Summer Flounder Allocation Model Peer Review

Friday, November 18, 2016, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM

DoubleTree Baltimore-BWI Airport
890 Elkridge Landing Rd., Linthicum Heights, MD 21090
(410) 859-8400

http://www.mafmc.org/council-events/2016/nov-18-sf-allocation-peer-review-meeting

Agenda

Friday, November 18, 2016

9:00- 9:20  Introductions; Overview of Meeting Objectives and Agenda

9:20 - 10:00  Presentation: recreational module (Kurt Schnier/Rob Hicks)

10:00-10:30  Discussion, Q&A, and response to recreational module terms of reference

10:30 - 10:45  Break

10:45 - 12:00  Continued: Discussion, Q&A, and response to recreational module terms of reference

12:00 - 1:00  Working Lunch: Presentation: commercial module (Kurt Schnier/Rob Hicks); begin Q&A and discussion

1:00 - 3:30  Discussion, Q&A, and response to commercial module terms of reference

3:30 – 3:45  Break

3:45 - 5:00  Presentation: synthesis of model results; discussion and response to remaining terms of reference

5:00  Adjourn

Note: The meeting will be treated as a working meeting. The agenda reflects approximate times. Questions from the review panel may be entertained at any time during presentations.
Background and Rationale for Review

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) are developing an amendment to the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass, to perform a comprehensive review of all aspects of the FMP relating to summer flounder. One major issue that the Council and Commission plan to address through the amendment is the current allocation between the commercial and recreational sectors of the fishery.

Currently, the annual total allowable landings (TAL; does not include discards) is allocated 60% to the commercial fishery and 40% to the recreational fishery. These allocations were established via Amendment 2 to the FMP in 1993, and have remained unchanged since that time. The 60%/40% allocation split was based on historical landings over the period of 1980-1989. Many Council members, Commissioners, and other stakeholders have expressed interest in revisiting these allocations to determine whether they are still appropriate, or whether they should be modified.

The Council and Commission are interested in using an empirical basis to help evaluate allocation decisions in the summer flounder fisheries. The Council contracted Kurt Schnier (University of California, Merced) and Rob Hicks (College of William & Mary) to develop a model to examine the economic efficiency of the current allocation system.

This project includes the development of two separate models, one for the commercial sector and one for the recreational sector. Each of these models is used to construct a behavioral simulation, calibrated using existing data. The simulation model is used to estimate the marginal value for summer flounder in the recreational and commercial fisheries under alternative sector allocations.

Terms of reference (listed below) have been developed to guide the review of the summer flounder allocation analysis. Other important issues that the panel may choose to address not contained under the terms of reference will be incorporated in the final report under a special comment section.
Terms of Reference (TORs)

1. Were the theoretical and statistical model specifications for the recreational valuation module done in a manner consistent with professional standards?
   a. Are the statistical methods themselves compliant with theory?
   b. Are the statistical methods appropriate for the problem being addressed?
   c. How appropriate were the data used in the analysis? Are the data sufficient to estimate the model? Do missing data pose a risk of biasing the parameter estimates or the model results? Are appropriate reasons listed for not including specific data sets? What proxy data are used and was it the most appropriate data to use?
   d. Were alternative model specifications investigated and tested? Were assumptions underlying the statistical analysis of the models clearly stated?

2. Were the theoretical and statistical model specifications for the commercial module done in a manner consistent with professional standards?
   a. Are the statistical methods themselves compliant with theory?
   b. Are the statistical methods appropriate for the problem being addressed?
   c. How appropriate were the data used in the analysis? Are the data sufficient to estimate the model? Do missing data pose a risk of biasing the parameter estimates or the model results? Are appropriate reasons listed for not including specific data sets? What proxy data are used and was it the most appropriate data to use?
   d. Were alternative model specifications investigated and tested? Were assumptions underlying the statistical analysis of the models clearly stated?

3. Was the link between the commercial module and recreational module done in a manner consistent with professional standards?

4. Were the results of the analysis (synthesis of the two modules) clearly interpreted? Can the model be used to map out a benefit curve given changes in allocation across commercial and recreational fisheries and can the results be used for management purposes? Can the model be used to consider allocation alternatives that were not specifically analyzed? Is it possible to make modifications to the current model that would allow for the measurement of benefits (both total and marginal) in situations where allocations are not binding?

5. Can this model be used to assess allocation in other fisheries? Could future models be run by other individuals without major modifications (e.g., Council and/or ASMFC staff)? Can the model be easily updated to support new MRIP estimates?