

Review of Intersector Allocations

Summary of Agenda Item F.4, Attachment 2

Factors to Consider in the ISA Review

- Ecological Factors

- Am 24 analysis indicated there were no adverse ecosystem/ecological impacts associated with non-whiting groundfish species across a wide range of removal assumptions (Atlantis modelling results)
- Habitat impacts are discussed in the Am 28 EFH process
- Stock status in 2016 SAFE

- Economic and Social Factors

- Partially addressed in past spex analyses
- Augmented in this review

- Performance Indicators

- Partially addressed in past spex analyses
- Augmented in this review

Evidence of Stranded Yield

- The 5% non-trawl allocation of trawl-dominant stocks tends to strand yield
- Consider set-aside management of such stocks for the non-trawl sectors
 - arrowtooth flounder, darkblotched rockfish, Dover sole, English sole, longspine thornyhead north, petrale sole, POP, and splitnose rockfish south
 - this management strategy is more adaptive (set-asides decided every 2 yrs)

Should the Sablefish Management Line Change?

- The 36° N lat. line is not a meaningful biological boundary for sablefish; Pt. Conception at 34°27' N lat. is a more reasonable biogeographic break
- Existing sector allocations in the north can be recalculated using relative biomass estimates by area from the trawl survey
- Moving the line would require a reallocation in the south since the vast majority of historical trawl catch in the south occurred north of Pt. Conception
- Consider equitability effects for LEFG permits with and without sablefish endorsements (~74% of vessels fishing in that area do not have the endorsement)

Should the Sablefish Management Line Change?

- ~30 trawl vessels have fished in the area between Pt. Conception and 36° N lat. using fixed gears since 2011
- Gear switching has caused gear conflicts between the traditional LE and OA fixed gear fleets and the trawl fleet in the Morro Bay area
- If moving the management line is too onerous a step, consider a coastwide management strategy for sablefish
 - OFLs and ABCs are coastwide; ACLs are stratified N&S of 36° N lat.
 - Many trawl vessels with southern sablefish quota move south to target sablefish
 - Coastwide trawl management would likely shift much of the current trawl effort north of Morro Bay
 - A northern HG could be calculated every 2 yrs using the relative biomass from trawl surveys to maintain the existing sector allocations; recombine trawl quota to manage that sector coastwide

Within-Trawl Allocations

- Formal within-trawl allocations exist for Pacific whiting, canary rockfish, darkblotched rockfish, POP, and widow rockfish
- The at-sea whiting sectors have experienced some economic disruption from the allocation of the non-target rockfish species
- Darkblotched and POP concerns have been addressed by the decision last year to manage these impacts in the at-sea sectors as set-asides
- Canary and widow are aggregating pelagic species that often mix with Pacific whiting schools and can be caught incidentally in large amounts when targeting whiting – continued bycatch control may be desired
- Yellowtail impacts are managed with a 300 mt set-aside in these sectors, which has not been exceeded (annual catches since 2011 have ranged from 14-90% of the set-aside)
- There may be a consideration to manage yellowtail with an allocation for the at-sea sectors in the future if mid-water targeting results in high ACL attainment rates

Performance of the IFQ Fishery with respect to Pacific halibut

- Trawl bycatch of Pacific halibut is managed through individual bycatch quota (IBQ) for IFQ participants N of 40°10' N lat. and with a 5 mt set-aside to accommodate bycatch in the IFQ fishery S of 40°10' N lat. and 5 mt to accommodate bycatch in the at-sea whiting fishery
- Managing the incidental trawl bycatch of Pacific halibut through IBQ has reduced trawl impacts significantly (see Fig. 3 in Agenda Item F.4, Attachment 2) with total mortality of Pacific halibut in trawl fisheries since 2011 ranging between 23% and 34% the trawl allocation (Table 8 in Agenda Item F.4, Attachment 2)
- IBQ management can be constraining to individual trawl IFQ participants in the north and has contributed to trawl effort shifts since IFQ implementation