

ELECTRONIC MONITORING – OBJECTIVES, CALENDAR, AND ADVISORY BODY BUDGET

EM Objectives

The regulatory objectives for this action are closely tied to the purpose and need and would be intended to further the policy goals and objectives of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) and the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) including Amendment 20. The regulatory objectives for this action pertain to catch share program compliance monitoring and, as proposed by workshop participants, would be to:

1. reduce total fleet monitoring costs to levels sustainable for the fleet and agency;
2. reduce observer costs for vessels that have a relatively lower total revenue;
3. maintain monitoring capabilities in small ports;
4. increase national net economic value generated by the fishery;
5. decrease incentives for fishing in unsafe conditions;
6. use the technology most suitable and cost effective for any particular function in the monitoring system; and
7. reduce the physical intrusiveness of the monitoring system by reducing observer presence; while
8. maintaining current individual accountability for catch and preserving equitable distribution of monitoring coverage among members of the fleet,
9. supporting the collection of biological information necessary for managing the fishery, for stock assessments, and to meet other needs for scientific data, with no degradation relative to pre-trawl catch share program standards,
10. taking into account agency budgets and abilities to support any new policy,
11. maintaining capabilities for annual catch limit (ACL) management (e.g. for non-quota species), and
12. following an implementation path most optimal for the fishery.

Note: These regulatory objectives are for an action to develop an Electronic Monitoring (EM) program for trawl catch share program compliance monitoring, not for the collection of scientific data. The first seven items in the above list are direct regulatory objectives, i.e. reasons for considering EM. Items eight through twelve in this list are constraints, i.e. the Council would not be undertaking this action in order to achieve items eight through twelve but rather in pursuing the first seven objectives will be bounded by the concerns listed in items eight through twelve. These objectives do not displace the original objectives for the trawl catch share program (Amendment 20 objectives) or the groundfish FMP.

EM Calendar

The following is the process adopted by the Council for its deliberations on EM. Highlighting indicates the changes the Council made to the process recommended by the February 2013 EM workshop.

EM Calendar	
<u>Dates</u>	<u>Process Considerations</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSMFC continues preliminary planning for 2013 season and in anticipation of likely Council guidance.
Apr 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider results of EM workshop and recommendations ● Adopt goals and objectives. ● Provide guidance on development of scoping package. ● Request <i>special studies</i>, as needed. ● Consider results of the 2012 PSMFC EM study. ● Provide comment on the 2013 PSMFC EM study design. ● Adopt regulatory process plan.
Spring 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NMFS/PSMFC finalize 2013 study design (starting in April – w/Council meeting results).
June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Full scoping session on EM. ● Appointment of workgroup on this issue.
Summer 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Execute at-sea and shoreside field studies
Sept 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review results from <i>special studies</i> and provide guidance on alternative development (if necessary). ● <u>Draft whitepaper performance standards for Council review.</u> ● <u>Scoping session on EM</u>
Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider initial results of NMFS/PSMFC 2013 field season^{a/} ● <u>Finalization of whitepaper.</u> ● Adopt alternatives for analysis.
June 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider full analysis of alternative. ● Select preliminary preferred alternative.
Sept 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Select final preferred alternative.
Sept 2014 through 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Secretarial approval process and implementation, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ regulation drafting and paperwork reduction act submissions, ○ securing contracts for video review, ○ commercial installation and testing, and ○ observer program adjustments.

a/ Staff Note: based on the 2012 field season, significant results may not be available until the spring of 2014.

Ad Hoc Advisory Body (Workgroup) Budget

At the April 2013 Council meeting, there were three proposals for the composition of the ad hoc workgroups to develop the EM proposals. These recommendations are provided in the right hand column of Table 1. Past experience in developing the groundfish rationalization policy indicates the importance of early and engaged participation by agency personal that will be responsible for various aspects of implementing and administrating the program. Therefore, Council staff has included a proposal for an ad hoc technical advisory group that may meet both jointly and separately from the constituent advisors. At this time it appears that state participation might be needed at only three of the technical advisory meetings. Cost estimates are provided in Table 2.

Table 1. Possible ad hoc advisory body compositions (alternatives discussed in April).

Constituent Advisors	Technical Advisors
<p>Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) Recommendations</p> <p>PSMFC Chair</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">2 bottom trawl 2 midwater trawl 1 fixed gear 1 processor</p> <p>Technical advisors from Council and agency staff in attendance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSMFC • NMFS Northwest Region • NMFS Northwest Fishery Science Center • NMFS Office of Law Enforcement • NOAA General Counsel • States – 3 meetings only
<p>Enforcement Consultant Recommendations</p> <p>[PSMFC Chair]</p> <p>At-sea whiting Shoreside midwater trawl Shoreside bottom trawl IFQ Fixed gear</p> <p>Technical advisors from Council and agency staff in attendance.</p>	
<p>GAP Composition – Trawl/Fixed Gear (processor or conservation?)</p> <p>[PSMFC Chair]</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Bottom Trawl Midwater Trawl Trawl At-Large Trawl At-Large</p> <p>Plus, one of the three Fixed Gear At Large seats</p>	

Table 2. Cost estimates for each ad hoc advisory body alternatives.

	No. of Travelers	Council Meeting	Outside of Meeting ^{a/}	# of days	Cost per person per meeting ^{b/}	
					Cncl Mtg	Outside Mtg
GAP Recommendation						
Constituent Advisory ^{c/}	7	3,022.25	4,597.25	3 days	431.75	656.75
Staff	1	656.75	-		656.75	-
<i>Estimate of Total</i>		<i>\$ 3,679.00</i>	<i>\$ 4,597.25</i>			
EC Recommendation						
Constituent Advisory ^{c/}	5	2,338.75	3,283.75	3 days	467.75	656.75
Staff	1	656.75	-		656.75	
<i>Estimate of Total</i>		<i>\$ 2,995.50</i>	<i>\$ 3,283.75</i>			
GAP Composition - Trawl and Fixed Gear						
Constituent Advisory ^{c/ d/}	6	2,680.50	3,940.50	3 days	446.75	656.75
Staff	1	656.75	-		656.75	-
<i>Estimate of Total</i>		<i>\$ 3,337.25</i>	<i>\$ 3,940.50</i>			
Technical Advisors^{e/}	4	\$ 1,682.00	2,383.00	3 days	420.50	595.75

a/ Outside meetings being held in Portland.

b/Cost Estimates are based on: Per Diem \$61.00, hotel - 113.00, airfare estimate \$315.00 per person, taxes and additional expenses are not included in the estimates

c/ Most members are currently on an advisory body so majority of costs would be already funded. Actual composition of members may change the amounts.

d/ Does not include a processor or a conservation representative.

e/ Meet jointly with constituent advisors or at separate meeting held in Portland (therefore no additional staff officer travel).

PFMC
05/30/13