

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES MANAGEMENT TEAM SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON PROPOSED DEEP-SET BUOY GEAR EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS

The Highly Migratory Species Management Team (HMSMT) discussed new and resubmitted deep-set buoy gear (DSBG) exempted fishing permit (EFP) applications at their November 2017 meeting. New applications were evaluated based on the same criteria the HMSMT has used at previous meetings, and resubmitted applications were reviewed for completeness of additional information provided. Applications that the HMSMT recommends for preliminary approval are missing some information but are otherwise ready for approval, while those with a resubmission recommendation need additional information for the Council to evaluate the application.

The HMSMT bases its recommendations for observer coverage in these EFP applications on the three-tiered criteria provided in the November 2016 Supplemental HMSMT Report 2 ([Agenda Item I.4.a](#)).

Summary of HMSMT Recommendations for Revised EFP Proposals

I.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 3; DSBG EFP Application from Mr. Stephen Mintz

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Council approval
- Level 1 observer coverage

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to Council Operating Procedures (COP) 20
- Experience in drift gillnet (DGN) swordfish fishery

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- Mr. Mintz submitted his revised application to the September supplemental briefing book. Since this was after the Council's specified deadline for applications, the HMSMT recommended the revised application be considered in November.
- The HMSMT recommends that the applicant be able to fish standard buoy gear (SBG) and linked buoy gear (LBG) configurations concurrently, as the Pflieger Institute of Environmental Research (PIER) has indicated that this would allow for the most adaptive approach to DSBG fishing.
- The Council, HMSMT and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) have all dedicated much time and effort in assisting, reviewing, and reconsidering Mr. Mintz's three separate EFP requests, yet there has been no effort to fish under his EFP. The Council may want to consider placing a limit on the number of times any one applicant's requests will be addressed without evidence of effort, in order to prevent a drain on Council and Agency resources when handling EFPs.
- The applicant did not provide the estimated number of fishing days he proposes he would fish LBG.
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

D) Requested Revisions:

- None

II.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 7; DSBG EFP Application from Mr. John Foster

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Council approval
- Level 1 observer coverage for any activity utilizing one set of LBG; Level 2 observer coverage for SBG only sets; 100 percent observer coverage for all activity using two sets of DSBG (SBG and/or LBG)

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to COP 20
- Applicant has DSBG experience
- Experience in harpoon and DGN swordfish fisheries

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- The applicant requests use of two sets (60 hooks) of LBG simultaneously. The HMSMT recommends Council require 100 percent observer coverage for all fishing activity using two sets of LBG.
- The HMSMT recommends that the applicant be able to fish SBG and LBG configurations concurrently, as PIER has indicated that this would allow for the most adaptive approach to DSBG fishing.
- Applicant indicates 40 days of effort in Southern California Bight (SCB) west of current EFP effort and 100 days/year expected effort in Central California.
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

Summary of HMSMT Recommendations for New EFP Proposals

I.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 4; DSBG EFP application from Mr. Donald Brockman

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Resubmission
- Level 1 observer coverage

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to COP 20
- Applicant does not have DSBG or swordfish experience. EFP will help inform learning curve and success for inexperienced swordfish fishers.

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- Applicant indicates approximately 130 days of effort; 30 of which would be in Central California.
- Applicant does not explain how his application will address checked data gap.
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

D) Requested Revisions:

- Provide explanation of how application will address data gaps.

II.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 5; DSBG EFP application from Mr. Thomas Carson

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Council approval
- Level 1 observer coverage

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to COP 20
- Applicant does not have DSBG experience, but is participating in marketing/sale of DSBG fish. EFP will help inform learning curve and success for inexperienced DSBG fishers.

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- Applicant indicates 180 days/year expected effort in SCB.
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

D) Requested Revisions:

- None

III.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 6; DSBG EFP application from Mr. Christopher Ekstrom

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Resubmission
- Level 1 observer coverage

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to COP 20
- Applicant does not have DSBG experience. EFP will help inform learning curve and success for inexperienced DSBG fishers.

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- Applicant indicates 100 days/year expected effort in SCB.
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

D) Requested Revisions:

- Provide explanation of how application will address data gaps.

IV.) Agenda Item H.3 Attachment 8; DSBG EFP application from Mr. Stephen Greyshock

A) HMSMT Recommendation:

- Resubmission
- Level 1 observer coverage

B) Merits:

- Aligns with Council goals
- Complete in regard to COP 20
- Applicant has DGN, longline and harpoon experience.

C) Suggestions and Comments:

- Indicates 30-90 days estimated effort in SCB, 30 in Central California and 30 in Northern California.
- Applicant did not answer all questions (question 9 regarding data gaps is blank).
- The HMSMT has determined that the proposal does not include a significant scientific component that warrants SSC review.

D) Requested Revisions:

- Complete application by answering question #9.

HMSMT Recommendation Summary

Applicant	Team Recommendation	Observer Coverage	Requested Revisions
<i>Mintz (revision)</i>	Approval	Level 1	None
<i>Foster (revision)</i>	Approval	Level 1/Level 2*	None
<i>Carson</i>	Approval	Level 1	None
<i>Brockman</i>	Resubmission	Level 1	Complete question #9
<i>Ekstrom</i>	Resubmission	Level 1	Complete question #9
<i>Greyshock</i>	Resubmission	Level 1	Answer question #9

*Level 1 observer coverage for effort utilizing one set of LBG or mixed set of both configurations; Level 2 observer coverage for effort utilizing only one set of SBG; 100 percent observer coverage for all effort utilizing multiple sets of DSBG