## 8 "Sweep-ups" of Small QS Blocks

The halibut IFQ program rules created non-severable "blocks" of QS. Persons received their QS in a block at initial allocation if their QS would have resulted in less than 20,000 pounds of halibut IFQ, given 1994 TACs. ${ }^{59}$ Blocks cannot be broken up when they are transferred, meaning all the QS in a block has to be sold or passed on to another person as a single unit.

Under the blocking rules, a person can hold a maximum of two blocks in an IFQ area, and a person with two blocks cannot hold any unblocked QS. However, the regulations also allow persons to combine, or "sweep-up," more than two blocks into a single block if their combined total is worth less than 3,000 pounds of a hypothetical halibut IFQ. ${ }^{60}$

The sweep-up provisions were added because many of the QS blocks that were issued were very small, and in some cases were probably too small to make a fishing trip worthwhile.

Originally, the sweep-up limit was set at 1,000 pounds of a hypothetical IFQ. In April 1996 the NPFMC amended the IFQ program rules to increase the sweep-up limit to 3,000 pounds. This amendment became effective in December 1996 and therefore did not have a substantial impact on 1995 and 1996 sweep-up transactions. The tables in this section reflect only the new rules for sweep-ups.

### 8.1 Changes in Sweepable QS Blocks

Table 8-1 provides data on the number of persons holding sweepable QS blocks, the number of sweepable QS blocks, and the total amount of sweepable QS in an area. Data are shown for both initial issuance and year-end 1998.

Administrative QS revocations are the only actions that should reduce the amount of sweepable QS in an area after initial issuance. However, administrative errors appear to have been recorded in the RAM data base. The errors have resulted in changes to the amount of sweepable QS that cannot be explained by revocations. Some of the other changes in the data base are the result of NMFS-RAM applying corrections during 1996 and 1998 so that QS units formerly issued as unblocked became blocked.

[^0]Whereas the amount of sweepable QS should not change significantly after initial issuance, the number of sweepable blocks should decrease as they are combined, or swept-up, into a smaller number of larger blocks.

Table 8-1 indicates there were substantial numbers of persons holding sweepable QS blocks at both initial issuance and year-end 1998. This was particularly true in Areas 2C, 3A, and 3B. The number of persons holding sweepable QS blocks and the number of sweepable blocks have each declined since initial issuance, particularly in the non-CDQ areas. In the non-CDQ areas the percentage decrease in number of persons who held sweepable QS ranged from a $22.2 \%$ decline in Area 2C to a $34.5 \%$ decline in Area 3B. There was a smaller percentage decrease in the number of sweepable blocks.

### 8.2 Sweep-up Transactions

Table 8-2 provides summary information on the sweep-up transactions by area and year. The table shows the total number of transfers and the unique number of transferors and transfer recipients. The table also indicates the amount of QS that was involved in the transfers, and indicates how many pounds of halibut IFQ are represented by the average QS that was transferred and received.

An oddity of the RAM database is that a person must first hold QS before they can execute a sweep-up transaction. Therefore, if a person holds no QS but purchases and sweeps-up one or more blocks, the first transaction is recorded as a "transfer" and not a "sweep-up." Subsequent transactions associated with the entire sweep-up are entered individually as sweep-up transactions. Therefore, for some persons, the data in Table 8-2 do not show the transfer of the first block involved in the sweep-up. If a person already held a block of sweepable QS then the purchase of additional blocks to combine in the sweep-up would be recorded as sweep-up transactions.

As can be seen there were many more sweep-up transactions in 1997 and 1998 than there were in either 1995 or 1996 . The total number of transfers, the total amount of QS involved in the transfers, and the average amounts of QS transferred and received are all much higher after 1996. This may be related to the higher sweep-up limits set by the Council that went into effect in December, 1996.

Table 8-2 also indicates that in 1995 and 1996 the number of buyers was similar to the number of sellers in each area and year, suggesting that most sweep-up transactions involved a sweep-up of only one or two blocks. However, in 1997 the number of transfer recipients is considerably less than the number of transferors, indicating that individuals were sweeping up more QS blocks. Again, this may be related to the higher sweep-up limits that went into effect in late 1996.

