

**Limited Access General Category (LAGC)
IFQ Fishery Performance Evaluation
(LAGC IFQ REPORT)**

Version 1: February 2012

Intentionally blank

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

Appendices

Table of Tables

Table of Figures

List of Acronyms

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Council decided to initiate this review for four primary reasons. First, a recent review and analysis of impacts of sector management in the Groundfish FMP highlighted some important impacts and areas for improvement. Therefore, a similar analysis of the LAGC IFQ program may identify similar trends and issues that could be improved. Second, a review of the Council process in this region was recently conducted and it identified the need to identify a mechanism to evaluate the general performance of fishery management programs. This report uses some of the ideas that will be further developed in the longer-term evaluation of all FMPs in New England. Third, the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) requires that all limited access privilege programs (LAPPs) should be evaluated within five years after adoption. This report is not the formal review of the LAGC IFQ program, but it can serve as an initial evaluation of the system before and after IFQs were implemented in 2010. Finally, the Council is potentially considering implementation of other LAPPs for other fisheries in this region. Therefore, a detailed analysis of the only IFQ system in New England could provide useful information for other actions and fisheries.

In 2011, the Council evaluated the sector management system that was first implemented in 2003 by Amendment 13 to the Multispecies FMP, and expanded in 2010 by Amendment 16. A report was conducted by the NEFSC that analyzed the economic and social performance of active limited access groundfish vessels in fishing year 2010 (NEFSC, 2011). In addition, the Council held a, “Lessons Learned Workshop” to collect input from the public related to sector performance and to identify potential solutions for improving the program. After the workshop the Council decided that a similar investigation of the economic and social changes from the only IFQ program in New England would be useful as well.

In addition, in 2011 there was a *Review of the New England Fishery Management Process* that was conducted by SRA Touchtone Consulting Group. The review was requested by a former Council Chairman and commissioned by NOAA NMFS. The first phase of the report focused on stakeholder interviews about the strengths and weaknesses of the management process. Over a dozen challenges were identified including the absence of a mechanism to evaluate or track the performance of management decisions. The Council has responded to a handful of the recommendations and most recently approved a white paper describing how the Council plans to conduct a “fishery performance evaluation” for all FMPs in this region to address the need for a mechanism to evaluate the performance of management decisions (Appendix 1).

The Draft FMP Performance Evaluation system approved by the Council at the January 2012 Council meeting, Appendix 1, is the first phase of a longer term project that will evaluate a wide range of performance measures such as biomass, economic indicators, fleet diversity, safety and general governance. Since this evaluation is based on available funding and may take several years to complete the Council decided to proceed with the LAGC IFQ Report now but expand the original scope to incorporate some of the relative indicators identified in the Draft FMP Performance Evaluation.

Furthermore, there is a requirement in the MSA to have a formal and detailed review of a limited access privilege program (LAPP) five years after implementation. This LAPP program has only

been in effect since 2010 (3 years), so the Council is not yet required to complete a formal review. However, the Council discussed that an **initial analysis of trends** in the fishery to date would be informative. Finally, the Council is already considering catch share systems in other plans, so it would be valuable to **assess the impacts of the only IFQ system** in this region first.

In summary, this LAGC IFQ Report will include some of the same economic and social performance analyses that were completed for the multispecies sectors, relevant performance evaluation indicators identified in the Council's Draft FMP Performance Evaluation, and some of the requirements in the five year review of LAPPs. **This report will focus on the LAGC IFQ scallop fishery only and will not include detailed information about the overall scallop fishery. The analyses will include information about the participants before and after implementation of IFQs.** The Scallop PDT will work on this report in 2012 and will present the results to the Scallop Committee and full Council in 2013. At that time the Council will decide if a specific meeting or workshop should be held to collect more input on the subject or not.

2.0 GENERAL CATEGORY FISHERY

2.1 SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT HISTORY

The Council established the Scallop FMP in 1982. A number of Amendments and Framework Adjustments have been implemented since that time to adjust the original plan. Amendment 4 was implemented in 1994 and introduced major changes in scallop management, including a limited access program to stop the influx of new vessels and a day-at-sea (DAS) reduction plan to reduce mortality and prevent recruitment overfishing. Limited access vessels were assigned different DAS limits according to which permit category they qualified for: full-time, part-time or occasional. Amendment 4 also created the general category scallop permit for vessels that did not qualify for a limited access permit. Although originally created for an incidental catch of scallops in other fisheries, and for small-scale directed fisheries, the general category fishery and fleet has evolved since its creation in 1994.

