Standard Default Measures

Sam Asci
Council Staff

Scallop Advisory Panel-May 23rd, 2018
Scallop Committee-May 23-24th , 2018

New England
Fishery Management Council

2018 Work Priority

Recent Activity:

The Council added standard default measures to the 2018 priorities list at the April Council meeting.

The PDT discussed this topic in detail at its May 8th, 2018 meeting.

Anticipated Outcomes:

1. Recommend a range of alternatives for analysis at this meeting. (Motion)
2. Provide feedback on 1) guidelines for standardizing part-time access area allocations; and 2) the 60-day window to finish access area trips in the following fishing year.

2018 Work Priority (contd.)

Stemmed from Nov. 2017 Committee discussion— "*are we over-specifying to the point where there is only marginal benefit for the effort that is put in for analysis and decision making*?"

Candidate measures include routine decisions made by the Council on an annual basis that have become consistent year to year.

Goal: Streamline the specifications process by reducing the number of decisions made by the Council at Final Action that have fairly predictable outcomes.

Candidate standard default measures

- 3.1—Default Specifications
- 3.2—LAGC IFQ allocations to access areas
- 3.3—Part-time access area allocations
- 3.4—Clarifying access area allocation timeline

See discussion document (Doc.4b) for section references.

3.1 Default Specifications

Background:

- allocated annually (i.e. DAS, LA access area trips, IFQ to LAGC vessels, access area trips to LAGC fleet).
- Allow vessels to fish at conservative level if updated specs are delayed.

Except FY2016, default DAS have been less than 84% of FY1 allocation.

Table 1. Open-area DAS allocations (FY1), open-area DAS default measures (FY2), and default measures as a percentage of FY1 allocation for limited access permit types from FY2013 to FY2018.

	LA full time			LA part time		
FY	FY1	FY2 (default)	FY2 % of FY1	FY1	FY2 (default)	FY2 % of FY1
2013	33.00	23.00	70%	13.00	9.00	69%
2014	31.00	17.00	55%	12.00	7.00	58%
2015	30.86	26.00	84%	12.94	10.40	80%
2016	34.55	34.55	100%	13.82	13.82	100%
2017	30.41	21.75	72%	12.16	8.69	71%
2018	24.00	18.00	75%	9.60	7.20	75%

3.1 Default Specs.

Background (contd.):

- LA AA default specs usually 1 trip regardless of FY1 allocation.
- Until FY2017, default LAGC allocation met or exceeded FY1 allocation.
  - Default IFQ at 75% of FY1 in FY2017-2018.

Table 3. Annual quota allocation (FY1), default quota allocation (FY2), and default quota allocation as a percentage of FY1 allocation for the total LAGC IFQ component from FY2013 to FY2018.

	LAGC IFQ		
FY	FY1	FY2 (default)	FY2 % of FY1
2013	2,449,856	2,773,129	113%
2014	2,423,145	2,807,315	116%
2015	2,971,828	3,745,649	126%
2016	4,473,174	4,473,174	100%
2017	2,489,016	1,865,109	75%
2018	3,086,468	2,314,851	75%

3.1 Default Specifications (draft alternative)

3.1.1 Alternative 1—No Action

The Council would continue specifying default specs each year (DAS and AA trips to LA permit categories, IFQ to LAGC vessels, AA trips to LAGC fleet).

Rationale: Allocations vary from year to year due to resource conditions and rotational management. Annual surveys provide updated assessment of the resource for the Council to consider and adjust specs.

3.1 Default Specifications (draft alternative)

3.1.2 Alternative 2

Standardize default open-area DAS for the LA component and LAGC IFQ quota allocation at 75% of the preferred alternative for the previous Fishing Year allocation. Alt. 2 does not include default access area allocations.

Rationale: Allows fishery to continue operating at a conservative level if implementation of updated specs were delayed. With April 1st start of FY it is unlikely that default specs will be fished for a prolonged time. Reduces number of decisions made by Council and provides predictable outcomes to stakeholders.

Additional consideration: Rotational management makes standardizing access area trips challenging. Not allocating default AA trips further ensures fishery is operating at conservative level.

