council's crab rationalization alternatives, and AFA (such as processing sector elements, regionalization and community allocations, and cooperatives) using 1995-1999 as the base years.

The Council adopted a modified GOA rationalization problem statement, but not the remaining two committee fishery problem statements. In June 2001, you also adopted a vision statement, which may have been intended to replace the problem statement. Both statements, however, may be so broad as to hamper a reasoned approach for rationalization in the Gulf fisheries. In preparation for initiating a staff analysis, you adopted the AP's suite of alternatives, which incorporated non-specific references to:

- a) processing sector elements from the crab rationalization proposal;
- b) processing sector and regionalization and community allocation elements from the committee rockfish proposal;
- c) the entire rockfish suite of elements from the staff discussion paper;
- d) the draft WGOAF GOA Groundfish Rationalization proposal for a two year test program to test ITQ-like rationalized fishery management regimes for one industry group .

The Council tasked staff with preparing a scoping paper on GOA Rationalization for the February 2002 meeting, at which time the Council would provide further direction on next steps for the GOA Rationalization Committee and for staff. Further, under the October 2001 AFA agenda item, the Council also requested information on recent participation patterns for trawl fisheries in the Gulf for 1995-2000 (different from the species endorsement issue previously discussed in June 2000). This also was requested for the February 2002 meeting, along with similar information for BSAI non-AFA trawl fisheries. Because such information for the GOA will be directly relevant to GOA rationalization, we intend to provide that information by species and by fishery sector, and include similar participation information for fixed gear fisheries in the GOA as well. While a separate discussion paper was requested to go along with this information, we expect that information for the GOA would be included as part of this GOA rationalization discussion paper.

So that staff has a clearer direction on how to prepare the February 2002 scoping paper, the Council could review its two (problem and vision) statements, the suite of proposed alternatives (AP, committee, and industry) for analysis, and its choice of base years (at this time we only have complete information through year 2000). If the Council is able to provide further specificity on any of these items at this meeting, we

would be better able to provide you with a meaningful discussion paper in February. Barring further guidance from the Council, we would develop a preliminary scoping paper that further addresses these same issues for Council clarification in February 2002; i.e., this iteration would attempt to assess and filter the problem statements, recency information, and various, major program alternatives to help the Council better focus this initiative. Once the Council provides further clarifications on these issues in February, staff would likely need to prepare a second discussion paper directly discussing the merits of the clarified problem statement and proposed alternatives at a subsequent meeting.

A Proposal to Study the Issue of Mandatory Data Collection

Economists from four State and Federal agencies have met to discuss methods of collecting economic data that are necessary for the preparation of FMP amendments but are currently not available. After review of past experiences and agency problems associated with voluntary data collection, participants in the meeting have concluded that it is necessary to develop a mandatory data collection program. Participants in the meeting also felt that it was necessary to ensure that the data collected under such a program would be available only to authorized staff from each of the represented agencies.

Economists from these agencies are charged with conducting net benefit and distributional analyses. A mandatory data collection system is believed to be the only way to meet these objectives. Voluntary data collection programs, with rare exceptions, are not timely, have low response rates, do not result in adequate time series, and can be subject to strategic bias. Moreover, several recent attempts by NMFS, ADF&G and the Council to collect economic data have not been successful despite multiyear efforts and working very closely with industry members.

Many important issues, including property rights, closed areas, Improved Retention/Improved Utilization, and endangered species, have been brought to the forefront recently, but economists do not have adequate data to conduct complete and thorough analyses of these issues. New emphases on regulatory completeness, such as was the case in the shark FMP amendment, have also highlighted the need for better economic data.

Economists attending the meeting believe that successful economic data collection will require the State and Federal agencies to continue to work together on the program. To facilitate development of the proposed economic data collection program the economists also concluded that the agencies should provide the staff time and resources necessary to develop a draft document that would outline some alternatives for a mandatory data collection program.