Under Amendment 4 the general category scallop fishery was established as an "open access" fishery. Open access means any vessel that wants to apply for a permit can; there were no specific qualifications to receive a general category permit. The main control on mortality for this component of the scallop fishery was a daily possession limit.

Starting in 1999 there was considerable growth in fishing effort and landings by vessels with general category permits, primarily as a result of resource recovery and higher scallop prices. Landings went from an average of about 200,000 pounds from 1994-2000 to over one million pounds consistently from 2001-2003, and 3-7 million pounds each year from 2004-2006 (NEFMC, 2007). Without additional controls on the general category fishery, there was a great deal of uncertainty with respect to potential fishing mortality from this component of the scallop fishery, thus the potential for overfishing was increased. Therefore, the Council initiated Amendment 11 to consider a range of measures to control fishing mortality by this component of the fishery, improving the ability of this plan to prevent overfishing of the scallop resource overall.

A control date was implemented for the general category scallop fishery on November 1, 2004 (69 CFR 63341). A control date serves as advance notice to vessels that future access to that

fishery may be limited in some way. Specifically, a control date can be used for establishing eligibility criteria for determining levels of future access and it implemented to discourage speculative entry into a fishery while a Council develops a management program to control effort.

The Council began working on Amendment 11 in 2005 in June 2007 the Council approved Amendment 11 to the Scallop FMP and it was effective on June 1, 2008. To help focus Amendment 11 during development, the Council approved policy guidance as well as a “vision statement” for the general category fishery to help define the scope of issues that would be considered during the amendment. These have been included in this document to help identify potential indicators and evaluate whether the program implemented by Amendment 11 has achieved the goals and objectives set by the Council as well as the vision developed for this fleet.

The policy guidance read:

Amendment 11 will focus on addressing capacity in the general category fishery by considering measures that will better control fishing mortality by this component of the fishery. Specifically, the amendment will consider limited entry and implementation of a hard total allowable catch (hard TAC) to prevent overfishing. This amendment will not consider measures that maintain the general category fishery as an open access fishery with input controls as the only mechanism to manage general category effort (i.e. possession limits and crew restrictions).

2.1.1 Vision of general category fishery adopted under Amendment 11

The Council recognizes that the general category scallop fishery has changed since development and implementation of Amendment 4 in 1994. While some of the participants are the same, many have changed and fishing behavior has evolved with time. The general category scallop fishery has been and still is very diverse. This component of the fishery is prosecuted by vessels of different size and gear types. For example, some general category vessels fish for scallops full-time but only seasonally, another component of the fleet lands scallops above incidental levels while fishing for other species, and some are full-time day boat vessels that target scallops year round.

This action will implement measures that will control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery. In order to accommodate this diverse fleet, this amendment will consider a range of measures that take these differences into account. Specifically, this action is considering a limited entry program, a hard TAC and other management measures to control capacity and mortality.

The overall intent of this action is to stabilize capacity and prevent overfishing from the general category fishery, and in doing so, the Council’s vision of this general category fleet from this point forward is to maintain the diverse nature and flexibility within this component of the scallop fleet. Specifically, the Council intends to consider measures that will control mortality from this component of the fleet, but preserve the ability for vessels to participate in the general category fishery at different levels. This Council recognizes the importance of this component of the fishery for small fishing communities, as a component of overall catch for some individual

vessel owners, and the value this “dayboat” scallop product has in the scallop market. Overall, the Councils’ vision of the general category fishery after Amendment 11 is implemented is a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities.

2.1.2 Goals and Objectives of Amendment 11 related to the general category fishery

The primary goal of Amendment 11 was to control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery. In order to achieve this goal, the Council identified the following list of objectives:

1. Allocate a portion of the total available scallop harvest to the general category scallop fishery.
2. Establish criteria to qualify a number of vessels for a limited entry general category permit.
3. Develop measures to prevent the limited entry general category fishery from exceeding their allocation.
4. Develop measures to address incidental catch of scallops while fishing for other species.

