

**Summary of Work Group Discussion on FKWTRP Monitoring Strategy Outline  
January 24, 2013**

Call participants: David Laist, Robin Baird, Eric Gilman, Ryan Steen, Kristy Long, Nancy Young, Erin Oleson, Karin Forney, Scott McCreary, Bennett Brooks

Summary of comments from Work Group

Only those sections of the outline that Work Group members commented on are included in the summary. Also note that we'll need to revise the lettering/numbering scheme in the document – it's not consistent across sections.

**I. Monitoring the TRP**

**1. Overview**

**c. Data sources**

- Consider other sources of data that may allow us to track any shifts from longline to shortline fishing (e.g., auction data, HDAR dockside landings monitoring)
- Support for including a table or matrix, here or in an appendix, that summarizes the monitoring metrics by data sources

**2. Compliance Monitoring**

- Consider reorganizing, and possibly combining, the enforcement and observer program activities; organize by what we're tracking rather than by data source
- Note that gear or information collected by observers provides an independent measures of compliance with the TRP that is separate from data collected by enforcement officers, but that information could not be used as the basis for any enforcement actions (but might lead to OLE investigation)
- Note: HLA is still considering the two suggestions identified above. HLA will discuss internally and report back with feedback on these suggestions and any other strategies it identifies for supporting compliance across fleet.

**1. Enforcement Activities**

- In addition to tracking numbers of enforcement hours and warnings/violations, track the number of boardings (and percent of fleet that is boarded) to indicate sample size (so we know if we have enough statistical power to detect trends in warnings/violations)
- Consider whether/how trend data from VMS and/or vessel call-in information (to Observer Program) could be used to track a shift from longline to shortline fishing

**2. Observer Programs**

- Many of the bullet points in this section should be moved to the effectiveness section – only include here those that are related to whether the fishery is complying with the TRP requirements (e.g., hook and branch line regulations)
- Add bullet points for observers to measure hooks and branch lines on every trip (described in David Laist’s email – point #1) [Note: HLA is still considering this suggestions and will provide feedback]
- Add bullet point for observers to collect the gear involved in protected species interactions (David’s email - point #3), to verify that gear was in compliance with the regulations. Gear collected by observers could/would not be used as basis for enforcement action. [Note: HLA is still considering this suggestions and will provide feedback]

### **3. Effectiveness Monitoring**

#### **2. Secondary Indicators**

- Consider prioritizing among secondary indicators, to focus our efforts and evaluation of the Plan
- Add bullet(s) for observers to collect a sample of hooks and/or branch lines for strength testing, particularly those involved in protected species interactions (David’s email – points #2 and #3) – might fit under “Observed marine mammal interactions and any associated trends” – e. Hook/terminal tackle performance [Note: HLA is still considering this suggestions and will provide feedback]
  - o Goal is to have weak hooks, so we are most interested in the hooks’ maximum strength; hooks are likely strongest when sold, so we could test new hooks (and wouldn’t need to take them from vessels), as long we know the source (suppliers) for most of the vessels. One possibility would be to require vessels to provide the names of their hook suppliers. Further discussion required
  - o Goal is to have strong branch lines, so we are most interested in their minimum breaking strength; used branch lines are weaker than new, so it would be better to test used line. We should consider options for how to get used gear from fishermen (maybe collect line from branch lines that are changed out, such as shark damaged). Further discussion required
- Consider two-step process for evaluating the effectiveness of the branch line requirement: first test/evaluate whether the line being used is too weak (even when new); second, test its strength over time, so we could eventually have a recommendation or requirement that fishermen replace their line at a predictable frequency (e.g., every xx months/years).

- NMFS should explore the possibility of periodically (annually?) run a standardized marine mammal bycatch model to identify factors affecting bycatch rates
  - o Could include consideration of environmental conditions, timing of fishing operations (i.e., time of day of set/haul), etc.
  - o Would help guide us to make sure we're tracking the most importantly correlated variables in our Monitoring Strategy
  - o (But as written in the draft outline, tracking changes in environmental conditions is not a high priority because it's not directly linked to the effectiveness of the Plan. Tracking environmental conditions is likely best pursued if warranted based on changes in other data.)

## **II. Monitoring Protocol**

- In row 1 of the table, revise the description of the monitoring protocol to indicate that if false killer whale M&SI are below or achieving ZMRG, the protocol should be to continue the outreach and monitoring program, with little to no TRT deliberations unless warranted. Further bycatch reductions (which were noted in the draft distributed to the work group) are not necessary.
- In row 3 of the table, add the case of a stable trend in takes (since that, like an increasing trend, is not movement toward ZMRG). A detailed status review could be conducted if takes increased 2-3 years in a row, depending on evaluation of data. Work Group members strongly recommended additional Team discussion on this particular point.

### Next Steps

- Andy and Sharon: provide any feedback on the Monitoring Strategy outline by email to Nancy (or call if you'd prefer to discuss by phone)
- Rest of Work Group: email Nancy if this summary mischaracterizes or doesn't fully capture your initial comments; as well, forward any additional comments/suggested revisions (if any)
- Nancy will develop a more detailed draft of the Monitoring Strategy (goal: late Feb/early March)
  - o Nancy will check in with the Work Group when the draft is ready, to determine whether Work Group members want to review and comment on the draft before the full TRT
- Draft Monitoring Strategy will be sent to TRT for review and comment
- HLA to provide feedback based on its internal discussions related to gear/branch line performance and compliance strategies