DRAFT FOR AGENCY REVIEW (Oct. 19, 2001)

A Proposal to Develop an Inter-Agency Economic Data Collection Protocol And Data Sharing Agreement for FMP Fisheries in Alaska

1. Background Information

Economists from four State and Federal management agencies are currently involved in developing a proposal for an inter-agency agreement to collect economic data for Alaskan fisheries. Combined, those agencies¹ have the responsibility of managing both the commercial and recreational fisheries off the coast of Alaska. The agencies involved in developing the proposal are the:

- Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) represented by Jeff Hartman;
- Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC) represented by Kurt Schelle;
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) represented by Todd Lee;
- North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) represented by Darrell Brannan.

The economists held a meeting during September 2001 to discuss the current status of economic data collection and the future outlook. The economists from each agency unanimously agreed that a mandatory data collection program should be explored and that inter-agency coordination is needed. The need for mandatory economic data collection is evident since several attempts to collect these data under voluntary programs have only had very limited success. It is important that a mandatory data collection program has the support of each of the management agencies involved overseeing fisheries under an FMP. Cooperation will ensure that the necessary data are collected while minimizing the burden on industry members. Cooperation will also help to ensure that once the data are collected they will be available only to the analysts within each agency.

The present need for economic data is quite high. Currently there are many important policy issues that affect commercial fisheries in Alaska. These include property rights, closed areas, Improved Retention/Improved Utilization, and endangered species. These policy issues may lead to economic and structural change in the fishing industry and result in distributional effects that rival or exceed those associated with the initial americanization of North Pacific fisheries. Economic analyses are also coming under increased scrutiny to ensure that agencies are living up to their statutory requirements. New emphases on regulatory completeness, such as was the case in the shark FMP amendment, have continued to highlight the need for better economic information.

In light of the increased scrutiny and threat of litigation, there has been a national and regional commitment by NMFS to supply more resources to improve the collection and analysis of economic data. If these regulatory requirements are to be addressed, the economists participating in this

¹Dave Colpo, Pacific States Marine Fishery Commission (PSMFC) economist, also attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The Commission has no opinion on voluntary versus mandatory data collection mechanisms for economic data.

meeting are not aware of any viable alternatives to mandatory economic data collection for the FMP fisheries of the North Pacific. Thus, we recommend to the participating public agencies that they work toward a unified data collection system. The data to be collected would include cost, employment and earnings data at the vessel or plant level.

2. Voluntary Economic Data Collection

Over the past several years, as the stakes have increased in fisheries management decisions, it has become more and more difficult to collect economic data on a voluntary basis, and the most recent attempts were met with very limited success. Today there is no economic cost data being collected for the commercial fleets on a voluntary basis that can be used for FMP amendments. The most recent attempt at voluntary economic data collection was a program developed by NMFS. That economic survey focused on the pollock harvesting and processing sectors participating in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island groundfish fisheries. After approximately two and a half years of working with industry members to develop the data collection surveys, only one firm completed a survey and that was ultimately returned to the company when no other industry members responded. ADF&G has recently attempted to collect ownership information from pollock catcher vessel owners. This information is essential to defining each firm as an entity for economic analysis. Catcher vessel response rates to the survey have been low and there has been continuing resistance to requests for reporting this basic data. In another independent effort, the Council's economic data committee was unable to secure a commitment from industry participants to collect individual firm level cost data from the EEZ pollock groundfish fisheries after several meetings from 1998 through 2000. That committee has recently been disbanded by the Council for lack of progress towards meeting its objectives. Given the reluctance of industry members to supply these data, economists from each of the agencies have concluded that it is unlikely that any voluntary program will result in a systematic and periodic data collection program that would provide analysts with a useful time series of disaggregated economic data. Therefore, the focus should shift to studying how the data can be collected through a mandatory program.

3. Existing Mandatory Data Collection

Currently, revenue and price data are the only economic data being systematically collected under mandatory programs. Two examples of these are ADF&G's fish ticket records, which contain a value field, and ADF&G's Commercial Operator's Annual Reports (COAR) which contain data on both ex-vessel and wholesale values.

The data from these reporting systems are extremely useful for a variety of purposes, but neither fish tickets nor COAR reports collect the additional data on costs or employment that are needed to carry out requisite economic net benefit and economic impact analyses. A systematic approach to collecting cost, employment, and earnings data at the vessel or plant level is needed.