Amendment 11 ultimately implemented a limited entry IFQ program for about 340 vessels (Category A LAGC permits). Each qualifying vessel received a “contribution factor” based on their catch history and years in the fishery. Vessels are allocated annual scallop poundage based on their individual contribution factor. Vessels are still subject to a possession limit; Amendment 11 maintained the limit of 400 pounds, but that was increased in a subsequent action to 600 pounds. The fleet of qualifying Category A general category vessels now receives a total allocation of 5% of the total projected (LA and LAGC) scallop catch each fishing year.

Amendment 11 also established separate limited entry programs for other classes of general category permits. Category B permits are restricted to fishing for scallop in the Northern Gulf of Maine and those vessels qualified under a separate set of criteria with different gear and possession limit restrictions. Category C LAGC permits are for vessels permitted to land and sell up to 40 pounds of scallop meat per trip while fishing for other species. There is a target TAC for this permit category of 50,000 pounds per year. Finally, about 120 limited access vessels (in Permit data, there are only 40 limited access vessels with IFQ permits in 2009-2012) also qualified for a LAGC IFQ permit under the same qualifying criteria). These vessels are allocated an overall 0.5% of the total projected annual scallop catch, and each permit has an individual contribution factor. These other limited access general category permits will not be evaluated in this report. This report is focused on LAGC IFQ vessels only, Category A permits.

Amendment 11 was implemented before the start of the 2008 fishing year, but there was a transition period for the first two years of the program. For fishing years 2008 and 2009 the fishery was managed under a quarterly hard-TAC equivalent to 10% of the total projected catch for the scallop fishery. The Council developed these interim measures because it was expected to take at least 12 months to implement a limited entry IFQ program. The Council adopted a quarterly TAC based on public comments related to potential derby fishing and safety concerns. The Council selected 10% because that is the value that was used in recent projections for assumed scallop mortality from the general category fishery, and that level of catch had not had

substantial impacts on the limited access fleet during that time period. Furthermore, the Council selected a higher value than the long-term allocation of 5% to reduce short-term impacts on vessels that would ultimately qualify for limited entry from additional effort expected under the appeals process.

2.1.3 Summary of changes to the IFQ program since Amendment 11

Since Amendment 11 there have been a handful of adjustments made to the IFQ program. The first action following Amendment 11, Framework 21 allowed partial leasing of general category IFQ allocations during the fishing year. The Council adopted this alternative to increase flexibility for general category qualifiers and to improve overall economic profits of the IFQ program. In addition, the amount of compensation a general category vessel can receive on observed access area trips was limited to 400 pounds per trip. This measure is not directly related to improvements of the IFQ program, but it does help prevent excessive compensation for observed LAGC trips, thus improving overall monitoring for both the LA and LAGC fleets. Limiting the compensation per trip will help the total observer set-aside compensation pool last longer, reducing the chance of the pool running out before the end of the year.

In 2010 Framework 22 considered a handful of modifications to various aspects of the LAGC program including VMS, accountability measures for YT flounder, and possession of in-shell scallops. But none of these measures were adopted, and none of them were specific to the IFQ program. In 2011 the Council approved Framework 23 which again did not consider any specific changes to the IFQ program, but modify one part of the NGOM LAGC permit. This action changed the NGOM management program so that a vessel with a Federal NGOM permit can fish exclusively in state waters and that catch would not apply against the federal NGOM TAC. Vessels could still fish in federal waters, but if they do all catch from that trip would apply against the federal TAC.

Amendment 15 included a handful of changes to the LAGC IFQ program specifically designed to make the IFQ program more effective and efficient for participating vessels. First, a rollover of 15% of the permit holder's original annual allocation will be allowed to a subsequent fishing year to increase flexibility and provide a safety mechanism in the case of a late-season breakdown. Second, the possession limit will be increased from 400 to 600 pounds to allow for more efficient harvest of quota, without the increase being large enough to change the nature of this small day-boat fishery and creating competition between the fleets. Third, the maximum amount of quota one vessel can harvest was increased from 2% to 2.5% to be more consistent with the maximum individual ownership value of 5%. Finally, IFQ vessels will be allowed to split the IFQ from their IFQ permit and other fishery permits to facilitate permanent IFQ transfers from vessels with a suite of NE fishery permits.

