

Draft Agenda*

60th Plenary Session
NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

April 24-26, 1984
Anchorage, Alaska

I. Introduction

- A. Eight Years of Management under MFCMA
- B. Perceived Weaknesses in Council System
- C. Meeting Purpose

II. Review of the Council Decision Process

A. Management Objectives

- 1. Should objectives be more measurable?
- 2. How long-term should objectives be?
- 3. How often should plan objectives be reviewed?
- 4. Should allocative objectives be explicit?
- 5. What action should Council take to improve objectives?

B. Procedures and Documentation

1. Proposals: Gathering and Processing

- a. Should there be a cut-off date on proposal submission for a specific fishery?
- b. Would the cut-off apply equally to proposals from the public, Council members, Council's advisory bodies?
- c. How should we deal with problems or proposals requiring an exceptionally rapid response? What can be done between Council meetings?
- d. How should proposals be screened: By whom and on what basis?
- e. Does the Council want to review all proposals before going public, or can proposals be batched and sent immediately out to the public as is done by the Board?

2. Decision Documents

- a. What documents does the Council want to have available when giving final approval to an amendment - FMP amendment, proposed regulation, economic analysis, environmental analysis, legal opinion?
- b. Should these documents be in final form, or just preliminary as long as nothing substantial is changed after the Council's decision is made?

*Closed session may be called at Chairman's discretion.

- c. Should we have a cut-off date for new information to be included in the analyses?
 - d. What if Board receives analyses during meeting?
 - e. How much lead time is needed for review by Council, Plan Team, SSC, AP, and public?
 - f. What sort of peer review should there be?
 - g. What are roles of SSC, AP, workgroups, and plan teams in review process?
 - h. Does the Council want a recommended alternative? On what items? From whom? What is adequate review?
- C. Task Assignments and Interagency Relationships
- 1. Plan Teams: composition, approval of new members, role in preparing and reviewing documents, role in recommending preferred alternatives.
 - 2. Council staff: participation on teams and workgroups, screening of proposals, doing analyses, making recommendations.
 - 3. How is the analytical manpower in the contributing agencies - NMFS Region, Center, ADF&G, Council staff - most effectively used in performing the required analyses? Long vs short term? Biological vs economic?
- D. Annual Management Cycles
- 1. Given answers to the questions above, what is the best annual cycle for management decisions by the Council?
 - 2. Should the meeting schedule be changed? For example, cluster meetings at certain times of the year?
 - 3. What definite changes can be made this year?

III. Beyond the Council and Regional Level

- A. Budget Process
- 1. Current budget outlook.
 - 2. Can the Council have more effective input into the Council, NMFS, and NOAA budgets?
 - 3. Can the programmatic funding process be improved?
- B. Washington, DC Review
- 1. How can communications between Region, DC and Council be improved?
 - 2. Do we need delegations to shepherd amendments through Washington?
- C. Amendments to MFCMA - suggestions?
- D. Oversight Hearings - need and topic.

IV. Council Policy Considerations

A. Council

B. SSC

C. AP

V. Draft Recommendations for the Future of Fisheries Management

VI. Council/Board of Fisheries Relationships

VII. Inter-Council Communication

1. Problem areas

2. Inter-Council Coordinating Committee

VIII. May and July Meeting Agendas