

A Maximized Retention and Monitoring Program for the Pacific Whiting Shoreside Fishery

FMP Amendment 10

November 2006 -- Recap

- PFMC reviewed Chapters 1 & 2, considered the range of alternatives
- Recommended alternatives to be analyzed before final decision (Alts 1-4)
- Formed Shorebased Whiting Advisory Group (SWAG) to draft additional hybrid alternative (Alt 5)
- NMFS reported on whiting first-receiver reporting rule

2007 – Transition to Managing Under Federal Regulations

- Fishery prosecuted under EFPs
 - Maximized retention
 - Vessels pay for Electronic Monitoring System (EMS)
- Processor/first receiver rule
 - Pacific whiting first receivers are defined
 - Electronic fish ticket reporting
 - Catch sorting
 - Prior to transport
 - To Federal species groups
 - Accurate weights

Regulatory Development & Implementation

<u>November 2006</u>	Draft EA chapters 1 & 2 with range of alternatives (Alts. 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b)
<u>January 2007</u>	SWAG met to define hybrid alternative (Alt 5)
<u>June 2007</u>	Draft EA for final action
<u>September 2007</u>	Proposed rule publishes
<u>November 2007</u>	Report to PFMC on E-fish tickets and E-logbooks
<u>January 2008</u>	Final rule publishes
<u>April 2008</u>	Regulations effective

June 2007

- PFMC recommends final alternative
- PFMC considers related issues
 - Vessels that sort catch at sea
 - Whiting processor permits
 - Electronic logbook development

The Alternatives

- Alt. 1** No Action -- Catch sorted at sea
- Alt. 2** Status Quo – Maximized retention with EFPs
- Alt. 3** Observers -- Maximized retention with Federal or industry funded observers
- Alt. 4** EMS -- Maximized retention with Federal or industry funded EMS, & data quality monitors
- Alt. 5** Hybrid -- Maximized retention with industry funded EMS, WCGOP observers as needed, industry funded data compliance monitors, & industry monitors

Management Structure

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Trip limit management for non-whiting species● Catch sorted at sea
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● State coordinated monitoring under annual EFPs● Maximized retention
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Monitoring under Federal regulation● Maximized retention
Alt.4 – EMS	Same as Alt. 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	Same as Alt. 3

Change in Management Structure

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If fishery is constrained by overfished species, revenue is expected to decline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Based on 2006, 13,789 mt of whiting would <u>not</u> have been available to shoreside. (\$1,823,954 @ \$0.06/lb)
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No change if bycatch limit management continues ● May benefit shoreside participants if very high coverage results in data that is adequate for sector specific limits
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Same as Alt 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Same as Alt 3

Federal Permits and Endorsements

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● LE permit with trawl endorsement
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● LE permit with trawl endorsement● Voluntary EFP - 100% EMS coverage, bycatch reports, mandatory pre-season meeting
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● LE permit with trawl endorsement● Annual whiting endorsement – declares intent to fish
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Same as Alt. 3, plus permits for EMS providers if direct pay
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Same as Alt. 3, plus● Permits for EMS providers● Annual whiting endorsement would have additional requirements: bycatch reports, mandatory pre-season meeting

Change in Federal Permits & Endorsements

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced cost to fishers – LE renewal \$152/vessel/yr (2006) ● Reduced costs to the states – less \$2,000/yr ● Reduced costs to NMFS – less \$13,000/yr
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced cost to fishers - LE renewal \$152/vessel/yr, plus time to acquire whiting endorsement ● Reduced cost to states - Same Alt. 1 ● Cost to NMFS for whiting endorsements, \$12,000/yr (similar to Alt. 2)
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost to fishers and states same as Alt. 3 ● Increased cost to NMFS for whiting endorsements, and EMS provider permits, \$15,000/yr
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Costs to fishers -same as Alt. 2 ● Reduced costs to the states – same Alt. 1 ● Increased costs to NMFS – same as Alt. 4

Recordkeeping and Reporting

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State requirements for paper fish tickets and trawl logbooks• Processor reporting requirements effective July 2007 – NMFS/PSMFC initiate monitoring in 2007
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	Same as Alt. 1, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Plus daily whiting bycatch reports for processors• States process data reports, NMFS/PSMFC initiates in 2007
Alt 3 – Observers	Same as Alt 1, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When fully developed, electronic logbooks,• NMFS/PSMFC processes data reports
Alt.4 – EMS	Same as Alt. 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	Same as Alt 3, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Daily whiting and bycatch reports for processors

Change in Recordkeeping & Reporting

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced cost to processors, less 191 hour/yr (no daily bycatch reports), neutral cost for electronic fish tickets ● Reduced cost to vessels- no high bycatch reports ● Reduced cost to states – data management, less \$114,560/yr (2005); high bycatch reports, less \$1,500-12,000/yr ● Neutral cost to NMFS for data management.
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Processors - same as Alt. 1 ● Vessels – same as Alt. 1 ● States – same as Alt. 1 ● Increased cost to NMFS – data management, plus \$40,000
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Same as Alt. 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Processors - same as Alt. 2 ● Vessels – same as Alt. 2 ● States – same as Alt. 1 ● NMFS – same as Alt. 3, plus daily and high bycatch reports, \$1,500-12,000/yr

