Black Sea Bass Commercial Issues

Joint MAFMC and ASMFC Board Meeting
October 9, 2019
Outline

- Background on commercial issues identified by ASMFC Commercial Black Sea Bass Working Group.
- Review state quota allocation modification options considered by Board.
- Discuss next steps and role of Council.
- Board: initiate a management action to consider revising state quota allocations?
Problem statement:

- States allocations loosely based on 1980-2001 landings. Implemented in 2003, remain unchanged. Shifts in distribution and abundance, and changes in fishing effort and fishing behaviors have occurred.

- All states subject to closures if a coastwide quota overage occurs, despite state-by-state quota management by the ASMFC. Can leave states with remaining commercial quota, especially ITQ, unable to utilize their full allocation.
State Quota Allocations

- Federally managed on a coastwide basis.
- Allocated among states under ASMFC FMP.
- Amendment 13 (2002)
- Many options jointly considered, analyzed.
- March 2019 - Council initiated amendment for sole purpose of dedicating staff time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Black Sea Bass Commercial Management

Joint Meeting of the MAFMC and ASMFC Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Management Board
October 9, 2019
1. Background
2. Review of Potential Management Strategies
3. Draft Goal Statement
4. Next Steps
5. Questions
## Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>Board established Commercial Black Sea Bass WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Board Reviewed Commercial WG Report; formed PDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Joint Board/Council Meeting: reviewed Board work on commercial black sea bass. Council initiated amendment for commercial issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr 2019</td>
<td>PDT met to develop/analyze management strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Board review of PDT and AP Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>Board review of all proposed options; development of draft goal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Board and Council Review and Discuss Proposed Options and Next Steps; Possible Board Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies for Further Development

1. Status Quo
2. TMGC – Dynamic Allocation Adjustments
3. Trigger-based approaches
   - Equal distribution of surplus quota
   - Distribution of surplus based on biomass distribution
   - Dynamic trigger approach (CT option)
   - Distribution of surplus first to CT and NY, then based on biomass distribution
4. Hybrid Approaches
5. Connecticut Quota Adjustment
“TMGC” Approach

• Formula for gradually transitioning the basis for allocations from resource utilization (allocations, landings) to resource distribution (regional biomass, abundance)

• Various “dials” that can be adjusted

• Dynamic, multidirectional allocation changes

• Control rule can be used to limit annual allocation changes
“TMGC” Example

• Retrospective example of TMGC (2008-2015)
• Resource distribution information from last assessment
• Transition from 90:10 to 10:90 weights for utilization:distribution
• 3% control rule
Trigger-based Allocation Approaches

• Establish a coastwide quota value that would “trigger” reallocation of surplus quota
  – 3 million pounds (average quota 2003-2018)
  – 4 million pounds (based on highest coastwide quota)

• Quota up to the trigger value would be distributed using current state allocations

• Surplus quota (exceeding the trigger value) would be distributed to the states or regions using a different method
A. Trigger with Equal Distribution

• Quota up to the trigger value distributed using current state allocations

• Surplus quota distributed equally to MA-NC
  – 1% of surplus quota each to ME and NH
Trigger Approach A – Equal Allocation

- Quota up to the trigger: Distributed equally, smaller % for ME and NH.
- Quota above trigger: Distributed based on current allocations.

- Quota above trigger:
  - ME: 1% each
  - NH: 1% each
  - MA: 10.89% each
  - RI: 10.89% each
  - CT: 10.89% each
  - NY: 10.89% each
  - NJ: 10.89% each
  - DE: 10.89% each
  - MD: 10.89% each
  - VA: 10.89% each
  - NC: 10.89% each
B. Trigger with Biomass Distribution

• Quota up to the trigger value distributed using current state allocations

• Quota above the trigger distributed regionally based on regional biomass from assessment

  – Then, *regional quota distributed to states*

  • Equally*

    OR

  • Based on historic allocations*

*1% of Northern Region Quota each to ME and NH
Trigger Approach B – Regional Biomass

Distributed based on regional biomass proportions

**N. Region Quota**

**S. Region Quota**

Distributed based on current allocations

Quota up to the trigger

1% each

Northern Region

Southern Region

ME/NH, MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, DE, MD, VA, NC
C. Dynamic Trigger (CT Proposal)

• If coastwide quota is $\leq 3$ million pounds:
  – Allocate quota using the previous year’s state allocation percentages.

• If coastwide quota is $> 3$ million pounds:
  – Allocate 3 million pounds of quota or “base” quota using the previous year’s state allocation percentages.
  – Allocate surplus quota as follows:
    • Distribute regionally according to proportion of available biomass in each region (ME-NY = north region; NJ-NC = south region)
    • Distribute quota within each region proportional to existing intra-regional allocation.
D. Trigger w/ Surplus to CT & NY 1st

• First 3 million lbs of quota distributed as per historical allocations.

• If quota exceeds 3 million lbs, surplus quota will first be used to increase CT’s allocation to 5% of the overall quota, and then increase NY’s to 9%.

• Remaining surplus quota split north/south according to the proportion of biomass in each region and allocated within each region proportional to existing intra-regional allocations.
Hybrid Approaches

• Two or more methods could be combined

• Example: 50% of quota allocated using status quo allocations, 50% using TMGC or Trigger

• Important to weigh flexibility vs increased complexity and potential confusion
CT Allocation Adjustment

Increase CT allocation to 5% before other adjustments

• Move 1/2 of ME and NH allocations to CT (+0.5%)

• Move some allocation from MA, RI, NJ, MD, VA, and NC allocation to CT, proportional to each state’s current percent allocation (+3.5%)

• Hold NY and DE allocations constant
“Consider adjusting current commercial black sea bass allocation using current distribution and abundance of black sea bass as one of several adjustment factors to achieve more balanced access to the resource. These adjustment factors will be identified as the development process moves forward.”
Next Steps

• **Board and Council**: discuss and provide feedback on proposed options and process

• **Board only**: Consider initiation of a management action
  
  – Specify which management strategies should be considered
  
  – Consider potential timeline for document development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Initiate addendum to address commercial black sea bass state allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Consider draft addendum for public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-Mar 2020</td>
<td>State public hearings on draft addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Consider addendum for final approval; potential implementation 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current % Allocation</th>
<th>% Change in Allocation</th>
<th>New % Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.2500%</td>
<td>0.2500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.2500%</td>
<td>0.2500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>-0.5291%</td>
<td>12.4709%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-0.4477%</td>
<td>10.5523%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.0000%</td>
<td>5.0000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>7.0000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>-0.8140%</td>
<td>19.1860%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>5.0000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-0.4477%</td>
<td>10.5523%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>-0.8140%</td>
<td>19.1860%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-0.4477%</td>
<td>10.5523%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>