Finally in 2012 the Council approved Framework 24 to set fishery specifications for 2013, as well as a handful of other measures. Several were specific to the LAGC IFQ program. One measure designed to improve flexibility and efficient use of LAGC IFQ during the year was to allow LAGC vessels to sub-lease IFQ as well as lease IFQ during the fishing year even if some fishing has occurred. A handful of other measures adjust management for LAGC vessels, but were not specific to the IFQ program: specific YT AMs for the LAGC fishery; adjustment to the timing of YT AMs in the scallop fishery; expand the observer set-aside program to include

LAGC trips in open areas; and modify the observer set-aside TAC so that it is still 1% of the ABC, but it would not be area specific. These last few measures were developed to make LAGC vessels more accountable for bycatch, as well as improve overall monitoring of this fishery.

May need to update if any changes proposed in FW25.

2.2 SUMMARY OF GENERAL CATEGORY FISHERY

General summary of participants, catch, revenue, pre and post IFQs – will take info from FW24 SAFE Report

3.0 VARIABLES USED TO EVALUATE THE LAGC IFQ PROGRAM

These variables are a combination of the elements analyzed in the economic and social performance evaluation of sectors (Kitts et al, 2011), indicators from the Draft FMP Performance Evaluation process approved by the Council in January 2012 (Appendix 1), and requirements for review of LAPPs in the MSA.

3.1 BACKGROUND

3.1.1 NMFS Report on the performance of the northeast multispecies fishery

In October 2011 NMFS published a report that evaluated the economic and social performance of active groundfish vessels for FY2010. The report compared a range of performance measures over time, 2007-2010.

Will insert more

3.1.2 NEFMC Draft FMP performance evaluation white paper

In January 2012 the Council approved a Draft FMP Performance Evaluation process, which included a range of indicators that could be used to evaluate fishery management performance.

There are other efforts underway to identify potential performance variables in this region as well as nationally. NMFS social scientists have compiled a list of performance variables that could be used for FMP tracking (Appendix 1, adapted from Clay, et al. 2010). In addition, NMFS plans to advance a nationwide set of fishery performance measures, as compared to FMP performance measures, beginning in 2012. This will begin with catch share fisheries using readily available data and will be expanded to include other fisheries and data in the future. In addition, MRAG Americas has developed a proposal for catch share system performance evaluation (MRAG Americas 2011).

The Draft FMP Performance Evaluation document approved by the Council incorporated all these sources and summarized a list of potential performance evaluation variables. The list balances the number of variables tracked with the time that is needed to compile and present the information recognizing the need for cost effectiveness and minimizing workload impacts.

1. Biological
 - a. Fishing mortality rate / target fishing mortality rate
 - b. Biomass / Biomass target
2. Economic
 - a. Catch as a percentage of ACL
 - b. Discards
 - i. Target species – use rate from NMFS NERO for ACL calculation
 - ii. Protected Resources – no estimate by FMP
 - c. Revenue from fishery
 - d. Revenue per active permit holder
 - e. Percentage of gross revenue taken by top 20% of permit
 - f. Net revenue per permit (if available, only available for few fisheries)
 - g. Number of active vessels
 - h. Number of inactive vessels
 - i. Average age of active vessels
3. Fleet Diversity
 - a. Number of vessels in fishery
 - i. Under 30 feet
 - ii. 30-50 feet
 - iii. 50-75 feet
 - iv. Over 75 feet
 - b. Landings revenue by port
 - c. Landing in weight by port
 - d. Number of ports in which FMP species are landed
 - e. Number of days fished by port
4. Safety
 - a. Fishing Vessel Casualty Rate
 - i. Per 100,000 hours fished (groundfish, scallop) – time intensive
 - ii. Per 1,000 days fished ?
 - iii. Working with USCG on best indicator
5. Governance
 - a. Ratio of actual vs. planned time for amendment or framework
 - b. Time needed to incorporate new assessment data into FMP
 - c. Time needed to respond to new conditions, e.g. changes in the fishery or requests from stakeholders
 - d. Number of advisory panel meetings
 - e. Public input metric to gauge how stakeholders feel their input is being heard and used.
 - i. Use web based survey tool, e.g. Survey Monkey, and note cards to allow people to comment in an anonymous, non-intimidating way.
 - ii. Questions to be developed

Once the specific variables or performance indicators are identified there are several other issues to consider.

