MSB Framework 9

Slippage

Framework Meeting 2, Feb 2014
“...ensure that catch of incidentally-caught species such as river herring and shad are fully documented when vessels in the mackerel fishery are being observed. Full documentation will ensure that the river herring and shad cap is estimated accurately.”
Purpose/Need

- Slippage events are rare, but can still have a big impact on cap estimates.
- At 100% coverage, about 500,000 pounds of observed RH/S could close mackerel fishery.
- At 10% coverage, about 50,000 pounds of observed RH/S could close mackerel fishery (p 73-83).
Am 14 & Slippage

- Slippage = catch discarded before being made available to the observer
- Operational discards not slippage
- Test tows where catch is brought aboard and sampled or retained in net for additional fishing not defined as slippage, slipped test tows would be
Prohibition on slippage except for dogfish clogging pump, safety, mechanical (gear) failure.

All slippages will require affidavits to be submitted to NMFS (form)

Slippage cap was disapproved
With slippage cap disapproved, concern that uncontrolled slippage could undermine cap

Council initiated a framework to consider relevant alternatives
Staff Perspective

- Slippage could theoretically undermine cap
- Depends on what was slipped
- Quantities can be substantial, but don’t know what was slipped so hard to know impact...
Alternatives could...

- Increase consequences for non-exempted slippages

  and/or

- Institute consequences for exempted slippages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Slippage Trigger</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety, Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety, Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>Enforcement actions by NOAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safety, Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>Vacate stat area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Safety related Other slippages</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>Vacate stat area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Safety related Other slippages</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Safety, Mechanical, Spiny Dogfish related Other slippages</td>
<td>Trip termination (and violation?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Spiny Dogfish related Safety or Mechanical related Other slippages</td>
<td>Vacate stat area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Spiny Dogfish related Safety or Mechanical related Other slippages</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Move-Along’s

- Council asked for a range: 10, 15, 20 (nm)

- 3nm = median distance from end of one haul to the beginning of another on observed trips 2009-2013 that caught at least 20,000 pounds of mackerel and 500 pounds of RH/S (approx. 85 hauls on 20 trips).
The most meaningful and implementable interpretation would be to create a no-go circle

- Middle = slippage location
- Radius = 10, 15, 20 nm
- area = 314 707 1,257 nm²
- Make declarations (vms)
Figure 1. Statistical areas used for commercial fisheries data collection by the National Marine Fisheries Service in the Northeast Region. The 50, 100 and 500 fa bathymetric lines are shown in light gray and the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone is indicated by the dashed black line.
Impacts

- 2004-2006, trips landing 20,000 pounds of mackerel landed about $14,000 of fish per day at sea; operational costs
  - Slippage events are rare, would likely be rarer with consequences

- Safety concerns
  - Captain always responsible
  - Avoid regs that could lead to less safety
RH/S Impacts

- Could have more RH/S recorded, benefits to RH/S
- Better data
Mackerel, Squid, Butterfish

- Mr Lars Axelsson - North Cape May, New Jersey
- Mr. Vito Calomo - Gloucester, Massachusetts
- Ms. Kristen Cevoli - Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Mr. Paul Eidman - Tinton Falls, New Jersey
- Mr. Dave Ellenton - Gloucester, Massachusetts
- Mr. Emerson Hasbrouck - Riverhead, New York
- Mr. Hank Lackner - Montauk, New York
- Mr. Kurt Martin - S. Orleans, Massachusetts
- Mr. Sam Martin - Cape May, New Jersey
- Mr. Peter Moore - Waitsfield, Vermont
- Mr. Patrick Paquette - Hyannis, Massachusetts
- Mr. Eric Reid - North Kingston, Rhode Island
- Mr. Jeff Reichle - Cape May, New Jersey
- Mr. Robert Ruhle - Wanchese, North Carolina
- Mr. Stephen Weiner - Andover, Massachusetts
AP Meeting

- 2 main perspectives:
  - This is a minor problem and further restrictions are unwarranted – Alt 1 (8)
  - The potential for slippage to impact the cap & RH/S conservation means Council should create a strong incentive to avoid all slippage – Alt 6 a/b (5)
concerned about interpretation, subjectivity

should be able to release test tows (don’t kill fish to count fish)

slippage at end of trip is a load/safety issue, many variables

frustration – circle of options getting smaller

safety should be paramount
current coverage is sufficient
politics primary driver, already responsible
Alt 1 is defensible and has flexibility
Punishments harsher than need to be
  - Small movements can influence bycatch
Not appropriate to address small issue with single solution for different types of vessels
Keep close eye on issue as cap implemented
Already using best practices to minimize bycatch

Other factors besides location important re: catch composition

Large scale dumping should be limited, smaller scale slipping not an issue

If RH/S populations increase, interactions will increase

Need to acknowledge potential indirect effects on lobster fishery
Discards after topping off are still a concern (could still pump and sample)

Test tows OK as long as sampled or re-fished

Want to know catch composition, and have consequence for events that lead to erosion of overall data usefulness

Slippage appears to be a tool – need to know extent and catch composition
Slipped fish unlikely to have high survivability in trawl fisheries
Better to know fish that are discarded rather than have unknown slipped fish
Slippage would likely undermine RH/S cap
Needs to be disincentive and consequence for slippage
AP Meeting – View 2

- Slippage is very important because of low coverage rates
- RH/S populations are not recovering
Right now non-exempted slippage is prohibited.

If there is another consequence (like trip termination) is that sufficient or still prohibited. I.e. a vessel could slip, terminate their trip, and then still be subject to a violation. Up to Council...
Questions?

Motions Needed If Desired…
(please read them slowly)