3.2 LAGC IFQ access area allocation

Background:

- LAGC IFQ fishery is allocated a fleetwide number of AA trips through specifications process.
- Overall LAGC IFQ AA allocation is based on total expected harvest from AAs (i.e. 5.5% of total expected AA harvest, see Table 4).

Table 4. An example of how LAGC IFQ access area allocations are calculated based on total expected access area harvest.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Example Scenario	FT Access Area Trips	Poss. Limit (lbs)	LA FT equiv.	LA AA Landings (lbs)	TOTAL AA Landings (lbs)	LAGC IFQ share (lbs)	LAGC Trips
					(b*c*d)	(e/0.945)	(f*0.055)	(g/600)
1	4 AA trips	4	18,000	327	23,544,000	24,914,286	1,370,286	2,284
2	5 AA trips	5	18,000	327	29,430,000	31,142,857	1,712,857	2,855
3	6 AA trips	6	18,000	327	35,316,000	37,371,429	2,055,429	3,426

- The Council typically considers stand-alone Alternatives for:
  - Total number of LAGC AA trips
  - Where LAGC AA trips are allocated to

3.2 LAGC IFQ access area allocation (draft alt.)

3.2.1 Alternative 1—No Action

The Council would continue to set the overall LAGC IFQ access area allocation in each specifications action.

Rationale: The Council is able to consider the most recent assessment of the resource and adjust LAGC IFQ access area allocations because the resource is surveyed on an annual basis.

3.2 LAGC IFQ access area allocation (draft alt.)

3.2.2 Alternative 2

Standardize overall access area allocations to the LAGC IFQ component by allocating the equivalent to 5.5% of total projected access area harvest.

The number of trips would be calculated by dividing 5.5% of total expected access area harvest by the LAGC IFQ possession limit (see Table 4 on next slide for example).

Rationale: This is same approach the Council uses to allocate LAGC AA trips. Embedding this in the allocation process will help streamline decision-making process and provide predictable outcomes to stakeholders.

3.2 LAGC IFQ access area allocation (draft alt.)

Table 4. An example of how LAGC IFQ access area allocations are calculated based on total expected access area harvest.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Example Scenario	FT Access Area Trips	Poss. Limit (lbs)	LA FT equiv.	LA AA Landings (lbs)	TOTAL AA Landings (lbs)	LAGC IFQ share (lbs)	LAGC Trips
					(b*c*d)	(e/0.945)	(f*0.055)	(g/600)
1	4 AA trips	4	18,000	327	23,544,000	24,914,286	1,370,286	2,284
2	5 AA trips	5	18,000	327	29,430,000	31,142,857	1,712,857	2,855
3	6 AA trips	6	18,000	327	35,316,000	37,371,429	2,055,429	3,426

3.2 LAGC IFQ access area allocation (draft alt.)

3.2.3 Alternative 3

Standardize LAGC IFQ access area allocation as 5.5% of the total expected access area harvest and allocate LAGC IFQ share proportionally to access areas west of 68° 30' W (eastern boundary of Closed Area I Access Area).

Rationale: Same as Alt. 2 for standardizing total trip allocation. Distributing trips proportional to total expected harvest from an area is consistent with approach already used by the Council. Redistributing CAII trips to areas west follows precedent set by the Council in the past (past rationale: LAGC vessels are smaller and not designed to fish so far offshore).

Redist. of CAII LAGC trips to areas west

Table 5 shows ex. of how CAII trips would be redistributed if there were 3 available AAs west of 68° 30' W.

Note: GARFO is considering expanding/removing dredge exemption areas.

- Possible that LAGC vessels could fish open-bottom in vicinity of CAII in future.