In recent years, some efforts have been made to indirectly estimate marginal costs from fish ticket data based upon the participant's in-season fishing decisions. While similar approaches to estimate

in-season marginal costs deserve continued exploration, the methodologies require many simplifying and ad hoc assumptions. The regular and systematic collection of detailed cost and employment data from participating entities would directly provide a reliable database that could be used for the analyses of many proposals.

4. Problem Statement

A successful economic data collection program has all of the following characteristics:

- The data are available in a timely fashion
- Sufficient cross sectional and time series data coverage at the operating unit level to allow for statistical analyses
- Sufficient in scope to carry out standard economic analyses (i.e., net benefit)
- Minimal biases (i.e., non-response bias and strategic bias)
- High degree of confidence in the accuracy of the data

If data satisfying the above characteristics were available, it would substantially improve the ability of economists to develop models and provide useful information to the public, fishing industry, policy makers, and fishery managers.

The economic data necessary to study the impacts of regulatory changes are currently not available. Analysts are being tasked with analyzing complex FMP amendment packages without being provided the economic data necessary to conduct formal economic analyses. These analyses are considered to be inadequate by many reviewers of the documents, since most must fall back on gross revenue calculations, which provide no insights to profitability or net benefits to the nation. Recent legal actions leave the agencies vulnerable to regulatory challenge (i.e., Atlantic Shark Amendment). Because the analysts lack the data required to conduct formal cost-benefit or distributional analyses, policy makers that rely on their work are often required to base their decisions on incomplete economic analyses. Furthermore, the number of policies requiring these types of analyses are increasing.

5. Goals

The goal of the proposed project is to develop a mandatory data collection program for vessel or plant level data that is verified to the extent practicable. The program will be designed to protect confidential data, coordinate the collection of data, minimize the burden on industry, and be administratively efficient. Improving the quality and scope of the economic data that are being collected will require cooperation from all of the agencies involved, as well as a commitment to supply the resources necessary to make the program successful.

6. Tasks

To facilitate the collection of economic data it is necessary to develop a data collection protocol that all of the agencies would agree to follow. The protocol would establish the following:

- Which agency would collect specific data
- Who would be responsible for oversight of the data collection and ensuring its confidentiality
- How the data would be shared between agencies, and
- The funding sources for the data collection projects.

Defining the basic structure of the data collection process before setting out to collect the data should ensure that the proper data are collected, they are properly stored and maintained, and that they can be used in the most effective manner.

A larger group of economists from the agencies met in July 2001 to develop a list of needs for economic research. That list represents the areas we feel need to be improved. Some of the areas of need that relate to this effort are:

- Markets
- Industrial organization
- Regional and community economic impacts
- Prediction of behavior
- Economic performance
- Rights based management

It is critical that the process to develop these protocols begins within a relatively short period of time. Currently several fisheries under the authority of the NPFMC, NMFS, and ADF&G are moving towards systems of more rational management. The management system changes being discussed for these fisheries will alter the economics of the industries and communities that rely on them. Without collecting information on the fisheries before these changes take place, economists and policy makers will not be in a position to determine the overall impacts of the programs. Therefore, without an adequate data collection mechanism, the successes, failures, and ability of those programs to meet their objectives may never be truly understood.

7. The Next Steps

If each of the agencies agree to provide staff support for development of this project, the next two steps towards implementing a mandatory data collection program will be (1) developing a draft Inter-agency proposal fleshing out the mandatory data collection mechanisms and (2) presentation of the proposal to each agency for modification and approval of the concepts.

Should each of the agencies agree to the proposal then efforts will focus on developing the implementation details of the program and the collection of data. These steps will require additional support from a broad group of people with specialized knowledge in the agencies (lawyers, policy

experts, and database designers and administrators).

Appendix I

Summary of Agencies Involved

ADF&G

Mission and Statutes

The mission of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) is to manage, protect, maintain, and improve the fish, game and aquatic plant resources of Alaska. The primary goals are to ensure that Alaska's renewable fish and wildlife resources and their habitats are conserved and managed on the sustained yield principle, and the use and development of these resources are in the best interest of the economy and well-being of the people of the state.