- What should the baseline years be?
- Has the FMP met original objectives?
- How should the material be presented?

For this LAGC IFQ Report:

- Baseline years
 - o 5 years before IFQ (2005-2009) – This period is not a uniform one- 2005-2007 corresponds to big increase in GENERAL CATEGORY effort, while 2008-2009 is more limited entry with 10% quota – part of the program was implemented. Can compare 2011-2012 to two separate periods. I think 2008 could be a good starting year for comparison (ownership data is lacking in 2009).
 - o Qualifying years (2000-2004); This baseline makes sense.
 - o Transition period (2008-2009)
- Amendment 11 LAGC IFQ Program Objectives
- Presentation of results
 - o Separate white paper presented to Council (June 2013)
 - o Separate part of scallop page on NEFMC website as well as Social Science Page for NEFSC
 - o Potential workshop to present info to public and gather feedback

3.1.3 MSA requirements for review of LAPPs

MSA – MSA 303A (c) Requirements for LAPPs

(1) In general

(G) include provisions for the regular monitoring and review by the Council and the Secretary of the operations of the program, including determining progress in meeting the goals of the program and this Act, and any necessary modification of the program to meet those goals, with a formal and detailed review 5 years after the implementation of the program and thereafter to coincide with scheduled Council review of the relevant fishery management plan (but no less frequently than once every 7 years);

3.2 BIOLOGICAL PERFORMANCE

Explain that the LAGC fishery is a component of a larger fishery so biomass and F more linked to that – not LAGC component exclusively.

3.2.1 Biological Variable 1 – Catch and associated fishing mortality from LAGC fishery

The mortality from the LAGC fishery is projected to be about 5% of the total mortality, as measures by catch. In some cases general category vessels may have a lower fishing mortality than larger limited access vessels due to smaller gear and lower area swept. However, in other cases the mortality could be relatively higher if general category vessels are fishing in areas with lower scallop densities, potentially having higher impacts on scallop mortality and bycatch per unit of effort. In the end the only direct way to measure how this component of the fishery is doing in a biological sense would be to evaluate how much of the total LAGC IFQ sub-ACL is being harvested.

In 2010 the LAGC IFQ sub ACL was 2.35 million pounds and 0.23 million pounds for LA vessels with LAGC IFQ permits. Total catch for vessels with LAGC IFQ permits was 2.2 million pounds, or 94% of the total sub-ACL. Total catch for LA vessels with LAGC IFQ was 0.23 million pounds; all of the sub-ACL. [need to confirm this with NERO website].

In 2011, vessels with LAGC IFQ were allocated a sub-ACL of 2.9 million pounds and LA vessels with IFQ permits were allocated a sub-ACL of 0.29 million pounds. Total catch for FY2011 was 2.8 million pounds, about 95% of the total sub-ACL. For LA vessels with LAGC IFQ permits total catch was about 273,000 pounds, or 94% of the total sub-ACL.

Based on two years of information only, the sub-ACLs in place are effectively controlling mortality from this component of the fishery. Over 90% of the total IFQ for the LAGC IFQ fishery is being harvested; so there does not seem to be large amounts of quota going unfished. In summary, from a biological perspective this program is effective at controlling mortality and preventing overfishing from the LAGC IFQ fleet.

Table 1. Scallop landings by permit category

fishyear	Permit	<41	41-400	401-1200	>1200	Grand Total
2010	IFQ	2,731	2,270,722	87,038	23,664	2,384,155
	INCI	20,656	8,697	3,286	119,578	152,217
	LA	20	9,852	131,890	53,575,726	53,717,488
	NGOM	275	9,788	8,698	36,948	55,709
	UNK	24,266	312,246	13,936	300,970	651,418
	2010 Total	47,948	2,611,305	244,848	54,056,886	56,960,987
2011	IFQ	4,659	1,507,392	1,539,394	280,720	3,332,165
	INCI	32,922	4,679	7,415	15,471	60,487
	LA	77	4,214	102,594	54,345,792	54,452,677
	NGOM	1,192	16,533	12,277	18,137	48,139
	UNK	30,287	224,610	27,866	273,446	556,209
	2011 Total	69,137	1,757,428	1,689,546	54,933,566	58,449,677

