NGOM TAC split Considerations

Updated for August 29/30, 2017 PDT Meeting

NGOM as Council Priority: At its April meeting, the New England Council approved a problem statement and goals for managing the NGOM management area. The Council identified the problem as unknown biomass and recent high landings from the management area, with a goal of developing tools in order to fully understanding total removals from the area and improving management. **On June 1, the scallop Committee passed the following tasking motion for the PDT to develop options that consider both the historic TAC and historic removals from the NGOM management area:**

Motion 7: Stockwell/Kendall

The Committee tasks the PDT with developing options for splitting the NGOM TAC using a hybrid approach to splitting the NGOM TAC between the LA and LAGC component.

Rationale: One concept is to use an initial "floor" of lbs, a percentage split between groups, and a maximum amount of pounds from the NGOM. It would be helpful to see tables of how this approach would work under a range of TAC options.

The motion carried on a show of hands: 10/0/0

A goal for the September meetings is to have the AP and Committee consider a range of alternatives for:

1. The Overall TAC for the NGOM area.
2. The distribution of the NGOM TAC between fishery components.
3. Limited access harvest approaches.

To keep this timeline, the PDT will need to address each of these issues in August after survey work in the area is completed, and develop a reasonable range of values for the Committee to consider. The Committee will be meeting in September, October, and November, and will have a chance to weigh in on these draft measures ahead before selecting a preferred alternative.

FOR August 30: Review survey information and biomass estimates. Discuss potential TACs for NGOM area, range of potential LAGC and LA split based on the TAC, and ideas for LA harvest approaches.

Current status of NGOM TAC: Through Amendment 11 and subsequent FW adjustments, the Council has set a NGOM TAC for the LAGC component. This TAC has been based on historical landings from the area (TAC at 70,000 lbs from 2008 to 2016), and most recently using survey information. LA vessels currently operate under DAS when fishing in the Gulf of Maine; there is not an overall landing limit from the NGOM management area for these vessels.

Qualifying Criteria by Permit Category: Limited entry into the Atlantic sea scallop fishery began in 1994 through Amendment 4 to the FMP. See Table 1 for a summary of the limited access programs in the fishery.

Table 1 - Summary of scallop permit categories and qualifying criteria.

Permit Type	Year Created	Action	Qualifying Criteria	Permit Category
Limited Access (Multiple categories)	1994	Amendment 4	One trip with more than 400 pounds in either 1988 or 1989, extended for new vessels under construction	Based on number of days used in 1990, or average of 1985-1990 days
LAGC IFQ	2008	Amendment 11	Possess Open Access GC permit	1,000 pounds landings in a year (FY2000-2004), individual allocation based on best year indexed by # of years active in the fishery
LAGC NGOM	2008	Amendment 11	Possess Open Access GC permit	No landings history required
LAGC Incidental	2008	Amendment 11	Possess Open Access GC permit	No landings history required

Existing Allocation between LA and LAGC IFQ: The existing allocation split between the LA and LAGC IFQ components is 94.5% LA / 5.5% IFQ of the annual projected landings. During the Amendment 11 process, the Council considered landings history as a basis for allocating between the two components. A lower and upper bound for a LAGC IFQ allocation (2.5% - 11%) of the total available scallop harvest was approved as a range for consideration at that time. The rationale for the lower bound of the range was to consider the approximate historical average from when Amendment 4 was implemented to 2005 (1994-2005). The rationale for the upper bound was to consider an amount that reflects the percent of the most recent landings (based on available data from fishing year 2005) from vessels with general category permits before the control date.

Harvest Limits by Permit Type: Harvest limits vary within the scallop FMP by permit category. Table 2 summarizes the existing harvest limits and the various forms of allocations across permit categories (ex: DAS, IFQ, etc.).

Table 2 - Summary of harvest limits and allocation types by permit category

Permit Type	Harvest Limits	Vessel allocation?	Form of allocation
Limited Access	94.5% of annual projected landing, after set-asides and incidental catch removed	Yes	DAS and access area trips
LAGC IFQ	5.5% of annual projected landing, after set-asides and incidental catch removed	Yes	IFQ pounds; set # AA trips at fleet level
LAGC NGOM	Up to TAC for management area, not linked to annual projected landings estimate	No	Harvest in area until LAGC fleet reaches TAC
LAGC Incidental	Deducted from annual projected landings before allocating to LA and LAGC IFQ	No	Harvest allowed until limit is reached

Considerations:

a) A simple, straightforward approach to setting and splitting a TAC between fishery components increases the likelihood that NGOM measures can be in place for the start of FY2018. A complex or controversial approach would likely delay the development and implementation of NGOM measures beyond the start of the 2018 fishing year.

