

HMS FMP Amendment 2

To Authorize a Shallow-set Longline
Fishery Outside the West Coast EEZ

Alternatives (Overview)

- All action alternatives include gear requirements, incidental take limits (“turtle caps”) and 100% observer coverage
- Alternative 1: No Action
- Alternative 2: Limited Entry
- Alternative 3: Large Limited Entry Program
- Alternative 4: Open Access


Alternative 2: LE Program, ≤ 20 Permits

- A maximum of 20 permits could be issued; analyzed for 5, 10, 15, & 20 permits
- Closed area options (no closure, E. of 150 W, E. of 140 W)
- Permit transfer restriction (1 or 2 years); minimum number of landings (0-5)
- Permit qualification (options 1-4)

Alternatives 3 & 4

- Alternative 3: Permits limited to those making at least one west coast swordfish landing, 2005-2007
- Alternative 4: Open Access
- Under both options fishery closed west of 140° W. longitude

Distribution of Observed West Coast Sets, 2001-2004



Sea Turtle Impacts

Impact evaluation compares estimated sea turtle mortality under the alternatives to 2004 NMFS guidance: low levels of sea turtle mortality approximating no jeopardy levels in DGN fishery

Sea Turtle Mortality Estimates

	5 vessels	10 vessels	15 vessels	20 vessels
E of 140	1 loggerhead 1 leatherback	2 loggerhead 1 leatherback	2 loggerhead 2 leatherback	2 loggerhead 2 leatherback
E of 150	2 loggerhead 1 leatherback	3 loggerhead 2 leatherback	3 loggerhead 2 leatherback	4 loggerhead 2 leatherback
No closure	2 loggerhead 1 leatherback	3 loggerhead 1 leatherback	4 loggerhead 2 leatherback	4 loggerhead 2 leatherback

Other Impacts

- Finfish
- Marine Mammals
- Seabirds
- Economic viability


Economic Viability Analysis

- Characterize economic viability as expected profits to a SSL participant
- Gauge effect of different factors on viability
 - turtle caps (leatherback/loggerhead = 8/9, 4/5)
 - observer coverage (785 sets, 300 sets)
 - areas open to fishing (no limit, E. of 150, E. of 140)
 - number of permits issued (5, 10, 15, 20, 30)

Scenario Summary Table Example

Area Restriction 2 (E of 140, Leatherback Cap = 8, Loggerhead Cap = 9, Q1 Season Start)					
No. of Vessels	5	10	15	20	30
Expected Effort	142.8	78.5	52.3	39.2	26.2
Expected Total Revenues	\$2,714,705	\$2,983,315	\$2,983,315	\$2,983,315	\$2,983,315
Accounting Profit per Participant	\$169,436	\$55,677	\$9,482	-\$13,615	-\$36,712
Economic Profit per Participant	\$107,700	\$17,282	-\$19,415	-\$37,763	-\$56,111

Estimated Aggregate Economic Profit



Key Economic Conclusions

- Turtle caps did not significantly limit effort.
- Key potential limiting factors on economic viability are (1) area limits; (2) observer availability; (3) number of permits.
- Given constrained fleet effort, average profit per participant declines as the number of vessels increases.
- For a number of scenarios, the fishery might not be economically viable.

Decisions to be Made

- Choice of Alternative
- Number of permits/vessels
- Area closure
- Permit transfer limit / minimum landings
- LE qualification option
- LE Permit Application and Issuance
- Gear measures equivalent to Hawaii