

North Pacific Fishery Management Council

CHAIRMAN

Mr. Elmer Rasmuson
P.O. Box 600
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Suite 32, 333 West 4th Avenue
Post Office Mall Building
Phone: 907-274-4563
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3136DT
Anchorage, Alaska 99510

Attachment #8

SUMMARY OF MEETING

ADVISORY PANEL

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Anchorage, Alaska

January 26-28, 1977

The Advisory Panel met both as a group and as separate subcommittees during the third plenary session of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council meeting. All meetings were held either on the 8th floor of the Hill Building or in the Windsor Room of the Sheffield House. This summary consists of (1) time periods the committee met, (2) the information of the various subcommittees, (3) persons in attendance, and (4) a list of reports and recommendations brought forth by the Advisory Panel.

The following Advisory Panel members were present:

Mr. Jack Cotant, Chairman
Mr. Nick Szabo, Vice Chairman
Ms. Judith Ayres
Mr. A. W. "Bud" Boddy
Mr. Oral Burch
Mr. James Beaton
Mr. Truman Emberg
Mr. Paul Guy
Mr. Sigfried Jaeger
Mr. Charles L. Jensen
Mr. Joseph Kurtz
Mr. Richard B. Lauber
Mr. Raymond P. Lewis
Mr. Robert W. Moss, Jr.
Mr. Daniel J. O'Hara
Mr. Ken O. Olsen
Mr. Al Otness

Mr. Keith Specking
Mr. Robert Starck
Mr. Harry Wilde, Sr.

Absent were:

Mr. William Burke
Mr. Jay S. Gage
Mr. Knute Johnson
Mr. Robert Alverson

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The general order of business of the Advisory Panel was as follows:

Wednesday, January 26, 1977
8:30 a.m.

The Advisory Panel attended the Council meeting.

10:30 a.m.

The Advisory Panel met informally to select membership for two subcommittee working groups. These were:

#1 A subcommittee to study the Standard Operating Practices and Procedures, consisting of Ms. Judith Ayres, Chairwoman; Mr. Daniel J. O'Hara, and Mr. A.W. "Bud" Boddy.

#2 A subcommittee to consider foreign permit applications, with Mr. Keith Specking, Chairman; Mr. Truman Emberg, Mr. Charles Jensen, Mr. Sig Jaeger, and Mr. Ken Olsen.

Each subcommittee working group was comprised of Advisory Panel members and Council members.

11:00 a.m.

The Advisory Panel attended the Council meeting.

1:00 p.m.

The Advisory Panel met as a group to discuss working methods and to separate into the two working subpanels.

1:15 p.m.

The Advisory Panel subcommittees on Standard Operating Practices and Procedures and foreign permit applications met. Advisory Panel members that were not a part of either working subcommittee attended the Scientific and Statistical Committee meeting.

4:00 p.m.

The Advisory Panel met as a formal group. Reports were given from the Standard Operating Practices and Procedures subcommittee and from the foreign permit review subcommittee. At this meeting a tanner crab resolution was introduced by Mr. Nick Szabo and Mr. Charles Jensen and passed by the Advisory Panel. It is included in the general minutes as enclosure #31 and also as an attachment to this report of the Advisory Panel. Formal subcommittees were then formed for the following groups:

- #3 Black cod - Mr. Sig Jaeger, Chairman; Mr. Robert Starck, Mr. Al Otness, and Mr. Charles Jensen.
- #4 Foreign ownership - Mr. Ken Olsen, Chairman; Mr. Joseph Kurtz, Mr. Keith Specking, and Mr. Sig Jaeger.

Thursday
January 27, 1977
8:30 a.m.

The Advisory Panel attended the Council meeting. Mr. Nick Szabo gave a report of Advisory Panel progress to the Council which is included in the meeting minutes.

10:00 a.m.

The Advisory Panel broke into working groups to consider three of the four topics for which subcommittees had been formed. These were the Standard Operating Practices and Procedures subcommittee, the foreign permit review subcommittee,

and the black cod subcommittee. The foreign ownership committee did not meet because they felt that they needed more information with which to act on.

1:30 p.m.

The Advisory Panel attended public hearings. After the public hearings the Advisory Panel met to discuss a resolution introduced by Mr. Jack Cotant, which dealt with proposed abrogation of the INPFC treaty. It was moved, seconded, and carried and is an attached part of this report.