Shoreside Catcher Vessel Monitoring At Sea

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WCGOP observers quantify discards, $\leq 20\%$ coverage
Alt. 2 – Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EMS for monitoring catch retention, 100% coverage ● Authority to place WCGOP observers
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Observers for monitoring catch retention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 3A WCGOP observers $\leq 20\%$ coverage – 3B Direct pay observers 100% coverage
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EMS for monitoring maximized retention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 4A WCGOP pays coverage and data analysis – 4B Direct pay 100% coverage, NMFS pays for data analysis ● Authority to place WCGOP observers
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EMS for catch retention, 100% coverage ● As needed, WCGOP placed to monitor discard events

Change in Shoreside Catcher Vessel Monitoring At Sea

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost to selected vessels - WCGOP observers, \$900/vessel/yr, \$6,840 to the fleet or 0.05% of the 2006 exvessel revenue
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (Option A) cost to vessels - 20% coverage same as Alt. 1; 100% coverage \$34,200/yr to the fleet or 0.27% of the exvessel revenue (2006) ● (Option B) cost to vessels – \$24,750/vessel/yr, \$940,500 to the fleet or 7.52% of the 2006 exvessel revenue. Increased cost to NMFS- \$190,000yr
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (Option A) – cost to NMFS 7-10% of WCGOP budget, data analysis same as Alt 2 ● (Option B) - same as Alt. 2, \$5,333-\$6000/vessel/yr. Less than 2% of the 2006 exvessel revenue, Cost to NMFS same as Alt. 2,
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Same as 4B

Monitoring Shoreside

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● In WA and CA, State port samplers collect fish tickets, count salmon, & sample for composition● In OR, in addition to port samplers, industry samplers collect biological data & sample for composition
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	Same as Alt. 1, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none">● States collect fish ticket data & summarize inseason
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● (Option 3A) WCGOP Observers● (Option 3B) NMFS trained 3rd party observers
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● (Option 4A) WCGOP Observers● (Option 4B) Catch Monitors; NMFS-preferred Data Quality Monitors
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Data compliance monitors and industry monitors (plant employees)

Catch Monitors

Catch Monitors: generic term for individuals who collect independent data that can be used for verification of fish tickets or used to evaluate the accuracy of fish tickets

Observers: biological technicians, educated in the natural sciences, trained in species identification and biological sampling. They collect catch and effort data used to estimate total catch

Data Quality Monitors: 3rd party employees paid for by industry and trained in species identification and techniques used for the verification of fish ticket data.

Industry samplers: plant employees with basic training in biological data collection and species identification. Responsible for observing vessel offload, conducting bycatch species composition sampling, and collecting biological information for Pacific whiting and for bycatch species

Data compliance monitors: 3rd party employees paid for by industry and trained to collect data to verify fish ticket data and to verify information collected by plant employees.

Change in Monitoring Shoreside

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced cost to processors - \$5,400/processor/yr, \$75,600 to all ● Reduced cost to states ● Neutral costs to NMFS
Alt. 2 –Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (Option A) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Neutral cost to NMFS, WCGOP observers – Reduced cost to states ● (Option B) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increased costs to processors \$23,626/processor/yr, \$330,750 to all – Increased cost to NMFS for training \$23,000/yr – Reduced cost to states
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (Option A) - Cost to NMFS – same as 3A ● (Option B) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increased cost to processors, \$12,000 -\$18,000/processor/yr, \$168,000-252,000 to all – Increased cost to NMFS & states same as 3B
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increased cost to processors – same as 4B, plus \$5,400/processor/yr, \$75,600 for plant employees (see Alt 1) ● Increased cost to NMFS – same as 3B

Overage Disposition

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● No overages
Alt. 2 – Status Quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reported on fish ticket● Vessels abandon<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Prohibited species to food banks– Value of marketable catch remitted to state
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reported on fish ticket● 3A Vessels abandon (state)<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Prohibited species to food banks– Value of marketable catch remitted to state● 3B Vessels abandon (federal)<ul style="list-style-type: none">– All overages donated to food bank or for rendering
Alt.4 – EMS	Same as Alt. 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	Same as Alt. 3

Change in Overage Disposition

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● No revenue to states from overages● Reduced sorting & handling time for processors
Alt. 2 – Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● State overage program (Option A) – Same as Alt. 2● Federal overage program (Option B)<ul style="list-style-type: none">– No revenue to state from overages– Increased waste if whole fish cannot be donated
Alt.4 – EMS	Same as Alt 3
Alt 5 - Hybrid	Same as Alt. 3

Changes in Biological Effects

Indirect effects could occur if inaccurate or delayed catch data resulted in a fishery specification being exceeded.

Alt. 1 – No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Increased risk for incidental species</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – pre-season catch projections based on historical catch data. Final catch estimates available 1-2 years after the fishery – reduced WCGOP coverage in non-whiting fisheries
Alt. 2 – Status Quo	
Alt 3 – Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Increased risk for incidental species (sub-option A)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Higher risk if WCGOP coverage is <20% on non-whiting vessels – If WCGOP coverage is near 100%, risk to non-whiting fisheries increases ● <u>Reduced risk over Alt 2 (sub-option B)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – if 100% coverage on vessels & on shore (B)
Alt.4 – EMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Similar to Alt 3.
Alt 5 - Hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Similar to Alt. 3B

Related Issues

- Vessels that sort catch at sea
- Processor permits
- Electronic logbook development