

LAGC IFQ Report

Scallop PDT Meeting – April 9, 2014

New Bedford, MA

Background and Purpose

- Council initiated this review for 4 reasons
 1. Council reviewed impacts of GF sector management and requested a similar analysis to potentially identify trends and issues for improvement
 2. “Touchstone Report” identified a need to evaluate the general performance of FMPs
 3. MSA requires all limited access privilege programs (LAPPs) be evaluated within 5 years after adoption
 4. Council is considering LAPPS for other fisheries in this region

Primary resources used: NEFSC GF Performance Report (2011); NEFMC Lessons Learned Workshop; and NEFMC Draft Fishery Performance Evaluation

Outline of Report

1.0 Background

2.0 Historical description of GC fishery and management

3.0 Variables used to evaluate LAGC IFQ program

- Biological
- Economic
- Safety and Enforcement
- Governance

4.0 Findings and Recommendations

History of GC management and fishery

- Scallop FMP in 1982
- Limited entry in 1994 (Amendment 4)
- GC category for vessels that did not qualify – open access with possession limit
- Starting in 1999 increase in GC fishing activity (average of 0.2 mil lbs. between 1994-2000; 1.0 million in 2001-2003, and 3-7 million each year between 2004-2006)
- Control date on November 1, 2004
- Council developed Amendment 11 (2005-2007), effective June 1, 2008
- Allocation of 5.5% of resource and 3 permit categories: IFQ, NGOM and Incidental

History of GC management and fishery (cont.)

- Permits – Over 2,500 pre A11, over 750 post A11 and declining
- Active permits – About 200 until 2004, increased to ??? in ???. Post A11 about 250-300 and declining
- 75-80% of LAGC scallop landings with dredge gear, rest with trawl
- Most IFQ vessels homeported in MA and NJ followed by NC and NY. Specific ports with highest # of vessels: New Bedford, Pt. Judith, Gloucester, Boston Cape May and Barnegat Light
- About 30% of IFQ fleet very dependent on scallops (over 90% of total revenue, and about 50% below 50% of total revenue

Variables used to evaluate program

- Biological
 - Catch (sub-ACL) and Bycatch
- Economic
 - scallop landings, revenues from scallops and other species, permits and owners, fishing costs, vessel characteristics, primary state
- Safety and Enforcement
 - Vessel casualties and Vessel Age
 - Measures of compliance and enforcement (violations, pre-landing, monitored offloads, IFQ overages)
- Governance
 - Goals and objectives of A11 and Council vision for A11
 - LAGC representation and participation
 - Management responsiveness
 - Cost recovery

Biological Performance

1. Biological Variable 1 – Catch

This IFQ and sub-ACL program has been effective at controlling mortality and preventing overfishing.

On average, over 95% of total available catch has been harvested in the first three years under the program

(GARFO – need to reconcile values in tables 22-24)

2. Biological Variable 2 – Bycatch

Focus on 2 species: GB YT and SNE/MA YT (SNE/MA WP sub-ACL not adopted until 2013)

Overall impact from LAGC IFQ fishery relatively small, for SNE/MA YT larger % of total scallop fishery catch (20% of total, predominantly from trawl fleet)

Economic Performance

1. Total LAGC IFQ scallop landings and revenue
2. Number of active vessels, owners and effort
3. Leasing activity and lease prices
4. Scallop revenue per active vessel and owner
5. Revenue and profits including the revenue from leasing (net of fishing costs)
6. Distribution of revenue and profits
7. Employment and crew incomes
8. Distribution of landings, revenues and leasing activity by primary state

Safety and Enforcement

1. Safety Variable 1: Number of Vessel casualties by fishery
Still working on this with USCG
2. Safety Variable 2: Vessel age (focus on active vessels)
Relatively stable, average 2 years younger now
Leasing same but Transfer to newer vessels
3. Compliance/Enforcement Variable 1: LAGC violations
Limited info – small decline but may just be less enforcement presence
4. Compliance/Enforcement Variable 2: Pre-landing
Reasonable for most of the fleet, but 15-20% of fleet not complying with this – reducing effectiveness of compliance

Safety and Enforcement (cont.)

5. Compliance/Enforcement Variable 3: Offloads

Very little effort in 2010, 140 monitored offloads in 2011 and 2012. Very few over possession limit (assumption)

6. Compliance/Enforcement Variable 4: IFQ overages

Still working on this

Governance

1. Governance Variable 1: Goals and Objectives of IFQ program

- **Primary goal of A11** – Control capacity and mortality of general category fishery. *Achieved? YES*

- **4 Objectives of A11**

1. Allocate portion of total available catch
2. Establish criteria for limited entry
3. Measures to prevent excess catch
4. Measures to address incidental catch

All of these objectives were achieved through measures adopted in A11: 5.5% of total ACL, specific criteria using control date and minimum landings, IFQ and possession limits, and 2 other limited entry permits established for NGOM and incidental catch

Governance

2. Governance Variable 2: Vision Statement for A11

Overall, 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.

1. Relatively small vessels – size and HP of vessels - see other document
2. Possession limit – still working on this
3. Participants at various levels – catch level groups – see other document – # of NGOM and Incidental has declined, but # of active vessels has increased

Governance

3. Governance Variable 3: LAGC Representation in Council process

1. **Number of LAGC members on Scallop AP**

During A11 - adequate; one exclusive Gen Cat AP only and about 20% of the regular Scallop AP was made up of general category members.

Since A11 – adequate the panel is about even in terms of limited access interests, general category interests, and either both LA and LAGC or “other”

2. **Number of Council members with LAGC interests**

Adequate - For the most part the composition of the Council and Committee is divided into thirds, one third typically supportive of LA interests for the most part, one third with LAGC interests, and one third for both, or more neutral on those issues

3. **Frequency and Location of meetings - Adequate**

Governance

2. Governance Variable 3: LAGC Representation in Council process (cont.)

4. How quickly have changes been made to IFQ program
 - Allow rollover of 15%
 - Increase possession limit to 600 pounds
 - Modify ownership cap to 2.5% per vessel
 - Allow splitting of IFQ from vessel
 - Partial leasing during the FY
 - Separate YT AMs for LAGC vessels
 - Modify observer set-aside program to include LAGC trips in open areas

Most effective one year after IFQ program effective – relatively quickly considering competing priorities and size of fishery

Summary – Next steps

PDT Findings?

- Today - PDT identify final work needed
- After Meeting –
 - Staff complete analyses
 - PDT digest information and think about general findings to share with the Cmte
 - PDT Conference call in early May to review updated report and review findings