Friday
January 28, 1977
8:30 a.m.

The Advisory Panel attended the Council meeting and gave a report of their progress. Mr. Jack Cotant presented the resolution concerning the requested abrogation of the INPFC treaty. Mr. Charles Jensen and Mr. Nick Szabo presented the resolution concerning the tanner crab report to the Council.

12:00

Adjourned.

The Advisory Panel adopted the following resolutions as developed by the Alaska Board of Fisheries:

Now therefore be it resolved that no foreign harvest of tanner crab be allowed south of 58° north latitude and east of 173° west longitude.

Now therefore be it resolved that any foreign fishing of C. bairdi tanner crab be restricted to male crab greater than 140 mm of carapace width.

The Council moved, seconded, and approved a motion to accept the Advisory Panel report.

January 19, 1977

Possibilities for Organization of the Advisory Panel
to the
NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

The exact relationship of the Advisory Panel to the Council has not been established. It is still in a formative stage and input is needed from Council members, Advisory Panel members and the Scientific and Statistical Committee. Admiral Hayes and his staff have made some proposals in the form of revisions to the Charter of the Advisory Panel and a flow chart showing the development of Council management plans.

This suggests formation of working groups along management unit or plan lines, which appears to be both feasible and desirable. It may also be desirable to form sub-panels cutting across management units, based on categories as suggested in the first working draft of the agenda for the third Council meeting.

Perhaps the most pressing problem facing the North Pacific Council, after the working structure of the Council and its advisory bodies is formulated, is the definition and application of OSY - optimum sustained yield. The members of the Advisory Panel are particularly well qualified in the socio-economic area to give advice and direction to the Council and are probably in the best position of anyone in the Council structure to determine if a management plan is practical or not. All of these areas are

undoubtedly going to be pertinent to OSY, and therefore it seems apparent that the Advisory Panel is best fitted to take the lead role in advising the Council on both the general definition of optimum sustained yield and those specific parameters that will govern OSY in each management plan.

With OSY as the first and immediate goal of the Advisory Panel, it might be possible to work toward that goal by developing a number of sub-panels that would work on separate facets of OSY. As an example:

1. A ground fish development sub-committee to determine the interest and capability of the U.S. fishing fleet to harvest ground fish off Alaska. What areas are likely to be developed first and what elements of the existing fleet would be involved? Will ground fish development be based on existing fishing capacity or can new units be expected in the fishery?
2. Determine U.S. tanner crab catch capacity based on the U.S. fisherman's ability to catch the resource, the processor's current capability for processing tanner crab, both as sections and meat, and on an assessment of U.S. ability to market large quantities of tanner crab. Are all three components of this fishery - catching, processing and marketing - equal and currently in synchronization?

3. A sub-panel to assess the processing capability and problems involved in new fisheries, particularly those for ground fish and tanner crab. What capability is now available? What can be expected to be available in the immediate future? Where does the processing industry need help in technology, financing, et cetera, in order to get these fisheries started in Alaska?
4. Marketing capability. A working group to assess the current and future marketing capability for finfish in all of the various forms in which it can be processed.
5. A sub-panel to define the importance of fisheries that may be influenced by Council management plans. How can they best be protected? Are there alternatives?
6. A working sub-panel on limited entry to study its merits, demerits, pitfalls, and problem areas.

The Advisory Panel Charter can be revised to reflect whatever working method is decided on. The only problem is putting our heads together to work out an efficient system.

Prepared by CG (droff)
1/8/77

Advisory Panel Responsibilities
Management Plan/DEIS Flow

1. Statement of problem

a. Advisory panel members state they are not being adequately used. Many wonder what their role is. Some say they'll quit if their role isn't defined in more meaningful terms.

b. Under the present flow scheme for MPs, the advisory panel does not have an opportunity to review the plans. Since the working groups and the SSC consist almost exclusively of Scientists and Academia, there is little input from fishermen, processors, etc., until after the plans are submitted to the Council.

c. Since the Panel consists of 25 diverse members, it is difficult to involve the whole Panel in the early stages of MP development even though Panel involvement is necessary.

