# Agenda Item I.5 Whiting Electronic Monitoring Final Alternative and Regulations

November 2015

# Reference Materials for Agenda Item I.5.

- Attachment 1: An Electronic Monitoring Program for the Limited Entry Midwater Trawl Whiting Fishery (*Truncated Version*).
- Attachment 2: An Electronic Monitoring Program for the Limited Entry Midwater Trawl Whiting Fishery **(*Full Version Electronic only*).**
- Attachment 3: Analysis of Enforcement Consultants Recommendations
- NMFS  Report (Draft EM Regulations)
- Supplemental NMFS Report 2 (PSMFC logbook report)
- Supplemental NMFS Report 3 (Draft Third Party Regulations)
- Supplemental NMFS Report 4 (cost analysis)

# Overview

- Staff Overview
- NMFS Report
- Advisory body statements
- Public Comment

# Council Action (Revised)

- Confirm or revise final preferred alternative for whiting fishery electronic monitoring.

- ~~Deem regulations or~~ decide an alternative process to deem regulations.
  - a. Delay deeming until March or April, 2016
  - b. Defer deeming to Council staff

# Overview of Preferred Alternative
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Alternative 2** - Camera Recordings Used to Estimate Discard.
- **Video Review Option A:** 100% - census all video footage and estimate discard, includes a mandatory logbook requirement to document discard. Logbook requirement as a back-up data source.

- GEMPAC: Recommends switching to Alt 3

# Overview of Preferred Alternative
## (See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Discard Accounting Option A** (**Shoreside Sector)**: Estimate Discard with EM and Count against IFQ
- **Discard Accounting Option D (Mothership Sector)**: Deduct unintentional minor discards of whiting preseason from the MS Coop allocation.
- In September 2015, NMFS Recommended **Option A** for the Mothership sector
  - No additional cost savings under Option D
  - Better accountability on part of fisherman
  - GEMPAC: Recommends Option A for MS

# Overview of Preferred Alternative
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

Council staff removed these options from further consideration, however; Council voted on these topics so they should be considered:

- **Retention Requirements Option A:** Maximize

- **Halibut Retention/ Discard Option D:** Discard Exemption, 100% retained, 100% mortality

- GEMPAC: Retain both these options

# Overview of Preferred Alternatives
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Discard Species List Adjustment Option B** Routine Process
  - GEMPAC: Remove this Option (not necessary)

- **Eligibility for Camera Use Option A:** Initial and Continued Eligibility
  - GEMPAC: Retain this Option

- **EM Vessel Operational Plan - IVMP Expiration Option B**: Annual Expiration or if modifications are made
  - GEMPAC: Revise to Option A: No Expiration

# Overview of Preferred Alternatives
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Declaration of EM Use Option C**: Declare until changed with some limit on frequency

- **Data Transfer Process**
  - **Option C**: by Shoreside catch monitor
  - **Option D**: by Vessel operator/Crew

- GEMPAC: Recommends retaining these Options

# Overview of Preferred Alternatives
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Video and Data Processing and Analysis**
  - **Option D**: Certified Third party conducts video review (non-government)
  - Council Noted: Option D once a certification process has been established, until then, Government (Option A) – NMFS or their agent
  - NMFS Recommends revising to require only industry-funded third-party video review
  - GEMPAC: Recommends retaining this Option but removing Council's note

# Overview of Preferred Alternatives
(See Attachment 1, page 15-16)

- **Payment for Scientific data collection/observations Option A**: Government funded scientific observations, same as pre IFQ
- GEMPAC: Recommends retaining this Option

- **Implementation Option B:** Use EFPs to Test Policy *(Council staff removed this discussion and option; No longer relevant)*

- GEMPAC: Recommends removing this Option

# Implementation: Alternatives 2 vs 3

| Topic | Alternative 2 (preferred) | Alternative 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Data Source | Video | Logbooks |
| Level of video review | 100 % | Minimum of 10% (up to 100%, NMFS to determine level) |
| Who reviews the data? | Third Party (currently PSMFC) | Third Party (currently PSMFC) |
| How data is processed | Video is reviewed for estimates and entered into vessel acct system, logbooks are used as back-up data source | Logbook data is entered into system, video is reviewed randomly and compared to logbooks, discrepancies are flagged |
| Incentives for Accountability | Accountability in video; fishermen are still accountable to accurately fill out logbooks | Accountability in logbook; fishermen are still accountable to accurately fill out logbooks; Video verifies logbook entry |

# Implementation: Alternatives 2 vs 3

| Topic | Alternative 2 (preferred) | Alternative 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Who pays for EM system? | Industry | Industry |
| Who pays for video review? | Industry pays a Third Party for video review; NMFS likely incurs costs for auditing the third party | Industry pays for logbook audit; potential for lowering video review costs for a logbook audit of less than 100%, NMFS likely incurs costs for auditing the third party |
| Who pays for review prior to Third Party Certification? | Initially NMFS (catch share appropriations, NMFS pays for SS; MS cost recovery dollars) | Initially NMFS (catch share appropriations, NMFS pays for SS; MS cost recovery dollars) |

# Draft Regulations

- NMFS has addressed each EM component for the preferred alternative
- Topics discussed in NMFS report generally meet the intent
- Placeholder info throughout draft regulations

# Council Action (Revised)

- Confirm or revise final preferred alternative for whiting fishery electronic monitoring.

- ~~Deem regulations or~~ decide an alternative process to deem regulations.
  - a. Delay deeming until March or April, 2016
  - b. Defer deeming to Council staff

# QUESTIONS?