b) The NGOM TAC represents a limit for removals from the area. It is not an allocation to a specific permit type.

c) The NGOM TAC may be set and split temporarily through a Framework; however, a permanent division in the NGOM TAC between fishery components would likely require an Amendment.

d) The NGOM management area was created in 2008 through Amendment 11. The Council's vision for the LAGC component was a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of the fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from small communities. The southern boundary bi-sects statistical reporting area 514 in the Gulf of Maine.

e) LAGC removals from the area come from both IFQ and NGOM permit holders.

f) LAGC vessels have different reporting requirements than LA vessels when fishing in this area.
    a. LAGC vessels declare into the NGOM management area through VMS. Landings are calculated using dealer reports for declared trips.
    b. LA vessels operate under a DAS as if in an open area of the fishery. Removals from the NGOM management area for FY 2016 were estimated using point-location VTR reports for FY 2016; this method of estimating LA removals from the NGOM has proven difficult as LA vessels can fish both inside and outside the NGOM in the same trip.
    c. The estimate of LA removals from the NGOM in 2017 used VMS, VTR, and dealer data. VMS polls indicate that some LA vessels operated inside and outside of the NGOM on a single trip.

g) VTR data is available from 1996 – present. This data has limitations, and working with it will take time/resources, depending on the level of detail request (ex: tracking catch by GC component pre-NGOM).

h) Monitoring a TAC as currently implemented in the NGOM for the LA component is challenging (as illustrated in FY 2017). Given the current reporting requirements, it may not be possible to monitor Limited Access removals as quickly as necessary. Potential approaches to monitoring

activity in the area include 1) setting up a VMS code for LA fishing in the NGOM, and 2) setting a trip catch limit for LA fishing in the NGOM.

Potential considerations for shares of the NGOM TAC: Committee tasked the PDT on June 1, 2017 to develop a range of alternatives based on c) Hybrid approach of historic TAC and historic removals from the NGOM management area.

a) *Historic TAC in the management area.* For example, the TAC for the area was set at 70,000 lbs for the LAGC component for nearly all years since the inception of the program.
b) *Split based on historic removals from the NGOM management area by fishery component.* For example, dealer data is available from 2008 – present for the LAGC component. LA landings from the area would need to be estimated.
c) *Hybrid Approach of Historic TAC and historic removals from the area (combine a and b).* For example, start with a baseline of pounds to a component of the fishery, and then consider how harvest over and above that value is distributed.
    a. See EXAMPLES of TAC shares between the LAGC and LA in Table 5 and Table 6. NOTE: these are examples of how the hybrid approach could work using recent LAGC TACs for discussion purposes.
d) *Sunset provision:* For example, develop a short-term approach that would remain in place for a set number of years. The Council has identified work on the NGOM management as a potential priority for 2018.

Table 3 – Example of available data. Comparison of actual and potential LAGC and LA landings from FY2017 (area closed before LAGC TAC achieved)

Scenario	LAGC	LA harvest	LAGC % landings
2017 landings	44,557	1,578,020	2.7%
2017 TAC	95,000	1,578,020	5.7%
2017 TAC – including reduction for overage	73,371	1,578,020	4.4%

Table 4 - NGOM Fishery Data from 2008 - 2017

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Fishing Year	LAGC Landings (lbs)	LA Landings (lbs)	Total Landings (lbs)	LAGC % Landings	TAC	TAC - overages	LAGC Landings as % of TAC (F-B)
2	2008	9,936	0	9,936	100.0%	70,000	70,000	14.2%
3	2009	5,793	0	5,793	100.0%	70,000	70,000	8.3%
4	2010	8,639	0	8,639	100.0%	70,000	70,000	12.3%
5	2011	6,908	0	6,908	100.0%	70,000	70,000	9.9%
6	2012	7,440	0	7,440	100.0%	70,000	70,000	10.6%
7	2013	55,450	0	55,450	100.0%	70,000	70,000	79.2%
8	2014	57,842	0	57,842	100.0%	70,000	70,000	82.6%
9	2015	72,546	0	72,546	100.0%	70,000	70,000	103.6%
10	2016	89,083	292,517	381,600	23.3%	70,000	67,454	127.3%
11	2017	44,557	1,578,020	1,622,577	2.7%	95,000	73,371	46.9%
12	Note: The 2016 TAC in the NGOM was based on historic landings data (as were all TACs from 2008-2016). The 2017 TAC was informed by the UMaine/ME DMR survey of the area. Biomass estimates were developed assuming a dredge efficiency of 0.4, and include animals >88.9mm. The Council recommended setting the TAC using an exploitation rate of 0.2 (2,055,240), and selected the q 0.15 value (411,048 lbs). The LAGC TAC was set by applying the ratio of GC to LA landings from the 2016 FY (23%) – this is how the Council arrived at the 95,000 lb LAGC TAC. The LAGC exceeded its TAC in 2015 and 2016, so final TAC was reduced to account for this overage in subsequent years.							

