



Recreational Harvest Control Rule



Joint Council and ASMFC Policy Board Meeting August 10, 2021

Presentation Outline

- Goal of Harvest Control Rule
- FMAT/PDT recommendations for draft alternatives
 - 1) No action alternative
 - 2) Percent change alternative
 - 3) Fishery score alternative
 - 4) Biological reference point alternative
 - 5) Biomass based matrix alternative
- Next steps





Goal of Harvest Control Rule

- Rely less on MRIP vs. RHL or ACL.
- Use a more holistic approach with greater emphasis on stock status indicators and trends.
- Pre-determined mgmt. responses to a suite of metrics.
 - Details vary by alternative.



Under All Alternatives:

- Changes are only considered to how the rec. bag/size/season are set, and potential changes to AMs.
- No changes to how ACLs are set.
- No changes to commercial fishery mgmt.
- MRIP will continue to be the primary data source for rec. catch, harvest, discards, effort, and fishing mortality.
 - May not be the main driver in determining bag/size/season, depending on the alternative.
- Methods to account for variability and uncertainty in MRIP data can be considered.

Alt 1: No action

- Represents the current process.
- MRIP data from one or more recent years used to predict the impacts of status quo or changes in bag/size/season limits.
- Aim to prevent RHL overages, and therefore ACL and ABC overages.
- Process does not vary based on stock status.
- Generally does not account for expected differences in availability or other factors in upcoming year.

Alt 2: Percent Change Alternative

Maintains MRIP vs. RHL comparison.

- RHL within, above, or below confidence interval (CI) of MRIP estimate?
- Includes explicit consideration of B/B_{MSY} when determining if measures should be liberalized, restricted, or remain unchanged.
 - Below target, above target but less than 150% of target, or more than 150% of target?

Amount of change (if any) varies based on magnitude of difference between MRIP and RHL, as well as B/B_{MSY} ratio.

Alt 2: Percent Change Alternative

- One of two approaches used to determine mgmt. measures.
- Binned approach no change, or a, b, or c% liberalization/reduction.
- Coefficient approach -% difference between RHL and MRIP multiplied by d or e scalar. Response is proportional to difference between RHL and MRIP.

Binned approach:

Future RHL vs MRIP Estimate	B/B _{MSY}	Change in Measures
Future PHI more than V% higher than	> 1.5	c% Liberalization
MPID actimate (and outside CI)	1 - 1.5	b% Liberalization
MRIP estimate (and outside CI)	< 1	Status quo
Euture PHL up to V% bigher than MPID	> 1.5	b% Liberalization
Future RFL up to X% higher than MRIP	1-1.5	a% Liberalization
estimate (and outside CI)	< 1	Status quo
	> 1.5	a% Liberalization
Future RHL within CI of MRIP estimate	1-1.5	Status quo
	< 1	a% Reduction
Future DHL up to X% lower than MDID	> 1.5	Status quo
Future KFL up to x% lower trial MKIP	1-1.5	a% Reduction
estimate (and outside CI)	< 1	b% Reduction
Future DHL more than V04 lower than	> 1.5	Status quo
MBID activists (and autoids CI)	1-1.5	b% Reduction
MIKIP ESUITALE (dilu OULSIDE CI)	< 1	c% Reduction

Coefficient approach:

Future RHL vs MRIP Estimate	B/B _{MSY}	Change in Measures	
RHL above CI of MRIP estimate	> 1.5	Δ*d% Liberalization	
	1 - 1.5	Δ*e% Liberalization	
	< 1	Status quo	
RHL within CI of MRIP estimate	> 1.5	∆*e% Liberalization	
	1-1.5	Status quo	
	< 1	∆*e% Reduction	
RHL below CI of MRIP estimate	> 1.5	Status quo	
	1-1.5	∆*e% Reduction	
	< 1	Δ*d% Reduction	

 Δ = difference between RHL and MRIP estimate.

