Black Sea Bass
Commercial Issues

Joint MAFMC and ASMFC Board Meeting
December 11, 2019
Annapolis, MD
Review two black sea bass commercial management issues:
  – State commercial quota allocations
  – In-season coastwide federal closures

Decision point: What type of action, if any, does the Council want to move forward with? Which issues to address?
State Quota Allocations

- Amendment 13 (implemented 2003).
- Many options jointly considered, analyzed.
- Council voted for coastwide federal quota to facilitate state allocations in ASMFC FMP.
- At the time, NMFS advised against state allocations in MAFMC FMP due to concerns about monitoring.

<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>
State Quota Allocations

- Board initiated addendum to consider modifications, Oct 2019 joint meeting.
- Goal statement: 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.
- Several potential options already partially analyzed by PDT.
Addendum a Board-only action, but Board agreed that all future discussion would occur at joint meetings with Council.

In Oct, Council considered “activating” previously initiated amendment but postponed motion until this meeting.
In-Season Closure

- All states subject to federal closure if a coastwide quota overage occurs.
- Can leave states with remaining quota, especially ITQ, unable to utilize their full allocation.
- ASMFC BSB Com. WG suggested Council should address this issue
- Have not yet determined best path forward.
In-Season Closure

Summer flounder vs. black sea bass quota management

- SF state allocations in MAFMC and ASMFC FMP. BSB state allocations only in ASMFC FMP.
- Federal closure for SF if inaction of one or more states will cause ACL overage. BSB closure if coastwide quota exceeded.
- States must pay back SF quota overages regardless of whether coastwide quota was exceeded. States pay back BSB overages only if coastwide quota exceeded.
In-Season Closure

- Black sea bass landings have not exceeded quota prior to end of year but have come close.
- States closely monitor their landings and can request transfers from other states to account for minor overages.
- Changes based on SF mgmt. could be considered but may not fully address issue.
- Potential option to consider for further analysis:
  - Close at 105% of quota, rather than 100%.
Discussion

- Council role in any potential changes to the state allocations.
  - Voting role for Council would require joint action. For the Council, must be an amendment.
  - Timing/prioritization

- How to best address coastwide in-season closure issue?
Backup slides
## Potential Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Board initiates addendum to address commercial black sea bass state allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Consider draft addendum for public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-July 2020</td>
<td>State public hearings on draft addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Consider addendum for final approval; potential implementation 2021</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

Current allocations

- ME & NH
- MA
- RI
- CT
- NY
- NJ & VA
- DE
- MD & NC

0%  5%  10%  15%  20%  25%  30%

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
Triggers Versus Recent Quotas

- Commercial BSB Quota (M lb)
  - 3 M lb trigger
  - 4 M lb trigger
- Commercial Quota

Graph showing fluctuations in commercial BSB quota from 1998 to 2019, with triggers at 3 M lb and 4 M lb.
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 based on current allocations
  - Equal allocations for states above the trigger

- **Quota above trigger**
  - Distributed equally, smaller % for ME and NH

- **Trigger**

- **States Above Trigger**
  - MA
  - RI
  - CT
  - NY
  - NJ
  - DE
  - MD
  - VA
  - NC
  - ME
  - NH

- **States Below Trigger**
  - 1% each
  - 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
- Distributed based on current allocations

N. Region Quota

S. Region Quota

Quota up to the trigger

ME/NH
MA
RI
CT
NY
NJ
DE
MD
VA
NC

Southern Region
Northern Region

1% each
C. Dynamic Trigger (CT Proposal)

• If coastwide quota is ≤ 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.
• 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
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
<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>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Current % Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<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>