

NPFMC Spatial Management workshop report: focus on BSAI BS/RE

Workshop at AFSC July 2016

agenda

- Overview of BS/RE assessment and background on catch issues
- Discussion of available tools and input from workgroup and public participants
- Comparison of alternative management measures with subarea ABC management. How should the efficacy of these measures be evaluated?
- Next steps for BS/RE for 2016 assessment and BSAI Plan Team discussions for September

Little or no concern, in which case no action needs to be taken. This includes situations where information is insufficient to determine a level of concern, which may motivate additional research.

Moderate concern, in which case special monitoring (e.g., frequent updating of the template) is required at a minimum and Steps 2 and 3 of the Council's process may be activated

Strong concern, in which case Steps 2 and 3 of the Council's process must be activated

Emergency, in which case the Team will recommend separate harvest specifications at the ABC level, the OFL level, or both, for the next season (straight to Step 4 of the Council policy)

Joint Plan Teams draft proposed schedule for stock structure/spatial management concern:

Month	Action
September/October (year 1)	Notification of strong stock structure concern. SSC indicates to Council that it has 11 months to develop suite of tools and management and economic implications of the application of these tools to the stock/complex in question.
March/April (year 1)	Suite of proposed management tools compiled. One of these would be separate ABCs and/or OFLs per recommendations listed earlier.
March/April-August (year 1)	Evaluation of suite of management tools for consideration of management and economic implications. Note that this does not necessarily mean a comprehensive analysis; this could simply be an informed listing of the likely implications of each tool.
September/October (year 2)	Team/SSC/Council review of suite of tools and selection of approach for use in the coming harvest year (assuming that the approach does not require rulemaking).
2 years later: September/October (year 4)	Update on result of application of tool. If deemed insufficient to address issue, consideration of additional measures (e.g., area split).
Continuing forward annually in September/October	If management tool successful over 2 year time frame, continued annual update on progress. Consideration of performance criteria for continued need for tool.

Joint Plan Teams draft proposed schedule for stock structure/spatial management concern:

Month	Action
September/October (year 1)	Notification of strong stock structure concern. SSC indicates to Council that it has 11 months to develop suite of tools and management and economic implications of the application of these tools to the stock/complex in question.
March/April (year 1)	Suite of proposed management tools compiled. One of these would be separate ABCs and/or OFLs per recommendations listed earlier.
March/April-August (year 1)	Evaluation of suite of management tools for consideration of management and economic implications. Note that this does not necessarily mean a comprehensive analysis; this could simply be an informed listing of the likely implications of each tool.
September/October (year 2)	Team/SSC/Council review of suite of tools and selection of approach for use in the coming harvest year (assuming that the approach does not require rulemaking).
2 years later: September/October (year 4)	Update on result of application of tool. If deemed insufficient to address issue, consideration of additional measures (e.g., area split).
Continuing forward annually in September/October	If management tool successful over 2 year time frame, continued annual update on progress. Consideration of performance criteria for continued need for tool.

Council motion clarifications (December 2015):

- If MSSC not sufficient to limit catch in WAI, Workgroup to provide plan team and Council with recommendations for additional tools and evaluation of management and economic implications of those recommendations.
- To do this:
- Public meeting to discuss available and develop additional management tools
- Following meeting FMP coordinator evaluate proposed tools (with input from AFSC and NMFS AKR) and provide report to BSAI Plan Team in September
- BSAI Plan team will provide recommendations in September of any change in management approach with rationale articulated in Plan Team minutes.

available tools:

- two main categories –
 - 1) a subarea ABC and TAC
 - 2) an MSSC.

MANAGEMENT MEASURE CONSIDERED	BENEFITS	DRAWBACKS	POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
SUBAREA ABC AND TAC	<p>Transparent and familiar catch limit and in-season response mechanism for putting on non-retention status</p> <p>Clear disincentive (and lack of revenue) to catch fish when ABC is reached.</p>	<p>Some potential to increase in discards without decreasing total catch (assuming current catch level are primarily incidental with no targeting to top off); unclear what the implications for subarea ABC for remaining sub-areas would be;</p> <p>May cause unnecessary avoidance of good fishing areas which may have the potential to impact</p>	<p>Request that the stock assessment author provide proposed splits for all sub-areas so that it is clear what the proposed ABC/TAC implications are to all areas.</p>

MSSC

- Benefits:
 - Provides flexible measure to increase avoidance without closing fisheries or increasing discards or forcing the Council to spatially divide the TAC as part of the TAC-setting process
- Drawbacks
 - Less transparent than ABC or TAC level because it does not appear in the harvest specifications or the Federal Register; no immediate management response to exceeding MSSC.
 - Additional work for stock assessment scientists, Plan Teams/SSC, and managers to create, monitor, and manage a separate category of harvest advice.
 - Because the MSSC does not correspond to a recognized management unit (i.e., areas for which we have OFLs/ABCs/TACs), it could more easily be removed and thus fail to prevent high exploitation rates in the future.
 - May cause additional and unnecessary avoidance of good fishing areas which may have other negative impacts

Other considerations

- Multi-year average to calculate overages

Plan Team considerations

- Comments on following spatial management process?
 - Ad hoc attempt to follow for BSAI BS/RE
 - Lacking analytical impact assessment
- Additional analyses to pursue before or after management recommendation?
- Specific recommendations for BSAI BS/RE in 2017
- Other stock issues
 - Spatial catch issues as with northerns and recommendations for assessments
 - What happens with potential localized depletion issue when we move to longer lag times between assessments (possibly off-cycle considerations?)

FMP	Chapter	Stock	Author	Level
BSAI	1A	AI pollock	Barbeaux	Little
BSAI	2	BS Pacific cod	Thompson	Little
BSAI	4	Yellowfin sole	Wilderbuer	Little
BSAI	6	Arrowtooth flounder	Spies	Little
BSAI	13	Northern rockfish	Spencer	Little
BSAI	14	Blackspotted/rougheye rockfish	Spencer	Strong
BSAI	15	Shortraker rockfish	Spencer	Moderate
BSAI	16	Other rockfish	Spies	Moderate
BSAI	17	Atka mackerel	Lowe	Little
BSAI	18	Skates	Ormseth	Little
BSAI	21	Sharks	Tribuzio	Little
GOA	1	Pollock	Dorn	Little
GOA	7	Arrowtooth flounder	Spies	Little
GOA	9	Pacific ocean perch	Hanselman	Little
GOA	12	Dusky rockfish	Lunsford	Little
GOA	13	Rougheye/blackspotted rockfish	Shotwell	Little
GOA	17	Atka mackerel	Lowe	Little
GOA	18	Skates	Ormseth	Strong
GOA	20	Sharks	Tribuzio	Little