

MAFAC Priorities for Further Consideration May 2013

Of the 128 total findings, of the Managing Our Nation's Fisheries 3 conference, 33 were chosen by MAFAC as a priority for consideration. These are 'binned' by the overarching issue or theme, and have been assigned to a specific MAFAC subcommittee. The following table identifies the subcommittee (in caps), the overarching theme, and provides the full text of the specific finding. Note, a couple of findings are assigned to more than one subcommittee; these are shaded, with individual colors.

RECREATIONAL FISHERIES: Revise NS1 to allow multi-year minimum stock size thresholds	
1.1.1	Consider multi-year minimum stock size thresholds and ACL framework (phase-in ACL changes, constrain large inter-annual ACL changes, don't base overfished determination on a single year estimate).
1.1.5	Eliminate hard quotas managed in-season for rec stocks. Adjust pre-season input controls (bag limits, seasons) to stay within ACL (based on numbers of fish, not pounds).
1.1.6	Manage with long-term mortality rates for more stability (eliminate wide fluctuations in catch limits)
1.2.4	Replace 'overfished' with 'depleted' (status may not be due to excessive fishing) [only some conference folks supported this; others disagreed].
3.3.5	Need to define, identify sideboards, and metrics of elements of OY; redefine OY/MSY relationship to no longer be one directional --social, economic, and non-economic values could allow OY to be above MSY.
ECOSYSTEMS: Interjurisdictional coordination on effects of climate change on species shifts	
1.2.9	Increase frequency and quality of stock assessments and rebuilding analyses and incorporate ecosystem dynamics; recognize limitations of science.
2.1.2	Increase coordination between/across jurisdictions to address changing species distribution and ecosystem change (Councils, states, international).
2.1.3	Precautionary & Adaptive Management: Flexibility to respond to spatial, allocative, and distributional effects of climate change.
2.1.4	Precautionary & Adaptive Management: Address rebuilding requirements when environmental conditions may be predominant factor in stock's decline.
2.1.5	Precautionary & Adaptive Management: Assess barriers to adaptation (fishing communities & fish stocks).
2.1.8	Precautionary & Adaptive Management: Develop a comprehensive national plan and tools which facilitate development of regional management strategies.
2.1.10	Precautionary & Adaptive Management: Evaluate effectiveness and utility of closed/fixed areas.
2.1.12	ESA: Base listings on actual trends rather than projected trends of climate change.
2.2.11	Improve Interjurisdictional collaboration and coordination on forage fish management.

3.3.1	MSA needs to incentivize response to challenges, population growth, climate change, globalization, and budget cuts.
ECOSYSTEMS: Forage Fish Management	
2.2.3	Improve understanding of relationships between habitat and productivity to support identification and evaluation of tradeoffs.
2.2.11	Improve Interjurisdictional collaboration and coordination on forage fish management.
ECOSYSTEMS: Priorities for EFH implementation	
2.2.3	Improve understanding of relationships between habitat and productivity to support identification and evaluation of tradeoffs.
2.3.1	Consider a national standard for habitat: "Minimize adverse impacts on EFH to the extent practicable."
2.3.7	Define EFH more broadly.
2.3.8	Shift interpretation of EFH from single-species to multispecies and ecosystem focus.
2.3.10	Identify priority habitats that benefit fisheries, focus habitat research.
STRATEGIC PLANNING: Consideration of allocation processes, consistency, and related factors	
3.1.5	Allocations are not permanent - need to be more proactive in routine review and modification as needed. Decisions should be left to regions, and creative solutions may result from constructive dialog between sectors.
3.1.6	Rec and subsistence considerations need higher priority in fishery management policy choices, AND in other policy arenas that affect fisheries (conventional & alternative energy).
3.1.7	Define subsistence fishing in the MSA, and expand recognition of tribes and indigenous people engaged in subsistence fishing.
3.3.12	MSA mandate for Councils to consider review of rec. and comm. Allocations every (x) years after scoping allocation based on objective guidelines.
3.3.13	NOAA standardized methods on how to review allocations.
3.3.14	Improve NOAA support for allocation reviews (contracted analysts/economists).
STRATEGIC PLANNING: Confidentiality	
3.3.11	Reform MSA confidentiality provisions, access to data from public trust resource users while protecting sensitive information.
STRATEGIC PLANNING: Definition of Overfished	
1.2.4	Replace 'overfished' with 'depleted' (status may not be due to excessive fishing) [only some conference folks supported this; others disagreed].
3.3.5	Need to define, identify sideboards, and metrics of elements of OY; redefine OY/MSY relationship to no longer be one directional --social, economic, and non-economic values could allow OY to be above MSY.
COMMERCE: NS8, sustainable communities, working waterfronts	
3.2.1	Create, modify, and promote financial tools and training to support small and community-based borrowers (NOAA Fisheries Finance Program, CA Fisheries Fund).

