

*Streamlining Scallop Actions
Discussion Document*

Background:

There are a wide range of decisions that the Council makes on an annual basis during the scallop specification setting process. Some of the decisions have become fairly routine, and mostly consistent year to year, such as setting default measures for the following fishing year, or how many total access area trips the LAGC IFQ component is allocated. There may be some opportunity to streamline the specifications process such as prescribing a formula to follow for setting default measures, the total number of LAGC IFQ access area trips, and part-time allocations for access areas.

At the November 2017 AP and Committee meetings, members of the Scallop AP and Committee expressed interest in reducing the number of decisions made on issues that are addressed every year.

- Are we over-specifying to the point where there is only marginal benefit for the effort that is put in for analysis and decisions making?

Issue for AP and Committee to address:

- **This represents a “new” administrative work item.**
- **Does the AP/Committee want to recommend that the Council add this to 2018 priorities? If so:**
 - **What issues does the AP/Committee recommend work on?**
 - **Start with current list?**
 - **Are some streamlining issues more important to focus on than others?**
 - **Are there items (not listed below) that should be considered?**

Potential Areas of Focus:

There are multiple areas where the Council could opt to be more formulaic on during the specification setting process, such that alternatives would not need to be developed in every action. These include:

- Default measures
- LAGC IFQ allocations to access areas (ex: always 5.5% of the access area allocation)
- Part-time access area allocations
- Clarifying access area allocation timeline (12 months vs. 12 months + 60 days to finish AA trips)
- Clarify: Do we “open” and “close” areas, or are they always available, and if we allocate to them they are open and if there is no allocation they are closed.
- Area rotation has evolved considerably over time – in recent years AA boundaries have changed on a fine scale, which complicates the management and administration of AAs.

Expected benefits of streamlining decisions:

- Reduce number of decisions made by the Council at Final Action, and workload for PDT and staff to develop measures on an annual basis that have fairly predictable outcomes.
- Predictable outcomes for stakeholders.

Potential Drawbacks/Changes from recent default measures:

- Specific to Default Measures: Difficult to standardize allocating access area trips. May need to just focus on DAS and IFQ quota.
 - If pursued, may need to be more conservative in DAS setting to account for potential changes in specifications.

Considerations:

- The Council can always adjust measures on an ad-hoc basis. (EX: RSA compensation fishing)
- Changing the start of the FY to April 1 may relieve the need/desire to allocate access area trips as part of default specifications, because we expect to make April 1 implementation when the Council develops simple specification actions.
- Access area trips can be taken up to 60 days after the end of the FY (14 months to take AA trip, starting April 1) – PDT may wish to revisit this and codify the practice in regulation if appropriate. Or is it that there is just no allocation?
- Just “bake-in” part-time allocations, so there is some flexibility, but it does not require a vote by AP and Committee.
- Develop a set of standards for treating AA carryover when boundaries shift year to year.
 - EX: ET Flex and MAAA. ET Flex is a “sub-area” of MAAA, becomes MAAA allocation.
- Should there be special consideration for areas that were part of an AA, but will become open bottom?
 - EX: CAI proper... DMV.... Can you finish up access area trips in these areas, or does the allocation shift to another AA? Does it matter? Is it just additional uncertainty?

PDT Recommendation: The Council add “streamlining scallop actions” as a 2018 work priority.

Potential Approach to Complete Work:

- Sub-set of PDT aim to complete work on these issues before June Council meeting while SAW/SARC process is ongoing → Report back to the full PDT after the benchmark before forwarding to the AP and Committee.
 - Do not want this work to extend into the late summer/fall.
 - Goal would be to have measures developed and analyzed in time for Sept. Council meeting.