

#9

Preliminary Ideas for A15 Social Impact Assessment

Most alternatives under consideration are not expected to have substantial social impacts (i.e. research set-aside alternatives, overfishing definition, etc.). The potential social impacts of these alternatives will be primarily qualitative and will be based on expected impacts on the resource. In general, if alternatives are expected to have positive impacts on the resource, then overall social impacts should be positive as well in the long-term. However, the alternatives to address excess capacity and provide more flexibility for efficient use of the resource may have social impacts that would require more thorough analyses. Below is an outline of the issues and sources of data that will likely be examined in the social impact assessment for Amendment 15. It should be noted that much of the social impact analyses will build on outputs from the economic analysis of alternatives. In addition, the Affected Environment section of the amendment will update tables through 2008 that contain social information about ports, vessels, other fisheries scallop vessels are involved in etc.

Capacity Reduction: Permit leasing and stacking

Impacts:

Since the impacts of consolidation may mimic some of the impacts thought to be caused by the introduction of ITQ's in a fishery, the SIA will provide a literature review and explanation of potential impacts that have been studied through empirical examples of ITQ's (e.g. community impacts from ownership consolidation, social sustainability when difficult to enter fishery, etc.) In particular permit stacking could only have benefits for owners with more than one vessel. Capacity would not be reduced in the sense of overall fishing impact; profitability is increased for some but not others, which may have long-term consequences for the structure of the fishery.

Questions and Issues to be addressed through literature review:

Permit leasing:

1. What would cost of leasing do to long-term structure of fishery? Further negative impacts against coastal culture of owner operated family businesses?
2. Who would pay for leasing: from crew shares or owner shares (some indications from groundfish industry that crew have had to absorb the costs)?
3. Impacts to crew employment/income?
4. Impacts to shore side businesses?
5. Impact to other fisheries: would leasing DAS away allow a vessel to concentrate effort in other fisheries or other areas?

Permit stacking:

1. Impacts to other fisheries: requiring all permitted fisheries to move with scallop permit would leave a permit-less boat. What fishing options for that boat remain—does it have any value? How does that affect values of boats overall and who would be impacted?
2. Who could take advantage of stacking without “cost” of obtaining additional permits: only owners with at least two vessels, which do not fish at same time
3. Impacts to disadvantaged one-boat owners... how would overall fishery change their position?
4. Impacts to crew employment/income?

5. Impacts to shore side businesses?

Potential fisheries that would be included in literature review:

1. Mid-Atlantic surf clam
2. New Zealand fisheries
3. Canadian scallops
4. Leasing DAS in Groundfish FMP
5. Icelandic IFQ programs

Additionally, data exists on ownership (who owns how many vessels) for 2006-2008, data that is cross-referenced by vessel permit number, which will allow different classes of owners to be analyzed according to differences in landed value, variety of species fished, variety of federal permits held, vessel crew size, homeports and landing ports, areas fished, and so on. (However, because the data is at the moment only accessible for three years, one cannot obtain a longer sense of trends in ownership patterns over time.) Additionally, logbook data may help indicate whether fleet owned vessels are already using the same captains on multiple vessels, though there is not data to analyze this practice for other members of a vessel crew. Lastly, NEFSC has been updating port profiles for major ports in the Northeast and those should be available to include in the Affected Environment.

Example of information that can be generated from ownership data available

	#corps	#boats	landed value 08	% of landings	% of \$	\$/corporation	\$/boat
own 1 vessel	117	117	101,652,320	33.8	30.2	868,823	868,823
own 2-4 vessels	52	130	110,922,793	37.6	32.9	2,133,131	853,252
own 5 or more vessel	13	99	88,098,814	28.6	26.2	6,776,832	889,887
not limited access	454+	454+	36,032,643		10.7	79,367	79,367
			336,706,570				

Questions for SSC:

Is this list adequate for covering the important social issues related to capacity alternatives?

Are there any issues missing that should be addressed?

Are there other approaches the PDT should consider to analyze and present potential social impacts of the alternatives?

Any other fisheries the PDT should examine for literature review?