The mission of the Division of Commercial Fisheries of the ADF&G is to manage, protect, rehabilitate, enhance, and develop fisheries and aquatic plant resources in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the state, consistent with the sustained yield principle and subject to allocations established through public regulatory processes. The division is responsible for management of the state's commercial; subsistence, and personal use fisheries; the rehabilitation and enhancement of existing fishery resources; and the development of new fisheries. Technical support is provided to the private sector mariculture and salmon ranching industries. The division also plays a major role in the management of fisheries in the 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone and participates in international fisheries negotiations.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game is an independent regulatory agency, whose fishery regulations are deliberated by the appointed members of the Alaska Board of Fish and the Commissioner of ADF&G. Statutes relating to fisheries are covered within selected sections of Alaska Statutes Titles 5, 8, 12, 16, 20, 37, 38 and 44.

Data Bases and Collection

There are three primary commercial fishery and seafood information databases maintained by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game that are relevant to economic analysis. In combination these reports are used to generate available data on commercial fishing harvests, industry participation (by processor, buyer, exporter) by name and area, seafood production, and landed and seafood processor purchase and sales (processing sales are determined at wholesale level).

The three databases are:

- Alaska Fish Ticket Data Base
- Seafood Processors Intent to Operate
- Commercial Operators Annual Report.

For the purpose of fishery management many other minor databases exist, including survey data from large and small fisheries, crab observer data, sport fishery Statewide harvest survey data, creel census

data, Charter logbook data, recreational license data and other commercial and recreational fishery registration data. There are also production and permit databases from Private Non-Profit Salmon Hatcheries is maintained, as well as production data for Maricultured species within the state.

CFEC

The Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC) is an independent regulatory and quasi-judicial agency of the State of Alaska. Alaska's Legislature passed the Limited Entry Act (AS16.43) in 1973. The law created Alaska's limited entry program and established CFEC. The purpose of the law is to promote the conservation and sustained yield management of Alaska's fishery resource and the economic health and stability of commercial fishing in Alaska by regulating and controlling entry into the commercial fisheries in the public interest and without unjust discrimination.

The commission consists of three members who are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the legislature. Commissioners are appointed for terms of four years. The commissioners are responsible for the agency and serve as administrative judges in adjudicative proceedings. The commissioners employ professional staff to help carry out the functions of the agency.

The limited entry law requires persons to have fishery specific CFEC permits for the operation of gear in all Alaska commercial fisheries, both unlimited and limited. CFEC annually issues between 20,000 and 30,000 interim-use and permanent entry permits for Alaskan commercial fisheries. In 1974, 19 salmon fisheries were placed under limited entry programs. At the end of 2000, more than 60 Alaskan fisheries had been placed under permanent limited entry programs and two fisheries were operating under temporary vessel moratoria. Since 1978, CFEC has also handled vessel licensing for the State of Alaska.

CFEC creates, maintains, and updates CFEC gross earnings files, which are derived from ADF&G fish ticket files, CFEC permit data, price modules containing CFEC ex-vessel price estimates, and other CFEC data. The CFEC gross earnings files are generated primarily for the agency's own analytical needs and reporting purposes. However, fishery analysts at NMFS and NPFMC also use versions of these CFEC gross earnings files. Fishery analysts from other agencies also use CFEC vessel license files as a source of data. Both as a data provider and a data user, CFEC agrees that quality data are needed to analyze regulatory proposals and make informed decisions.

NMFS

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is the agency responsible for the science-based conservation and management of the Nation's living marine resources. NMFS is part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) within the Department of Commerce. NMFS scientists collect and analyze scientific data on the Nation's living marine resources, marine ecosystems, and the benefits to the Nation.

Resource managers and other stakeholders, including the public at large, cannot make well-informed

~~C:\DOCUME~1\CHRISO~1\LOCALS~1\TEMP\FINAL\INTER\AGECY\DOC.DOC~~ ~~C:\NPFMC\NMFS~~
~~DATA\FINAL\INTER\AGECY\DOC.DOC~~

COST

decisions concerning the conservation and management of living marine resources without a sound basis for assessing a wide range of potential effects, including the economic effects of management actions. Therefore, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, Executive Order 12866, and other Federal laws include requirements for economic analysis of Federal management actions and policies. The principal mission of economists at the Alaska Region and the Alaska Fisheries Science Center is to assist NMFS in meeting its stewardship responsibilities in the Alaska Region by improving the economic information available for the management of living marine resources. This economic information is provided to resource managers, the fishing industry, the environmental community, fishing communities, and other stakeholders, including the public at large. To meet this mission, NMFS collects data and conducts research in order to measure economic performance, estimate the economic effects of existing management measures, and predict the economic effects of proposed management measures.

