

**Nearshore Advisory Committee Meeting
June 27, 2002
Los Alamitos, CA**

The following individual spoke at this meeting:

Speaker	Comment	Response
S-1 Bob Osborn		
C-1	It's not appropriate, in my view, to essentially having peer review panel to, in essence being used to, review their own work. The basic concept of peer review is independent review. The Department is polluting the peer review group by including options developed jointly with the peer review panel is in danger of repeating the same kind of mistake as Arthur Anderson and Enron.	The peer review process (please see FGC §7062) was observed throughout the NFMP process.
C-2	Regulations do not match UASC proposal as outlined in body of plan. It's not 4 hooks but instead it's 20 hooks, 10 per fishermen, 20 per boat.	Wording has been changed in the amended Initial Statement of Reasons.
C-3	Disappointing to hear it will take a minimum of 2 years to get automated license system. We need an interim paper solution to identify anglers.	The Department collects information on commercial fishermen and is developing an automated license system for recreational fishermen. The commercial license information is entered into a data base and the recreational information will also be entered into a database. At this time, the Department plans to incorporate an e-license component into its Automated License Data System which is under construction. More information is available on the Department's website. In addition, the Department's Marine Region maintains a database of almost 7,000 people interested in receiving information. This database was used to solicit input during the initial stages of developing interim regulations.
C-4	The consensus on recommendation on a nearshore stamp. Absence of southern CPFV representative and note that SoCal anglers absence.	Speaker noted that, while members of the Nearshore Advisory Committee came to consensus on support for the recreational permit or stamp, not all recreational industry members were at the meeting.
C-5	Essential Fishery Information should determine whether an area density model is better than a stockwide assessment. Focus should remain with Stage I rule and transition to new control rules as data is improved.	Essential fishery information will be a key component of determining how to move from stage to stage and what models or assessments would be best suited to make decisions. The intent is to allow any valid new information on the status of a stock to be used in the management process. In that context, practically any type of scientifically sound stock assessment could allow management to move from Stage I to Stage II. A broad range of approaches would be

Speaker	Comment	Response
		acceptable, from simplistic surplus production models to more sophisticated integrated models such as “Stock Synthesis” or “AD Model Builder” approaches.
C-6	The plan has too narrow of a focus. Regimes and dynamics for the same reason we see problems with the control rule, we see problems with a focus on local management versus a range of international, federal, state, and regional management as essential fishery information.	The distributions of some species may shift with changes in oceanic conditions. Such variability in the fishery can be handled under the framework of the NFMP. Specific management measures for each region are not hardwired into the NFMP, but can instead be modified to respond to changes in oceanic conditions and subsequent changes in the fishery.
C-7	Control rules should tell fishermen how many fish he can catch.	The fishery control rule is a framework within which total take will result in the primary goal of sustainability for all nearshore species. This approach enables management to be adaptive to regional considerations, the eventual development and use of marine protected areas, and amount of data-richness available for a fishery. The framework approach allows take to be adjusted as needed to reflect changes in knowledge of the stock. The actual calculations of maximum sustainable yield (or a proxy for it), the precautionary adjustment to determine an optimum yield to lessen the risk of overfishing, and allocation will be done at regional levels to provide local fishermen (recreational and commercial), industries and communities a voice in the decision-making process.