Table 5 - EXAMPLE of Hybrid Approach, assuming first 70,000 lbs go to General Category Harvest, and then a percent split of the remaining lbs between LA and LAGC

	LAGC: first **70,000** of NGOM TAC							
	First 70,000 to GC, 5% above 70,000 to GC		First 70,000 to GC, 10% above 70,000 to GC		First 70,000 to GC, 15% above 70,000 to GC		First 70,000 to GC, 20% above 70,000 to GC	
Split %	0.05		0.1		0.15		0.2	
TAC	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70000	70000	0	70000	0	70000	0	70000	0
95000	71250	23750	72500	22500	73750	21250	75000	20000
100000	71500	28500	73000	27000	74500	25500	76000	24000
125000	72750	52250	75500	49500	78250	46750	81000	44000
150000	74000	76000	78000	72000	82000	68000	86000	64000
175000	75250	99750	80500	94500	85750	89250	91000	84000
200000	76500	123500	83000	117000	89500	110500	96000	104000
225000	77750	147250	85500	139500	93250	131750	101000	124000
250000	79000	171000	88000	162000	97000	153000	106000	144000
275000	80250	194750	90500	184500	100750	174250	111000	164000
300000	81500	218500	93000	207000	104500	195500	116000	184000
325000	82750	242250	95500	229500	108250	216750	121000	204000
350000	84000	266000	98000	252000	112000	238000	126000	224000
375000	85250	289750	100500	274500	115750	259250	131000	244000
400000	86500	313500	103000	297000	119500	280500	136000	264000
425000	87750	337250	105500	319500	123250	301750	141000	284000
450000	89000	361000	108000	342000	127000	323000	146000	304000
500000	91500	408500	113000	387000	134500	365500	156000	344000
750000	104000	646000	138000	612000	172000	578000	206000	544000
1000000	116500	883500	163000	837000	209500	790500	256000	744000
2000000	166500	1833500	263000	1737000	359500	1640500	456000	1544000
4000000	266500	3733500	463000	3537000	659500	3340500	856000	3144000

Table 6 - EXAMPLE of Hybrid Approach, assuming first 95,000 lbs go to General Category Harvest, and then a percent split of the remaining lbs between LA and LAGC

	LAGC: first **95,000** of NGOM TAC							
	First 95,000 to GC, 5% above 95,000 to GC		First 95,000 to GC, 10% above 95,000 to GC		First 95,000 to GC, 15% above 95,000 to GC		First 95,000 to GC, 20% above 95,000 to GC	
Split %	0.05		0.1		0.15		0.2	
TAC	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**	**GC**	**LA**
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70000	70000	0	70000	0	70000	0	70000	0
95000	95000	0	95000	0	95000	0	95000	0
100000	95250	4750	95500	4500	95750	4250	96000	4000
125000	96500	28500	98000	27000	99500	25500	101000	24000
150000	97750	52250	100500	49500	103250	46750	106000	44000
175000	99000	76000	103000	72000	107000	68000	111000	64000
200000	100250	99750	105500	94500	110750	89250	116000	84000
225000	101500	123500	108000	117000	114500	110500	121000	104000
250000	102750	147250	110500	139500	118250	131750	126000	124000
275000	104000	171000	113000	162000	122000	153000	131000	144000
300000	105250	194750	115500	184500	125750	174250	136000	164000
325000	106500	218500	118000	207000	129500	195500	141000	184000
350000	107750	242250	120500	229500	133250	216750	146000	204000
375000	109000	266000	123000	252000	137000	238000	151000	224000
400000	110250	289750	125500	274500	140750	259250	156000	244000
425000	111500	313500	128000	297000	144500	280500	161000	264000
450000	112750	337250	130500	319500	148250	301750	166000	284000
500000	115250	384750	135500	364500	155750	344250	176000	324000
750000	127750	622250	160500	589500	193250	556750	226000	524000
1000000	140250	859750	185500	814500	230750	769250	276000	724000
2000000	190250	1809750	285500	1714500	380750	1619250	476000	1524000
4000000	290250	3709750	485500	3514500	680750	3319250	876000	3124000