

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

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 data) is required at a minimum and Steps 2 and 3 of the Council's process may be required.

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

urgent concern, in which case the Team will recommend separate harvest specifications at the OFL level, the OFL level, or both, for the next season (straight to Step 4 of the Council process).

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
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 other negative impacts</p>	<p>Request that the stock assessment author proposed splits for all areas so that it is clear what the proposed ABC/TAC implications 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., area 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?)

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