3.2.2	Resolve institutional impediments to fisheries commerce (establish central registry to facilitate lending; improve aquaculture permitting process).
3.2.8	Anchor quota in communities (use ecosystem-based management, Community Fishing Associations).
3.3.5	Need to define, identify sideboards, and metrics of elements of OY; redefine OY/MSY relationship to no longer be one directional --social, economic, and non-economic values could allow OY to be above MSY.
3.3.6	Expand socioeconomic analysis requirements to include economic value and non-market value quantification.
COMMERCE: Aquaculture permitting and funding	
3.2.2	Resolve institutional impediments to fisheries commerce (establish central registry to facilitate lending; improve aquaculture permitting process).
3.2.14	Need end to end streamlined regulatory process for aquaculture.
3.2.15	Wild harvest and aquaculture are more similar than different, and both need to meet supply needs and attain economic benefit.
PROTECTED RESOURCES: ESA listing issues	
2.1.12	ESA: Base listings on actual trends rather than projected trends of climate change.

To provide context, the following table provides a brief description of the focus and issues raised and discussed by MAFAC members, per session:

Session 2.1 Assessing Ecosystem Effects and Integrating Climate Change	
Findings 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12	There is a need for a national strategy for improved interjurisdictional collaboration for species movement across existing boundaries. Changes may happen rapidly; management will have to react quickly and effectively. Iterative/adaptive management, EBM and integrated assessments will be needed. Maintaining/increasing management flexibility. With shifting baselines due to warming waters, there will also be interest in reopening and possibly shifting closed areas in particular. Finding 12 concerns ESA and whether species should be listed based on current trends or predictions of changes in climate.
Session 3.2 Integrating Community Protection, Jobs Emphasis, and Domestic Seafood Quality Assurance	
Findings 1, 2, 8, 14, 15	Focus was on financing, aquaculture, and access to resources for smaller communities. There is a lot of utility already in MSA that some groups are unaware of, so potentially need more guidance on CFAs, RFAs. Issues raised on property rights and facilitating private investment, and related topics were analogous to working waterfront and NS8 issues. Discussed whether MSA is the proper tool to manage aquaculture, how to support permitting.
Session 3.3 Assessment and Integration of Social and Economic Tradeoffs	
Findings 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14	#1 was chosen as a topic for MAFAC to recognize as critical, but not debate. Fits in with interjurisdictional discussion. As a longer term topic, there was interest in how to operationalize OY and factor social, economic, and ecological factors. Regarding data and confidentiality, the issue is a broad policy question – how much information

	is available to the public, from those that are using a public resource (quid pro quo). Allocations and reallocation is a larger concern and higher priority for MAFAC (#12, 13, 14); there's concern from the rec community of limited methodology/tool for assessing and transferring allocation, economic data may not be used consistently.
Session 2.2 Forage Fish Management	
Findings 3, 11	Tools exist to manage forage fish. There was discussion as to whether a new national standard is necessary. This is important, but not a priority for MAFAC. However, it should be possible for MAFAC to develop a <u>statement</u> supporting NOAA's work on understanding relationships between habitat and productivity to evaluate tradeoffs and improving interjurisdictional collaboration on forage fish management.
Session 2.3 Integrating Habitat Considerations and Impediments	
Findings 1, 7, 8, 10	High priority for the Ecosystem Subcommittee to discuss further include whether EFH should have a national standard, whether EFH needs to be defined more broadly, shift focus from single species to multispecies, and identify priority habitats through research and science.
Session 1.1 ACL Science and Implementation Issues	
Findings 1, 5, 6	Flexibility under ACLs was discussed, as was the recommendation that MAFAC stays up to date on NS1 development and use the MAFAC subgroup to explore how to manage recreational catch differently (different tools and strategies).
Session 3.1 Recreational and Subsistence Fishery Connections	
Findings 5, 6, 7	5 deals with allocation issues (which is also discussed below). There is a need for better recognition of subsistence fishing and its definition (local, indigenous), and what it would include, in the MSA.
Session 1.2 Rebuilding Program Requirements and Timelines	
Findings 4, 9	Discussed use of different terms for 'overfished' (such as depleted), potentially adjusting rebuilding timeframes for species with long generation times,
Session 1.3 International Fisheries Management – Leveling the Playing Field	
	No findings chosen; no priorities for MAFAC