3.2.2 Biological Variable 2 – Discards

Still brainstorming the best way to approach this??? **Ideas??**

3.3 ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

3.3.1 LAGC IFQ Fishery Revenues

3.3.1.1 Gross Revenues

3.3.1.2 Revenues by Species and dependence on the scallop fishery

3.3.1.3 Scallop prices (premium for LAGC product)

3.3.2 LAGC IFQ Vessels and Effort

3.3.2.1 Number of active LAGC IFQ Vessels

3.3.2.2 Number of inactive vessels with LAGC IFQ permit

3.3.2.3 Number of Trips and Days Absent

3.3.3 LAGC IFQ Fishing and Leasing Costs and Quota Prices

3.3.3.1 Trip costs

3.3.3.2 Fixed costs

3.3.3.3 Leasing costs (depending on the available info)

3.3.3.4 LAGC IFQ Quota prices (if information is available)

3.3.4 Average LAGC IFQ Vessel Performance

3.3.4.1 Revenue per Vessel, Trip, and Day

3.3.4.2 Net Revenues (net of fishing and other costs)

3.3.4.3 Estimation of Owner's Share of Net Revenue

3.3.4.4 Average Gross Scallop Revenue per day

3.3.4.5 Average Net Revenue per Vessel

3.3.4.6 Aggregate Revenue (from all species) per vessel

3.3.5 LAGC-IFQ Fleet Diversity and Ownership

3.3.5.1 Number of Active Vessels by Home Port

3.3.5.2 Number of Inactive Permits by Home Port

3.3.5.3 Number of Active Vessels by Vessel Size and Average Age

- 3.3.5.4 Number of Vessels by owner
- 3.3.5.5 Distribution of Revenue Among Vessels
- 3.3.5.6 Distribution of Revenue Among Ownership groups
- 3.3.6 Employment in the LAGCIFQ fishery
 - 3.3.6.1 Number of Crew Positions
 - 3.3.6.2 Number of Crew Trips
 - 3.3.6.3 Number of Crew Days
 - 3.3.6.4 Total Employment
- 3.3.7 Summary of LAGC IFQ by port
 - 3.3.7.1 Number of Active Vessels by Home Port
 - 3.3.7.2 Number of Inactive Permits by Home Port
 - 3.3.7.3 Revenue by Landing Port and Home Port
 - 3.3.7.4 Number of Trips and Days Absent by Home Port
 - 3.3.7.5 Employment by Port
- 3.3.8 Impacts of LAGC IFQ program on state water scallop fisheries
 - 3.3.8.1 Changes in Maine
 - 3.3.8.2 Changes in Massachusetts
- 3.3.9 Summary of spatial fishing location trends
 - 3.3.9.1 Summary of LAGC IFQ fishing locations (VMS and VTR data pre and post IFQs)
 - 3.3.9.2 Comparison to trends in LA fishery in terms of fishing location shifts with biomass, or are there distinct LAGC fishing areas that have remained the same?

3.3.10 Summary of LAGC Incidental and NGOM Fisheries

This section will evaluate how these other two LAGC permit categories add to the overall diversity of the LAGC fishery.

3.4 SAFETY PERFORMANCE

Still brainstorming the best way to address this???

Description of vessels that did and did not qualify

Number of vessels with upgrades each year

Number of vessel casualties for this fleet specifically – catalogue of type

Vessel age?

Management measures that improve or reduce safety – crew limits, other?

3.5 GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE

3.5.1 Governance Variable 1 - Goals and Objectives

The first variable related to governance is to evaluate whether the LAGC IFQ program has met the original Goals and Objectives set in Amendment 11.

3.5.1.1 Goal of LAGC IFQ Program

The primary goal of Amendment 11 was to control capacity and mortality in the general category scallop fishery.

Was this goal achieved? YES

Capacity was controlled by implementing a limited entry program starting in fishing year 2008. Prior to Amendment 11 general category permits were open access.

Mortality was controlled by implementing an overall hard TAC for this fishery of 5% of the total projected scallop catch. An IFQ program was established to determine what portion of the total general category allocation would be granted individually to qualifying vessels.

3.5.1.2 Objectives of LAGC IFQ Program

In order to achieve the primary goal of Amendment 11, the Council identified four objectives.

