ACL Flowchart Measure – Questions/Discussion for PDT

- **Review Draft Problem Statement, Draft Objectives, and current measures.**
  - **Is further refinement of problem statement and objectives needed?**
  - **Are there other approaches and/or considerations that the PDT feels should be explored (in addition to Options A and B)?**
  - **Additional information for alternatives/measures needed (ex: tables, figures, maps)?**
- **Data needs for analysis and impacts.**
  - **Existing analyses to draw from?**
  - **Ongoing work?**
  - **Discuss assignments.**
- **Initial thoughts on impacts (and analyses)**
  - **Biological impacts**
  - **Economic impacts**
  - Social impacts
  - Protected Species
  - EFH

Draft Problem Statement:

~~The current ACL structure and fishery allocations in the Scallop FMP are not spatially explicit.~~ Annual catch limits (ACLs) in the scallop fishery are based on scallop biomass in all areas, including small scallops and closed areas, while projected landings are limited to the harvestable biomass in areas that are open to the fishery in a given year. This catch limit structure can be problematic because the overall scallop management program is an area based system that is spatially explicit. This disconnect between annual catch limits and projected landings is more of an issue when higher levels of total biomass are in closed areas and not available to the fishery.

Additionally, measures adopted during and since Amendment 15 have introduced the potential for management uncertainty. The scallop PDT identified several sources of management uncertainty in A15. These include mortality from carry-over allowances, and ability of the FMP to monitor and enforce all catch. An example of a change made through A15 is that the LAGC IFQ component is now allowed to carryover up to 15% of allocated quota from one fishing year to the next.

Draft Objectives:

The annual catch limits for the LA and LAGC fisheries are consistent with decisions made in Amendment 11 (94.5% to the LA fishery and 5.5% to the LAGC fishery). However, under the current ACL structure the LA fishery allocations (DAS and allocations in access areas) are constrained by the available biomass from areas that are open, while the LAGC fishery allocation is based on available biomass from all areas. This disconnect between the catch limits and fishery allocations is more of an issue when more biomass is in closed areas and not available to the fishery. For example, in 2015 and 2016 a large proportion of total biomass was within EFH and GF closed areas as well as very large year classes of small scallops closed within scallop access areas.

As noted in the problem statement, measures adopted during and since Amendment 15 have introduced the potential for management uncertainty. Several sources of management uncertainty were identified by the PDT in A15.

An action could be developed to address these issues. The alternatives could be developed based on the draft objectives below.

1. Consider modifications to the ACL structure to set allocations that account for:
    a. Changes in management during and since A15 (ex: carryover).
    b. Spatial management.
2. Consider reducing potential impacts on the resource from allocations that are based on all areas, but are only fished in areas available to the fishery.
3. Consider the performance of fishery catches in both access areas and open areas (for both LA and GC IFQ components), with an emphasis on times/areas where the fishery is under performing (landings below projections).

Potential Approaches (Current Measures):

1. Status Quo – Maintain current approach to ACL flowchart
    a. ACLs for both components based on overall biomass
    b. Table 1 – Comparison of overall biomass and projected landings for recent FY
2. "Option A" – Would add a management uncertainty buffer for LAGC IFQ component
    a. 5%, 10%, 20% (AP also discussed 1%)
    b. Could be applied in combination with "Option B"
    c. Table 4 – Recent LAGC IFQ aggregate carryover (by FY)
3. "Option B" – the 94.5%/5.5% split would be based on biomass available to the fishery (projected landings, not total biomass), not to exceed specified ceiling.
    a. Maintains the LA/LAGC IFQ allocation split specified in A11.
    b. Account for set-asides and LAGC incidental, than divide remaining landings among components.
    c. Table 2 – Comparison of Status Quo/Option B
    d. Table 3 – Comparison of recent LA/LAGC IFQ landings
4. Other ideas?

Table 1 - Recent ACLs, Projected Landings, and Projected Landings as % of ACL

FY	ACL	Projected Landings	PL % of ACL
2010			
2011	27269	23723	87%
2012	28961	25945	90%
2013	21004	17335	83%
2014	20782	17327	83%
2015	25352	21500	85%
2016	37852	21288	56%

Table 2 - Comparison of status quo and option B by FY since 2011, including actual landings by LA and LAGC IFQ components

		Status Quo			Option B			
	Add in 2010 data?			Allocations of Projected Landings				Actual Landings (mt)
FY		mt	lbs	Status Quo	Option B %	mt	lbs	
2011	ABC/ACL	27,269	60,117,854					
	Total Projected Landings	23,723	52,300,000					
	IFQ	1,452	3,201,880	6.12%	5.30%	1,257	2,771,895	1,382
	LA ACT	21,431	47,247,267	90.34%	91.06%	21,603	47,626,199	24,462
2012	ABC/ACL	28,961	63,848,076					
	Total Projected Landings	25,945	57,200,000					
	IFQ	1,544	3,405,000	5.95%	5.32%	1,380	3,043,000	1,511
	LA ACT	23,546	51,910,044	90.75%	91.41%	23,716	52,284,273	23,711
2013	ABC/ACL	21,004	46,305,894					
	Total Projected Landings	17,335	38,216,741					
	IFQ	1,111	2,449,856	6.41%	5.26%	911	2,009,362	1,095
	LA ACT	15,324	33,783,637	88.40%	90.34%	15,660	34,524,485	16,213
2014	ABC/ACL	20,782	45,816,467					
	Total Projected Landings	17,327	38,463,656					
	IFQ	1,099	2,423,145	6.34%	5.26%	911	2,008,423	948
	LA ACT	15,567	34,319,360	89.84%	90.34%	15,653	34,508,351	12,948
2015	ABC/ACL	25,352	55,891,593					
	Total Projected Landings	21,500	47,400,000					
	IFQ	1,348	2,971,831	6.27%	5.29%	1,138	2,509,390	1,161
	LA ACT	19,331	42,617,560	89.91%	90.96%	19,557	43,115,883	14,317
2016	ABC/ACL	37,852	83,449,375					
	Total Projected Landings	21,288	46,932,006					
	IFQ	2,029	4,473,180	9.53%	5.29%	1,127	2,483,908	
	LA ACT	18,290	40,322,555	85.92%	90.94%	19,358	42,678,051	
2017	ABC/ACL	62,929	138,734,697					
	Total Projected Landings	***	***					
	IFQ	3,394	7,482,599					
	LA ACT							

Table 3 - Comparison of actual landings by LA and LAGC IFQ components

Actual Landings by LA and LAGC IFQ

	LA		LAGC IFQ		Combined Landings (LA and LAGC IFQ – No set-asides or LAGC incidental)		
FY	mt	%	%	mt	mt	% of Projected Landings	% of the ACL
2010*	Add??						
2011	24,462	94.7%	5.3%	1,382	25,844	109%	95%
2012	23,711	94.0%	6.0%	1,511	25,222	97%	87%
2013	16,213	93.7%	6.3%	1,095	17,308	100%	82%
2014	12,948	93.2%	6.8%	948	13,895	80%	67%
2015	14,317	92.5%	7.5%	1,161	15,478	72%	61%

Table 4 - LAGC IFQ Aggregate Carryover Data for FY2010 - FY2016.

LA_IFQ			
IFQ only			
fishing_year	Sum of carry_over	Sum of base alloc	% carryover
2010	0	2329500	0%
2011	131881	3044151	4%
2012	194049	3273502	6%
2013	301354	2494866	12%
2014	209897	2375277	9%
2015	243041	2939585	8%
2016	312796	4369333	7%
Total	1393018	20826214	7%