

eFEP

Permit & Allocation Approaches

Andrew Applegate
EBFM Plan Coordinator
April 17, 2019



New England
Fishery Management Council

Access and permitting approaches

- Not discussing permit requalification
- Not intended to change the number of permitted vessels, i.e. capacity
- Strengths and weaknesses
- Transitional strategies
 - Catch shares
 - MAFMC fishery permits
- Permit overlay or replacement of existing permits

Permitting approaches

- New permitting structure
- Permit overlay
- Vessels with existing limited access permits and history of fishing in the Georges Bank EPU
- Catch allocations for cross-boundary stocks would be applied stock wide, but only a portion of the allocations may be taken from within the GB EPU.
- Permits or LOAs could be associated with gear types or other fishery metrics.

Permitting approaches

- Create permitting options that would be more consistent with fishing modes (métiers). Catch allocations may be based on the EPU permitting. Stock complex catch allocations may be counted against stock catch limits that also occur outside of the EPU and are managed by the NEFMC or others.
- Vessels authorized to obtain a permit and fish in the Georges Bank EPU based on history (does not need to be defined now – only as a concept). Distinct single species fisheries such as scallop, lobster, and red/Jonah crabs might not be included. Allocations and catch would be managed similar to the way they are for the Easter Georges Bank co-managed (US/CAN) areas.

Permitting approaches

- Additional considerations
 - Existing fishing history has been affected by current and past restrictions.
 - Some special EPU permitting or LOA may be needed for recreational fishing on managed species in the EPU.

Options

1. No additional permit required (No Action), but vessels would declare into a Georges Bank EPU fishing mode (métier) for monitoring catch
 - Weaknesses – No way to limit effort other than existing limited access permits which also apply to Georges Bank fishing; requires existing suite of permits (some which may be unobtainable) to fish. Requires an additional type of trip declaration (similar to Eastern Georges Bank).
 - Strengths – no additional permitting costs; no qualification procedure

Options

2. EPU/Gear Overlay – additional permit needed to fish within the GB EPU

- Weaknesses – creates an additional permit, but still requires a fishing vessel to have species permits (some which may be unobtainable) to land.
- Strengths – Limits effort to only vessels that have had a history fishing within the Georges Bank EPU with specific gears. Strategy could be used as a transitional step, as it meshes easily with existing permits and allocations.

Options

3. A letter of authorization (LOA) to fish on Georges Bank with existing permits.
 - Weaknesses – usually anyone can apply for and obtain an LOA, so it allows anyone with no history to fish in the Georges Bank EPU.
 - Strengths – Compatible with existing permits, but may contain additional conditions of use, such as data collection requirements and trip notification, etc. LOA requirements could be less controversial than other permitting strategies.

Options

4. Hybrid EPU permit – new permit to fish with specific gear within the GB EPU and land NEFMC-managed species
 - Weaknesses – Vessels fishing on GB would still require permits for stocks managed by MAFMC, ASMFC, and HMS. **May lock vessels into a gear they have used, inhibiting innovation and gear switching.**
 - Strengths - Manages effort and catch allocations for all NEFMC managed GB species (other permits needed only if vessels fish for NEFMC species in the GoM and SNE/MA)

Options

5. EPU/Gear permit – Vessels with history of using a gear in the Georges Bank EPU may obtain a permit to fish and land all species associated with that fishing mode (métier).
 - Weaknesses – catch allocations need to be consistent with single stock limits for MAFMC, ASMFC, and HMS unless the stock is primarily a Georges Bank stock (but these stocks would be managed by NEFMC anyway).
 - Strengths – Manages effort and catch allocations for all managed Georges Bank species. Total catch allocation would be consistent with EPU MSY limit.

Options

6. Open access with auctioned access rights and associated catch allocations.
 - Weaknesses – mechanisms needed to prevent a run on the fish. May inhibit full participation by fishermen that do not have sufficient capitalization, might be used by some to exclude other participants
 - Strengths – opens Georges Bank to new participants. It can allow more flexibility to develop and use more selective gear. Some lessons from similar EU allocation system.

Questions

1. Since qualification periods for individual fisheries (as currently defined) differ, how would a vessel qualify to fish with a specific gear in the Georges Bank EPU?
2. What is the qualified vessel entitled to do? What are the limitations of the qualification? Can vessels with Georges Bank EPU history with one gear type obtain a permit for a different gear type?

Questions

3. Are Georges Bank EPU permits and allocations consistent with stock allocations (for species managed by MAFMC, ASMFC, and HMS) and monitoring?
4. Catch allocation can be discussed separately, but assuming that there is some sort of EPU/gear permit, what catch allocation systems would be compatible with other systems currently in use? Catch shares, sector allocations, a simple cap without an allocation to a permit?

Questions

5. If single species fisheries (e.g. lobster, scallop, red crab) are not included in scheme, would they still need a permit for bycatch or land incidental catch of managed finfish?
6. Would LAPP regulations apply to these types of permits and potential allocation schemes?
7. How would this work if there is an inconsistency between GB EPU catch limits and state landings limits?
8. Are there vessels fishing GB that only have an open access commercial permit?

Mandatory Retention

- Not really an ecosystem issue, unless there is data and analysis to assess the impacts of dead discards on ecosystem structure and function, possibly evaluate effects in operational models
- Mostly a data monitoring issue, accurate catch estimation. Minimize waste.
- To be included in the eFEP, but discussed within a data monitoring section
- Should evaluate and include aspects of the EU Landings Obligation scheme

eFEP policy issues for committee development

- Access and permitting
- Jurisdictional coordination and cooperation **
- Mandatory retention
- Data monitoring and research *
- Transition strategies
- Ecosystem risk assessment **
- Forage fish management policy **

* PDT task ** Existing draft

eFEP Technical issues for PDT development

- A framework for providing catch advice for a fishery ecosystem plan (FEP)
- Potential strategies for overfished stock status determination and rebuilding management for stocks managed as part of a stock complex
- Spatial management measures for habitat, spawning, and endangered/threatened species protection
- Data monitoring and research *
- Incentive based measures
- Unmanaged and invasive species
- Ecosystem risk assessment **
- Forage fish management policy **