

# D1 HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN ALLOCATION REVIEW WORKPLAN

OCTOBER 2021

Sarah Marrinan, NPMFC Staff  
Presentation to the AP



# BACKGROUND ON NOAA ALLOCATION POLICY

## Step 1: A trigger for review is met

- 1) Public input trigger
- 2) Time trigger
- 3) Indicator trigger

### Stand Alone Allocation Reviews

- At least every 10 years
- BSAI cod, GOA cod, CDQ allocations, CSP

### Allocations reviews within Limited Access Privileges Program Reviews

- Five years after implementation and then at least every 7 years
- AFA, AI pollock BSAI crab ratz, A80, Halibut/sablefish IFQ, CGOA rockfish



# BACKGROUND ON NOAA ALLOCATION POLICY

## Step 2: Fisheries allocation review

1. Review FMP (or program) objectives
2. Are the objectives being met?
3. Have other relevant factors changed that would impact the allocation?

**At this stage, in depth analyses are not required; however, the review should include a clear description of how the objectives are or are not being met.**



# BACKGROUND ON NOAA ALLOCATION POLICY

If the Council determines development of allocation options (or changes to other parts of the program) are warranted:

## **Step 3:** Evaluation of fisheries allocation

Formal analysis to consider possible changes in allocations or other programmatic changes.





# SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

In addition to the Policy and Procedural Directives, we look to ...

- Other Allocation Reviews in the North Pacific and previous SSC guidance
- The goals of the CSP
- The Halibut Act and other applicable laws
- Additional feedback and public comment through the Council process



# OTHER EXAMPLES IN THE NORTH PACIFIC



# GOALS OF THE CSP

- (1) create a management regime that provides separate accountability for each sector;
- (2) management tools and season length should be established during the year prior to the year in which they would take effect, and that the tools selected, and season length should not change in season;
- (3) evaluate its success in achieving the sport charter sector allocation and specific needs for predictability, advance notice, and season length each year, and adjust its management tools as needed;
- (4) adjust management measures as needed to ensure that the sport charter sector is held at or below its allocation, recognizing that there may be annual overages or underages.



# FOCUS AND COUNCIL DECISIONS

## Focus is on the allocated sectors of interest

- Proposed plan is to provide a high-level overview of the resource management for halibut and basic trends on catch limits and expected mortality across areas and user groups but focus the bulk of the review (the dashboard metrics) on the allocated sectors of interest.

## Council decisions that could be made

- Allocation decisions
- Broader programmatic changes
- Other decisions within the Council's authority





# PROPOSED CONTENT

1. Purpose of an allocation review/ brief overview of the NOAA Policy
2. Goals of the CSP and any additional objectives identified by the Council
3. The Pacific halibut resource
  - Summary of halibut distribution, assessment, and stock status
  - Summary of IPHC harvest policy and management process which results in the catch limits
  - Time series info on sector mortality limits and how the resulting Area 2C and 3A limits fit into that paradigm
4. Management process created by the CSP
5. Description of the allocation
6. Factors that went into allocation decision-making



# PROPOSED CONTENT – 7. DASHBOARD OF METRICS

	Commercial halibut	Charter halibut
Catch limits and use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limits and harvest in pounds for Areas 2C and 3A.</li> <li>Harvest by subarea (port of landing)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limits and harvest in pounds for Areas 2C and 3A.</li> <li>Angler harvest and average weight by subarea.</li> <li>Reasons for overages, to the extent they can be identified.</li> </ul>
Number of participating entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of QS holders in Areas 2C and 3A (including CQE)</li> <li>Number of vessels in Areas 2C and 3A (including CQE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of halibut charter businesses</li> <li>Number of CHP holders (including CQE and MWR permit holders)</li> <li>Number of anglers harvesting halibut</li> </ul>



# PROPOSED CONTENT – 7. DASHBOARD OF METRICS

	Commercial halibut	Charter halibut
Gross revenue generated directly from target species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex-vessel price and value of commercially-caught halibut</li> <li>• Ex-vessel value per commercial vessel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proxy could be price of halibut charter trip * angler days, with a caveat that this estimate may include other values derived by anglers</li> </ul>
GAF usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GAF conversion rates</li> <li>• Pounds and number of fish transferred</li> <li>• GAF permit holders and percent of self-transfers</li> <li>• Number of self-transfers that reach the transfer caps</li> <li>• Average price per pound and average price per GAF</li> </ul>	



# PROPOSED CONTENT – 7. DASHBOARD OF METRICS

	Commercial halibut	Charter halibut
Diversification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fisheries revenue diversification associated with vessel owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trips with multi-species retained</li> </ul>
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Port of landings</li> <li>QS holder community</li> <li>CQE communities with QS and harvest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community or port where trip ended</li> <li>CHP holder community</li> <li>Harvest and effort of CQE permits</li> </ul>



# PROPOSED CONTENT

8. Discussion on the objectives of the allocation/ program and whether significant factors assessed in the CSP analysis have changed.

**Appendix to the review:** describe the concepts of the marginal economic value of halibut and economic impacts associated with charter and commercial halibut fishing and highlights some of the recent research relative to these concepts.



# NEXT STEPS - AP ACTION

- Consider proposed scope and content for the Allocation Review
- Suggest any modifications to workplan
- Next step is the Allocation Review (Step 2), at which time stakeholders may wish to provide comment on specific changes to the allocation or program
- If the Council wishes to further explore a different allocation or other changes, this would initiate Step 3 – an amendment analysis