1. Allocate a portion of the total available scallop harvest to the general category scallop fishery.

Was this objective met? YES

The LAGC IFQ fishery is allocated 5% of the total projected catch and LA vessels that also qualified for a LAGC IFQ permit are allocated 0.5% of the total projected catch.

2. Establish criteria to qualify a number of vessels for a limited entry general category permit.

Was this objective met? YES

The LAGC IFQ program is limited entry and individual allocations are based on historical participation in the fishery. In order to qualify each vessel had to have a permit before the control date and 1,000 or more pounds of scallop catch in any fishing year during the qualification period (FY2000-November 1, 2004 – the control date). A vessels best year is weighted by the number of years active in the fishery to recognize historical participation and dependence on the fishery.

3. Develop measures to prevent the limited entry general category fishery from exceeding their allocation.

Was this objective met? YES

Total catch from the LAGC fishery is very controlled. There is a total IFQ for the fishery that is monitored using vessel trip reports, dealer reports, and vessel monitoring systems.

4. Develop measures to address incidental catch of scallops while fishing for other species.

Was this objective met? YES

Amendment 11 also implemented a limited entry permit for incidental catch permits (40 pounds or less). There is a target TAC that is adjustable for vessels that qualified for an incidental catch permit, and catch from that permit category has remained under the target TAC of 50,000 pounds since adoptions of the program.

3.5.2 Governance Variable 2 – Council Vision Statement for Amendment 11

The overall intent of this action is to stabilize capacity and prevent overfishing from the general category fishery, and in doing so, the Council's vision of this general category fleet from this point forward is to maintain the diverse nature and flexibility within this component of the scallop fleet. Specifically, the Council intends to consider measures that will control mortality from this component of the fleet, but preserve the ability for vessels to participate in the general category fishery at different levels. This Council recognizes the importance of this component of the fishery for small fishing communities, as a component of overall catch for some individual vessel owners, and the value this "dayboat" scallop product has in the scallop market. Overall, the Councils' vision of the general category fishery after Amendment 11 is implemented is a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities.

Will insert tables and discussion to evaluate this variable.

3.5.3 Governance Variable 3 - LAGC Representation and participation in Council process

1. Number of LAGC members on the Scallop AP
2. Number of Council members with LAGC interests
3. Frequency and location of meetings

3.5.4 Governance Variable 4 - How quickly have changes been made to IFQ program

Since adoption of Amendment 11 several adjustments have been made to the IFQ program. This variable measures the length of time needed to make an adjustment to the IFQ program – the time between when issue was first raised and when a change was implemented.

1. **Allow rollover of 15% of the permit holder's original IFQ to subsequent fishing year (Amendment 15)**

To increase flexibility and provide a safety mechanism in the case of a late-season breakdown.

2. Increase the possession limit from 400 pounds to 600 pounds (Amendment 15)

To allow for more efficient harvest of quota, without the increase being large enough to change the nature of this small day-boat fishery and creating competition between the fleets

3. Modify the ownership cap restriction per vessel (Amendment 15)

Maximum increased from 2% to 2.5% cap per vessel to be more consistent with the maximum individual ownership value of 5%.

4. Modify permit provision to allow splitting of IFQ from vessel (Amendment 15)

Allow an individual to split the IFQ from their IFQ permit and other fishery permits to facilitate permanent IFQ transfers from vessels with a suite of NE fishery permits.

5. Partial leasing of IFQ during the fishing year (Framework 24)

Allow vessels to sub-lease IFQ as well as lease IFQ during the fishing year even if some fishing has occurred To increase flexibility for general category qualifiers and to improve overall economic profits of the IFQ program.

6. YT AMs for LAGC vessels (Framework 24)

7. Modify the observer set-aside program to include ALGC trips in open areas and modify set-aside so it is not area specific (Framework 24)

These last few measures were developed to make LAGC vessels more accountable for bycatch, as well as improve overall monitoring of this fishery.

3.5.5 Governance variable 5 - Cost recovery

Still brainstorming the best way to address this??

What is cost, %paid, what is it paying for?

3.6 OTHER – IDEAS?

Are we leaving anything out?

3.7 SUMMARY

Combine all indicators with major aspects and make one overall table for performance