

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FW24 MEASURES, POTENTAIL IMPACTS AND INPUT FROM PDT, AP, AND COMMITTEE

Decision # (FW24 page #)	Description	Brief summary of Impacts and any new PDT input since September Meeting	AP and Committee input on preferred alternatives
DECISIONS RELATED TO FISHERY SPECIFICATIONS			
1. Specification Scenario (Alternatives 1-4) (pages 19-23)	FW24 considering 5 overall allocation alternatives. All have the same DAS and LAGC IFQ. But level of LA effort in access areas varies.	Since September PDT has developed Alt4. Less CA2 effort to directly reduce 2013 YT catch in response to low 2013 GB ABC. PDT recommend that PT and Occ trips be combined into one trip per year for Alt 1 and 2. IMPACTS – All have similar impacts on biomass. Alt 2 smaller negative ST economic impacts compare to Alt 4. Alt 2 and 4 have higher LT net economic impacts compared to no action and other alternatives. Alt 4 least area swept and slightly higher net economic impacts than Alt 2 in the long-term,	Both AP and Committee support Alt 2 as preferred – Alternative 2.1.2.3
2. Prohibit RSA compensation fishing in NL in 2013 under Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 (p.20)	Should 2013 RSA compensation fishing in NL be prohibited to reduce potential impacts of increased fishing pressure in that area?	PDT expressed concern that a substantial portion of total 2013 RSA could be fished in NL if that area is open (up to 1.25 mil lbs.). IMPACTS – Potential to add fishing pressure for NL and potentially cause issues for 2014 access trips. Negative economic impacts in the ST and positive impacts in the long-term.	Both AP and Committee support No Action as preferred (no restriction on RSA compensation in NL in 2013) – Alternative 2.1.2.3.1
3. Default measures for LAGC IFQ fishery (p.24)	Currently the LAGC IFQ is 5.5 % of the total ACL.	Due to timing of survey and delayed implementation of specifications it may make sense to allocate 75% of total IFQ under default measures to be precautionary. IMPACTS – Reduce risk of vessels exceeding ultimate allocation and facing future reductions. I could have some negative economic impacts in the short-term by reducing flexibility to vessels to fish their quota possibly increasing the fishing costs,	Both AP and Committee support No Action as preferred – Not necessary to have default allocation automatically at 75% of projected catch since vessels have individual accountability if exceed final allocations.
4. Allocation of LAGC trips by area (p. 24 and Table 13)	FW24 is considering 2 options for allocating fleetwide LAGC trips in access areas	IMPACTS – Overall small amount of effort shift so minimal impacts on resource. Could benefit LAGC IFQ vessels if AAs have higher catch rates with positive economic impacts,	Both AP and Committee support that CA2 trips be prorated – Alternative 2.1.4.2.2.
5. Potential payback measure for LA vessels due to delayed implementation of FW24 (p.26, Tables 14, 15)	AP Rec - if a vessel takes 2013 access area trips authorized by FW22, it will have to give up all 2013 access area trips authorized to that vessel under FW24, plus ten 2013 open area DAS.	PDT supports this idea and recommends the DAS payback be reconsidered in light of FT small dredge vessels. A higher value may even be warranted. IMPACTS – reduced incentive to fish FW22 allocations would have positive impacts on the resource, as well as positive economic impacts on the scallop fishery.	Both AP and Committee support payback for LA fishery with 12 DAS – Alternative 2.1.5.2.

