Science, Service, Stewardship

Agenda Item I.1.a Supplemental NMFS Presentation 1 March 2018



Preliminary Analysis Increased Monitoring of the CA/OR Large-Mesh Drift Gillnet Fishery

PFMC - March 2018

NOAA FISHERIES SERVICE



Purpose & Needs / Alternatives

- <u>Purpose:</u> ensure adequate information is being collected
- <u>Need:</u> document bycatch and protected species interactions for evaluation of costs and benefits of the use of drift gillnet (DGN) gear

No Action Alternative: 20 percent coverage; unobservable vessels not be selected for observer coverage / allowed to fish without an observer

Action Alternative 1: observer coverage at a level sufficient for biological sampling; electronic monitoring (EM) on all DGN vessels that fish

Action Alternative 2: minimum of 50 observer coverage; unobservable vessels prohibited from fishing in the DGN fishery.

Action Alternative 3: 100 percent monitoring using on-board observers and/or EM





DGN Fleet

Number of active observable, unobservable, and total drift gillnet vessels and effort for 2013 through 2016.

Calendar Year	Number of Active Vessels	Number of Active Observable Vessels	Number of Active Unobservable Vessels	Total Sets	Observable Sets	Unobservable Sets
2013	18	12	6	470	421	49
2014	15	9	6	409	264	145
2015	17	11	6	361	216	145
2016	20	13	7	737	490	247



Economics

Estimated average variable profit per DGN day at sea.

Estimate	Observable	Unobservable		
High	\$1,310	\$499		
Mid	\$1,079	\$411		
Low	\$848	\$323		

Estimated Industry Costs of Monitoring per Day at Sea:

Electronic Monitoring: \$361.22

Human Observers: \$600



Estimates of average variable profit per day at sea under the alternatives.

Preliminary Analysis of Alternatives - Fleet

Action & Assumed Daily Costs	Estimate Type	Observable Daily Profits	Unobservable	Estimated percentage reductions in variable profit per day at sea	
			Daily Profits	Observable	Unobservable
	Low	\$848	\$323		
No Action	Mid	\$1,079	\$411		
	High	\$1,310	\$499		
Alternative 1:	Low	\$487	\$0	-43%	-100%
Require EM	Mid	\$718	\$50	-33%	-88%
\$361.22	High	\$949	\$138	-28%	-72%
Alternative 2:	Low	\$548	\$23	-35%	-93%
Min. 50% observer monitoring	Mid	\$779	\$111	-28%	-73%
\$300	High	\$1,010	\$199	-23%	-60%
Alternative 3:	Low	\$248	\$0	-71%	-100%
100% observer monitoring	Mid	\$479	\$0	-56%	-100%
\$600	High	\$710	\$0	-46%	-100%
Alternative 3:	Low	\$487	\$0	-43%	-100%
100% EM	Mid	\$718	\$50	-33%	-88%
\$361.22	High	\$949	\$138	-28%	-72%



Preliminary Analysis of Alternatives - Species

Likely...

- No direct effect on target, non-target, and protected or prohibited species
- Minor indirect beneficial effects if improved precision of catch and bycatch estimates
- 100% monitoring = no extrapolation and no potential observer bias
- Better data to inform management decisions



Next Steps

- Observer bias study in 2018 Biological Opinion
- NMFS EM study 2018 and possibly 2019
 - Achieving Council objectives
 - True costs
- Request for Council guidance before June PFMC