Alt 3: Fishery Score Alternative

- Combine multiple metrics into one fishery score
 - Fishing mortality relative to the threshold level (FMSY)
 - Biomass relative to the target (BMSY)
 - Recruitment trends
 - Comparison of average harvest to the RHL
- Each metric is weighted according to the relationship it has to harvest
- Provides one, easy to interpret value that encompasses multiple aspects of the fishery

Alt 3: Fishery Score Alternative

F/Fmsy(WF) + B/Bmsy(WB) + R Trend(WR) + Fishery performance (WFP) = Fishery Score

Fishery Score	Level of Concern	Stock Status and Fishery Performance Outlook	Measures
0-1.99	Highest Risk	Very Poor	Most Restrictive
2-2.99	High Risk	Poor	Restrictive
3-3.99	Medium Risk	Moderate	Liberal
4-5	Low Risk	Good	Most Liberal



Alt 4: Biological Reference Point Alternative

- Primary metrics are the B/BMSY and F/FMSY from the terminal year of the most recent stock assessment
- F is based on two states, above or below the target
- B/BMSY is defined as one of four states
 - Biomass is greater than or equal to 1.5x the target.
 - Biomass is greater than or equal to the target but less than 1.5x the target.
 - Biomass is less than the target, but greater than or equal to the threshold (the threshold is ¹/₂ the target).
 - Biomass is less than the threshold (the stock is overfished).

Alt 4: Biological Reference Point Alternative

Secondary metrics:

- Trends in biomass and recruitment
- Comparison to the RHL (fishery performance)
- Only evaluated when stock conditions remain unchanged between prior and most recent stock assessment
- Can be used to further relax, restrict, or reevaluate measures

Alt 4: Biological Reference Point Alternative



Alt 5: Biomass Based Matrix Alternative

Uses a matrix to set recreational measures based on two factors: B/B_{MSY} and the most recent trend in biomass (increasing, stable, or decreasing)

 Step A represents optimal conditions while Step F is the worst conditions

A 3x4 matrix will be used to determine appropriate management measure step

Alt 5: Biomass Based Matrix Alternative

- Abundant = Stock is at least 150% of the target level (B_{MSY})
- Healthy = Stock is above the target, but less than 150% of the target
- Below Target = Stock is below target, but above threshold ($\frac{1}{2} B_{MSY}$)
- Overfished = The stock is below threshold
- Biomass trend see Appendix B for example method

		Biomass Trend		
		Increasing	Stable	Decreasing
Stock Status	Abundant		Step A	
	Healthy	Step A	Step B	
	Below Target	Step C	Step D	
	Overfished	Step E	S S	tep F

Accountability Measures

Proactive AMs built into all alternatives.

- Set measures to prevent RHL overages (alt. 1).
- Greater chance of restrictions/less chance for liberalizations when stock status is poor (alt. 2).
- Movement to a more or less restrictive "bin" based on stock status and/or fishery performance (alt. 3 - 5).

Reactive AMs require further consideration.

- Maintain catch to ACL comparison in current AMs?
- Consider other fishery performance metrics such as F vs F_{MSY} ?

Milestones

- Further development of alternatives (Aug-Oct)
- SSC sub-group peer review of two models (September 20)
- Workgroups to solicit stakeholder input on management scenarios (Fall)
- Policy Board/Council review and approve final range of alternatives and draft addendum for public comment (October)
- Public Hearings (Nov-Dec)

- FMAT/PDT, MC, and APs meet to consider recommendations for final action (January 2022)
- Board/Council consider final action on FW/addendum (February 2022)
- MC, Board, Council set 2022 recreational management measures (Spring 2022)
- Development of NEPA document for framework and federal rulemaking (mid to late 2022)









Next Steps

- FW/addendum would define a process for setting recreational management measures
 - Will not prescribe specific management measures
- Guidance from Council and Policy Board on direction of alternatives presented.









Questions/Discussion

Objective: Provide feedback and guidance to FMAT/PDT on alternatives presented today.