6. Potential payback measure for LAGC vessels due to delayed implementation of FW24 (p.28)		The PDT developed draft language to address this issue. IMPACTS - reduced incentive to fish FW22 allocations would have positive impacts on the resource as well as positive economic impacts on the scallop fishery.	Both AP and Committee support payback for LAGC fishery – Alternative 2.1.5.3.
7. NGOM hard TAC (p.34)	2 options: 70,000 and 58,000 pounds	Updated summary results suggest that a hard-TAC of 58,000 pounds would help prevent overfishing in this area. The data is relatively uncertain so precaution should be used. IMPACTS – current catches very low so either TAC would likely not impact vessels. Thus, no significant economic impacts are expected from this measure.	Both AP and Committee support No Action (70,000 pounds) – Alternative 2.1.7.1.
8. Incidental catch TAC (p.35)	50,000 pounds	No new information to suggest this target TAC should be adjusted. IMPACTS – this is a target TAC so no direct impacts on vessels with this permit type. Thus, no significant economic impacts are expected from this measure.	Both AP and Committee support No Action (50,000 pounds) for incidental catch TAC – Alternative 2.1.8.1.
DECISIONS RELATED TO YT BYCATCH MEASURES			
9. Modify GB AA seasonal closures (p.38-42 and Table 20)	Range of options between No Action and eliminate closures.	PDT clarified some of the season dates and requests Committee reconsider a revised Option 3a. IMPACTS – compared to No Action all have beneficial impacts for YT since CA2 would be closed during high YT bycatch (fall). Varying impacts on scallop resource – if areas closed in winter beneficial impacts on scallop resource. May be increased impacts on WP if areas open in March and April compared to No Action. Effort shifts due to the seasonal closures would reduce flexibility and increase fishing costs. However, moving effort from low- to high-meat weight periods would have positive economic impacts over the long-term	Both AP and Committee support Option 3B – close CA2 from Aug15-Nov 15 only - Alternative 2.2.1.2.4.
10. LAGC trawl AMs (p.43-45)	Cmte already included Alt1 and Alt3	PDT developed a schedule for seasonal closure for Alt 1 and recommends consideration of Alt 2. IMPACTS – In general, the more vessels are accountable it should help reduce incentive to catch YT as bycatch. Some AMs could cause effort shifts, but hopefully to times and areas with lower YT bycatch rates. Gear restrictions would reduce impacts on YT, but have higher impacts on the fishery participants. The economic impacts are unlikely to be significant at low overage rates and as long as areas are open to part of the year. Allowing dredge gear to be used for fishing during closure periods would add	Both AP and Cmte supported adoption of a new LAGC trawl AM for SNE/MA YT. AP Motion 12- If the in-season estimate of projected LAGC YT trawl scallop catch exceeds 10% of the total SNE/MA YT scallop fishery sub-ACL then prohibit trawl gear for LAGC vessels for the remainder of and the following fishing year. Vessels could switch to dredge gear at any time. If YT catch remains high for the LAGC trawl fishery then a future

		to flexibility and have positive economic impacts. However, prohibiting the use of trawl gear for extended periods of time would increase fishing costs and likely to have negative economic impacts,	amendment should be developed to prohibit trawl gear. Both AP and Cmte supported No Action for GB YT AM for trawl fleet – there is no trawl fishing on GB.
11. LAGC dredge AMs (p.46-47)		PDT developed same AMs as LA but different schedules and 3% exemption - if LAGC dredge YT catch less than 3% of total YT ACL no AMs. IMPACTS - In general, the more vessels are accountable it should help reduce incentive to catch YT as bycatch. AMs could cause effort shifts, but hopefully to times and areas with lower YT bycatch rates. Effort shifts can have negative economic impacts on fishery by reducing flexibility. GB AM should have no impact.	Both AP and Committee support LAGC dredge AMs for SNE/MA and GB (Alternatives 2.2.2.3.1 and 2.2.2.3.2).
12. Timing of AMs for the scallop fishery YT flounder sub-ACL (p.46)	Subsequent year or Subsequent year if reliable data available, otherwise following year	IMPACTS – Neutral impacts on the resource overall. Implementation of the AMs in Year 3 instead of Year 2 would provide more flexibility and allow more time to vessels to adjust their fishing activity, and both of these options have positive impacts compared to a in-season AMs.	Both AP and Committee support adoption of Alternative 2.2.3.2 – AMs trigger in Year 2 if reliable data or Year 3 if not.
OTHER MEASURES			
13. Allow transfer of LAGC IFQ during the year (p.47-49)		PDT added some clarification language. IMPACTS – neutral for resource and positive economic impacts for fishery because of increased opportunities with transfer and land in full the amount of IFQ.	Both AP and Committee support adoption of Alternative 2.3.2 – allow transfer of IFQ during the year
14. Expand the observer set-aside program to include LAGC vessels in open areas (p.49-51)		IMPACTS – indirect positive impacts on resource and non-target species. Slightly positive economic impacts or neutral impacts on fishery if increased coverage remains under set-aside.	Both AP and Committee support adoption of Alternative 2.4.4 – include open area trips by LAGC IFQ vessels under set-aside
15. Modify the observer set-aside allocation (p.51)		IMPACTS - indirect positive impacts on resource, non-target species and economic benefits. Neutral on fishery if increased coverage remains under set-aside.	Both AP and Committee support adoption of Alternative 2.4.2.1.2 – same 1% allocation but not area specific