A comparison with Table 8-1 shows that the total amount of sweepable QS involved in these transactions was quite small relative to the amount of sweepable QS in each area.

For example, in Area 2C in 1997, 532,444 QS units were swept-up. This represents 6.5\% of the total sweepable QS in the area.

### 8.3 Sweepable QS Relative to Total QS

Table 8-3 shows the total amount of QS in each area at the end of 1998 and compares it to the year-end 1998 amounts of blocked QS and sweepable blocked QS. Similarly, it also compares the year-end 1998 total number of QS holders to the number of persons who held blocked QS and the number who held sweepable blocked QS.

As was also shown in Tables 7-1a and 7-1b, the percentage of QS that was blocked at year-end 1998 was relatively high in each area, ranging from $35.4 \%$ in Area 3A to $100 \%$ in Area 4E. More than half the QS was blocked in Areas 2C, 3B, 4A, and 4C. The percentages of persons who held blocked QS at year-end 1998 were also high, and were over $75 \%$ for all areas except Area 4A, where $62.7 \%$ of the total QS holders held blocked QS.

In contrast to blocked QS, the percentage of total QS that was sweepable at year-end 1998 was relatively small, ranging from 3.6\% of the total QS in Area 4B to 16.1\% in Area 3B. Although sweepable QS may have represented a fairly small percentage of each area's total QS pool, a considerable number of persons held sweepable QS. For example, $59.9 \%$ of the total QS holders in Area 3A held sweepable QS at the end of 1998, yet their sweepable holdings represented only $7.5 \%$ of the total QS pool in that area. More than half of the QS holders in Areas 2C, 3A, 3B, and 4C held sweepable QS.

### 8.4 Summary

The Council provided a sweep-up provision for small blocks of halibut QS because many of the blocks initially issued under the IFQ program were probably not worthwhile to fish. It was hoped that the sweep-up provision would allow such blocks to be combined into fishable blocks of QS. Sweepable QS blocks represent a relatively small portion of the total QS in each area but a relatively large percentage of the persons in each area hold them.

In December 1996 a revised sweep-up limit became effective, raising the sweep-up limit from 1,000 pounds to 3,000 pounds of a hypothetical halibut IFQ. Relatively few sweepup transactions occurred in 1995 and 1996 but in 1997 the number of transactions increased dramatically. This increase may have been related to the new sweep-up limit.

Table 8-1. Persons Holding Sweepable Halibut QS Blocks, Number of Sweepable Blocks, and Total Sweepable QS Holdings At Initial Issue and Year-end 1998

| Area | Initial <br> Persons Holding Sweepable QS | $1998$ <br> Persons Holding Sweepable QS | Change in Persons Holding Sweepable QS | Initial <br> Number of <br> Sweepable <br> Blocks | $1998$ <br> Number of Sweepable Blocks | Number of Sweepable Blocks Revoked | Change in Sweepable Blocks | Initial <br> Amount of Sweepable QS | $1998$ <br> Amount of <br> Sweepable QS | Total <br> Sweepable QS <br> Revoked | Change in Sweepable QS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 C | 1,269 | 987 | -282 | 1,282 | 1,088 | 1 | -194 | 8,268,342 | 8,244,799 | 549 | -23,543 |
| 3 A | 1,773 | 1,345 | -428 | 1,798 | 1,506 | 6 | -292 | 13,921,758 | 13,822,963 | 77,412 | -98,795 |
| 3B | 608 | 398 | -210 | 623 | 467 | 2 | -156 | 8,690,171 | 8,661,261 | 13,332 | -28,910 |
| 4A | 187 | 127 | -60 | 193 | 148 | 0 | -45 | 1,768,990 | 1,787,797 | 0 | 18,807 |
| 4B | 48 | 40 | -8 | 48 | 45 | 1 | -3 | 338,484 | 329,867 | 2,606 | -8,617 |
| 4C | 42 | 38 | -4 | 42 | 41 | 0 | -1 | 556,328 | 556,328 | 0 | 0 |
| 4D | 25 | 21 | -4 | 26 | 24 | 0 | -2 | 327,075 | 327,075 | 0 | 0 |