2. Alternate solutions

I. Reorganization of MP flow and AP Responsibilities (Recommended)

a. In one way or another, the Panel Members must become involved in the early stages of MP development. A possible reorganization would divide the Panel into 3 or 4 person sub-panels which would communicate with working groups. Each MP would have its own sub-panel. Also, there would be sub-panels created for special purposes such as examining limited entry. The input of the sub-panels would be in the socio-economic area. (subsistence, recreation, U. S. fishing and processing capability, marketing, etc.). While the Council created charter would establish guidelines for sub-panel selection, the Panel as a whole would set up its own sub-panels.

1. Statement of problem

a. Advisory panel members state they are not being adequately used.

Many wonder what their role is. Some say they'll quit if their role

isn't defined in more meaningful terms.

b. Under the present flow scheme for MPs, the advisory panel does not

have an opportunity to review the plans. Since the working groups and the

SSC consist almost exclusively of Scientists and Academics, there is little

input from fishermen, processors, etc., until after the plans are submitted

to the Council.

c. Since the Panel consists of 25 diverse members, it is difficult

to involve the whole Panel in the early stages of MP development even

though Panel involvement is necessary.

2. Alternate solutions

1. Reorganization of MP Flow and AP Responsibilities (Recommended)

a. In one way or another, the Panel members must become involved

in the early stages of MP development. A possible reorganization would

divide the Panel into 3 or 4 person sub-panels which would communicate

with working groups. Each MP would have its own sub-panel. Also, there

would be sub-panels created for special purposes such as examining limited

entry. The input of the sub-panels would be in the socio-economic area.

(Substance, recreation, U.S. fishing and processing capability, marketing,

etc.). While the Council created charter would establish guidelines for

sub-panel selection, the Panel as a whole would set up its own sub-panels.

b. The sub-panels should take inputs from all Panel Members and communicate them to the working groups. Later, the working group would submit a rough draft of the MP to the sub-panel for comments. The sub-panel would try to change the plans and, where it could not change the plans, would submit majority and minority opinions to the Panel. After this point, the sub-panel's role would cease. Smooth MP drafts would then be submitted to the SSC and the Panel*, majority and minority opinions developed, then both groups would submit their comments to the Executive Director. The ED or some other neutral party would be the one in the hot seat during Council meetings who would submit the plans along with minority and majority opinions of SSC and Panel.

*Note: The Panel is involved in this process for two reasons ' (1) There will be some Panel members who have an interest in an MP but won't be on the sub-panel. These people have an opportunity to get involved at this point. (2) For political reasons, it would be undesirable to completely reorganize the Panel down into sub-panels as is done in the PFMC.

c. See attached flow diagram (enclosure (1)) and revised charter for Advisory Panel (enclosure (2)).

II. Status Quo (not recommended)

a. Maintaining the status quo will lead to discontent in the Advisory Panel and eventually ill feelings about the Council process.

b. Input from the 25 individual Advisory Panel members at a late stage in the development of the Management Plans will result in significant changes to the plans and unnecessary rewriting of the plans. To the maximum extent possible the plans should be cohesive before they are reviewed at public hearings.

d. The sub-panels should take inputs from all Panel members and communicate them to the working groups. Later, the working groups would submit a rough draft of the MP to the sub-panel for comments. The sub-panel would try to change the plans and where it could not change the plans would submit majority and minority opinions to the Panel. After this point, the sub-panel's role would cease. Smooth MP drafts would then be submitted to the SSC and the Panel*, majority and minority opinions developed, then both groups would submit their comments to the Executive Director. The ED or some other neutral party would be the one in the hot seat during Council meetings who would submit the plans along with minority and majority opinions of SSC and Panel.

Notes: The Panel is involved in this process for two reasons: (1) There will be some Panel members who have an interest in an MP but won't be on the sub-panel. These people have an opportunity to get involved at this point. (2) For political reasons, it would be undesirable to completely reorganize the Panel down into sub-panels as is done in the PPMC.

c. See attached flow diagram (enclosure (1)) and revised

charter for Advisory Panel (enclosure (2)).

II. Status Quo (not recommended)

- a. Maintaining the status quo will lead to discontent in the Advisory Panel and eventually ill feelings about the Council process.
- b. In part from the 25 individual Advisory Panel members at a late stage in the development of the management plans will result in significant changes to the plans and unnecessary rewriting of the plans. To the maximum extent possible the plans should be cohesive before they are reviewed at public hearings.