Table 5. An example of how LAGC IFQ trips would be distributed under Alternative 3 in a scenario where CAII is allocated to and there are three available access areas west of 68° 30' W.

	a	b	c	d	e	f
		total LAGC IFQ trips	CAII	NLS-S	MAAA	CAI
1	Baseline allocation	2855	571	571	1142	571
Alt. 3 - Dist. CAII trips to the 3 available areas west of 68° 30' W						
2	Calculation			d1+(c1/3)	e1+(c1/3)	f1+(c1/3)
3	Trips	2855	0	761	1332	761

Summary of 3.2 IFQ Access Area Allocation Alternatives

3.2.1 Alternative 1—No Action

- No change to current process

3.2.2 Alternative 2—Standardize LAGC IFQ access area allocation as 5.5% of the total expected access area harvest.

- Allocation only (Council still specifies where the trips will be allocated)

3.2.3 Alternative 3—Standardize LAGC IFQ access area allocation as 5.5% of the total expected access area harvest and allocate LAGC IFQ share proportionally to access areas west of 68° 30' W (eastern boundary of Closed Area I Access Area).

- Standard allocation of overall LAGC IFQ AA share, and where trips are assigned

3.3 Part-time access area allocations

Background:

- Part-time limited access vessels are allocated 40% of full-time allocation.
- Though PT vessels are allocated at a fixed rate, the Council must decide where PT AA trips go and a possession limit in specs process.

Table 6. Open-area DAS (DAS) and access area allocations (AA) to full time and part time limited access vessels from FY2013 to FY2018. Part time allocations are also shown as a percentage of full time allocations.

	LA full time		LA part time			
FY	DAS	AA	DAS	AA	% of FT DAS	% of FT AA
2013	33.00	26,000	13.00	10,400	39%	40%
2014	31.00	24,000	12.00	9,600	39%	40%
2015	30.86	51,000	12.94	20,400	42%	40%
2016	34.55	51,000	13.82	20,400	40%	40%
2017	30.41	72,000	12.16	28,800	40%	40%
2018	24.00	108,000	9.60	43,200	40%	40%

3.3 Part-time access area allocations

- **PDT input:** Standardizing where PT trips go/possession limit may be difficult due to the nature of rotational management (i.e. variation in overall AA allocation and available areas).

- **PDT Recommendation:** Tasking from Committee on range of trip limits/number of trips may streamline decision-making process. Ex: preference for higher trip limits and fewer trips, or lower trip limits and more trips.

AP/Committee input needed: Are measures necessary, or would a tasking statement from the AP/Committee be enough to streamline how we go about setting PT access area allocations?

3.4 Clarifying access area timeline

- LA vessels have 60-day window at end of FY to harvest any outstanding AA pounds (14-month timeline from April 1st to complete AA trips)
  - Est. in FW18 as part of broken trip exemption. *Rationale*: reduce safety and business risks for trips taken at end of FY.
  - Org. applied to only AAs that were open in following FY. Regs now allow fishing in 60-day carry forward period in all areas regardless of what's available in the OY (unless otherwise specified by the Council).
- Difficult to manage when boundaries are modified before end of 14-month timeline (i.e. if one AA is split into several, AA is absorbed into a larger AA, AA turned into open bottom, etc.)
  - Ex: FY 2018 and FW29

PDT input re: 14-month access area timeline

Key points:

- Change to start of FY means 60-day window has shifted from March/April (when meat yield is improving) to April/May (when fishing is approaching best of year).
  - Possible unintended consequences (i.e. vessels shifting AA fishing to next FY) could impact management uncertainty and have neg. biological impacts on resource.
- Concern could be magnified by recent trend of increasing AA landings and fewer DAS.

Note: Similar concerns were expressed for the DAS carryover provision.

PDT input re: 14-month access area timeline

Possible solutions:

- Cap AA pounds that can be fished in 60-day window.
- Tax outstanding pounds fished in 60-day window (motivate vessels to fish AA trips before end of FY).
- Reduce carry forward fishing to 30 days.
- **Eliminate the 60-day carry forward window. This would alleviate uncertainty/neg. impacts on resource and simplify administration of AA fishing.**

AP/Committee input needed:

- **Is the 60-day carry forward provision necessary now that the start of the fishing year has shifted to April 1st?**

- **Should the Council continue to specify that vessels have 60-days to finish their access area trips?**

Other slides

3.2.3 Alternative 3

Figure 1. Example of how LAGC access area trips would be proportionally distributed to available areas west of 68 30' W longitude (red line) under Alt. 3 in Section 3.2. Available rotational areas are shown in green and unavailable rotational areas are shown in red.