Table 8-2. Number of Transferors and Recipients of Sweep-up Transactions With Mean QS of Sweep-ups, By Area

| Area | Year | Official Ratio of QS/IFQ | Number of Sweep-up Transfers | Total QS Swept-Up | Total <br> Unique <br> Transferors | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Average } \\ \text { QS } \\ \text { Transferred } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Avg. QS } \\ \text { Transferred } \\ \text { Expressed } \\ \text { as IFQ } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total Unique Recipients | Average QS <br> Received | Avg. QS Received Expressed as IFQ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 C | 1995 | 6.650 | 11 | 20,475 | 11 | 1,861 | 280 | 11 | 1,861 | 280 |
|  | 1996 | 6.664 | 22 | 52,233 | 22 | 2,374 | 356 | 16 | 3,265 | 490 |
|  | 1997 | 5.910 | 123 | 532,444 | 117 | 4,551 | 770 | 69 | 7,717 | 1,306 |
|  | 1998 | 5.672 | 35 | 162,139 | 35 | 4,633 | 817 | 28 | 5,791 | 1,021 |
| 3A | 1995 | 9.291 | 15 | 31,103 | 15 | 2,074 | 223 | 14 | 2,222 | 239 |
|  | 1996 | 9.304 | 30 | 80,393 | 30 | 2,680 | 288 | 26 | 3,092 | 332 |
|  | 1997 | 7.397 | 176 | 1,096,449 | 167 | 6,566 | 888 | 115 | 9,534 | 1,289 |
|  | 1998 | 7.112 | 66 | 392,410 | 65 | 6,037 | 849 | 47 | 8,349 | 1,174 |
| 3B | 1995 | 14.712 | 3 | 6,934 | 3 | 2,311 | 157 | 2 | 3,467 | 236 |
|  | 1996 | 14.731 | 11 | 95,046 | 11 | 8,641 | 587 | 8 | 11,881 | 807 |
|  | 1997 | 5.990 | 109 | 939,613 | 101 | 9,303 | 1,553 | 49 | 19,176 | 3,201 |
|  | 1998 | 4.900 | 32 | 298,361 | 31 | 9,625 | 1,964 | 18 | 16,576 | 3,383 |
| 4A | 1995 | 7.622 | 2 | 9,068 | 2 | 4,534 | 595 | 2 | 4,534 | 595 |
|  | 1997 | 4.933 | 33 | 225,529 | 33 | 6,834 | 1,385 | 18 | 12,529 | 2,540 |
|  | 1998 | 4.144 | 11 | 67,063 | 11 | 6,097 | 1,471 | 6 | 11,177 | 2,697 |
| 4 B | 1998 | 3.316 | 1 | 3,720 | 1 | 3,720 | 1,122 | 1 | 3,720 | 1,122 |
| 4 C | 1998 | 4.993 | 1 | 13,713 | 1 | 13,713 | 2,746 | 1 | 13,713 | 2,746 |
| 4 D | 1998 | 4.375 | 2 | 8,950 | 2 | 4,475 | 1,023 | 2 | 4,475 | 1,023 |

Table 8-3. 1998 Year-end Total Halibut QS, Blocked QS, and Sweepable Blocked QS by Area

|  | Total <br> Amount <br> of QS | Number <br> of QS <br> Holders | Total <br> Blocked <br> QS | Total <br> Persons <br> Holding <br> Blocked QS | Total <br> Area | Percent <br> of <br> QS | Percent <br> of <br> Total <br> QS | Persons <br> Bolding <br> Blocked <br> QS | Percent <br> of <br> Sweepable <br> QS | Percent <br> of Persons <br> Holding <br> Persons |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Blocked QS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$


[^0]:    ${ }^{59}$ See 50 CFR 679.40(a). The 20,000 pounds is actually a hypothetical IFQ based on 1994 TACs and the amount of QS in the QS pool on October 17, 1994. The halibut QS equivalent calculated for this blocking limit will be worth different amounts of IFQ from year-to-year as TACs and the QS pool change.
    ${ }^{60}$ This regulation is incorporated into 50 CFR 679.41(e).(3). The 3,000 pounds of hypothetical IFQ was based upon each area's 1996 TACs and QS pool as of January 31, 1996. The regulation translates the rule into a specific amount of QS units for each halibut area.

