Amendment 18 update

Rachel Feeney
NEFMC Staff

OSC Meeting
August 4, 2014



Outline

- I. Review A18 timeline & Action Plan
- 2. Development of measures
 - I. Accumulation limits
 - Inshore/offshore GOM
 - 3. Data confidentiality



Timeline & Action Plan

	Action Development (p. 4)	PDT Resources (p. 5)
2014		
June 17-19	NEFMC develops alternatives and	Develop measures, provide data, begin
	partially approves Range of Alternatives	analysis of alternatives
	(HA measures and US/CA).	
July 23	CIE review reports finalized.	
Aug. 4	OSC mtg.	
Aug. 7	PDT mtg.	
Sept. 16	RAP mtg. (AM)	
Sept. 16	GAP mtg. (PM)	
Sept. 17-18	OSC mtg.	
Sept. 30-	NEFMC approves remaining Range of	
Oct.2	Alternatives (accumulation limits,	
	inshore/offshore, data confidentiality).	
OctDec.	Revised NOI, PDT develop DEIS,	Revise NOI, analyze alternatives
	analyze probable effects.	
2015		
June 16-18	NEFMC votes on final action.	Finish DEIS, facilitate comment
		periods, Revise EIS
2016		
May I	Possible implementation of measures.	



Accumulation Limits

June Council motions

- Include as options for the PSC alternatives:
 - That holdings in excess of the cap would have the ACE annually distributed to the rest of the fleet in the manner described in Framework 45. PSC for each permit would remain unchanged.
 - That grandfathers holdings in excess of the cap as of the control date.
 - In the event that someone is required to sell permits as a result of this action, adequate time will be provided to do so.



Doc. #4 (p. 9-11) Doc. # 5a (p. 36-37)

Accumulation Limits

June Council motions

- Direct the Committee to discuss the impacts of PSC caps on divestiture of underutilized species, future buybacks, subsequent sales of permits, and other issues.



Accumulation Limits

PDT input

- Should NMFS determine that holdings above the Council-preferred limit constitute an excessive share under the MSA, holdings above this limit may not be viable.
- As is, each individual permit holder would be subject to the accumulation limit alternative that is approved, no matter if the permits held are issued by NMFS, purchased, bequeathed, or some combination thereof.
- See Discussion Document Section 4.1.3 and decisiontree figures on PDT memo.



Inshore/Offshore GOM

June Council motions

Develop a range of alternatives:

- Inshore/offshore Gulf of Maine boundary lines, including: 70° W longitude and 70° I 5' W longitude.
- Apply the following to the commercial and recreational groundfish fisheries:
 - Divide the existing ACL into inshore and offshore sub-ACLs (by historical catch patterns or stock distribution), and a sub-option to prohibit vessels from fishing in both the inshore and offshore GOM areas on a single trip without an observer or electronic monitoring technology;
 - Address concentrated inshore effort by expanding the gear restricted area in inshore Gulf of Maine; and
 - Create declaration time periods in and out of area.



Inshore/Offshore GOM

Doc. #4 (p. 3-9) Doc. # 5a (p. 49-54)

PDT Input

Concerns:

- OSC & Council discussions in June diminished the importance of promoting fleet diversity as the purpose of these measures.
- Protecting and rebuilding cod is very important, but the link to the A18 goals is currently too weak.

Options:

- 1. Shift the focus towards fleet diversity.
- 2. Revise the A18 goals to include cod protection.
- 3. Drop these measures and develop in a future action.
- See Discussion Document Section 4.5 and PDT memo.



Doc. #4 (p. 12-14) Doc. # 5a (p. 48)

Data Confidentiality

April Council motion

 PSC-determined catch allocations and subsequent leasing (amount and value) by individuals be non-confidential data.

PDT Input

- Concerns:
 - Allocations and trades occur at the sector level.
 - Currently insufficient legal standing to be a viable alternative.
 - Requiring posting of price data could incentivize misreporting and prices are difficult to verify.
 - PDT could not find a catch share program where permit holder and price are posted with each quota transfer.
- Options:
 - I. Move Section 4.4, Alternative 2 to Considered but Rejected.
 - 2. Articulate why making individual data public is necessary for the administration of the program, warranting a MSA exemption.