NPFMC

The NPFMC is one of eight regional councils established by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 1976 (which has been renamed the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act) to oversee management of the nation's fisheries. With jurisdiction over the 900,000 square mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) off Alaska, the Council has primary responsibility for groundfish management in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) and Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI), including cod, pollock, flatfish, mackerel, sablefish, and rockfish species harvested mainly by trawlers, hook and line longliners and pot fishermen. The Council also makes allocative and limited entry decisions for halibut, though the U.S. - Canada International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) is responsible for conservation of halibut. Other large Alaska fisheries such as salmon, crab and herring are managed primarily by the State of Alaska.

The Council has eleven voting members, six from Alaska, three from Washington, one from Oregon, and a federal representative, the Alaska Regional Administrator of NMFS. The non-federal voting members represent state fisheries agencies, industry, fishing communities, and academia. The Council also has four non-voting members representing the U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, and the U.S. Department of State.

The Council meets five to six times each year, four times in communities around Alaska, and once in Washington or Oregon. The Council's office is located in Anchorage. The Council receives advice each meeting from its Advisory Panel (AP) representing user groups, environmentalists and consumer groups, and from its Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) of highly respected scientists who review all information brought to the Council. Each of these groups has expressed concern over the lack of economic data available to them when making recommendations to the Council regarding fisheries policy decisions.

The need for these data by Council staff is becoming more acute as the required analyses become more rigorous and the standards for review are tighter. The Regulatory Impact Reviews (RIRs) that are required for each FMP amendment require specific issues be analyzed. Those include the

National Standards in the Magnuson-Stevens Act (NS 8 is an excellent example), net national benefit analyses, and distributional analyses. Currently the information is not available to the analysts to conduct those analyses in a formal economic framework.

PSMFC

Our goal

The goal of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) is to promote and support policies and actions for the conservation, development and management of fishery resources of mutual concern to member states through a coordinated regional approach, monitoring and utilization. The PSMFC does not have regulatory or management authority; rather it serves as a forum for discussion, works for coast-wide consensus, and represents that consensus to state and federal authorities. The PSMFC works to increase the recognition of the importance of recreational and commercial fisheries to local economies, and try to address issues that reflect the needs of the industry in federal and state legislation. In addition, the Commission works to facilitate inter-jurisdictional fishery agreements and coordinate information.

Commission and Advisors

Fifteen commissioners, three from each of the five member states, Alaska, Washington, Idaho, Oregon and California, work to set policy and provide direction for Commission activities. One-third of these members are appointed by the state legislatures one-third are appointed by the state's governors, and the remaining third are the state fishery directors. Each member state also maintains a PSMFC advisory committee, composed of representatives from the recreational and commercial fishing communities.

EFIN and AKFIN

The Economics Fisheries Information Network (EFIN) is a cooperative data collection effort to address the needs of fisheries managers and industry for economic data on the West Coast and in Alaska. This project is conducted by the Commission as part of a cooperative agreement with the National Marine Fisheries Service and with the help of the Pacific Fishery Management Council and the North Pacific Fishery Management Council.

The goals of EFIN are to provide reliable and timely data to assist with: 1) the monitoring and measuring of the economic performance of the West Coast and Alaska fishing industry and 2) analysis of the economic effects of present and future management decisions on these fisheries and fishing communities.

The Alaska Fishery Information Network (AKFIN) is a cooperative data program to support collection, entry, transfer, analysis and management of critical Alaska fishery information. AKFIN's objectives are to:

- Coordinate inter-agency participation and facilitate cooperation in data management
- Provide central access to Alaska fishery, biological, economic and social data
- Provide transfer, validation, integration and reporting of historical and real-time data

- Maintain the confidentiality of data
- Assure the quality and integrity of data.