

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RELATION TO 2018 Annual Report CH 6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

Trip-Selection Pool

- **Bullet 1: no comment**
- **Bullet 2 on page 106** Addendum = report continue to discuss some descriptive stats on tendering vs. non-tender in trawl and pot; *FMAC agrees with the OSC recommendation that the draft 2020 ADP include a reexamination of tendering strata (tender pot and tender trawl). This could be accomplished in a variety of ways and should not be limited to eliminating tendering strata altogether nor holding selection rates the same between tendered and non-tendered strata within a gear type. FMAC suggests that if NMFS decides to remove tender strata to continue to provide descriptive characteristics on the tender trawl and tender pot.*
- **Bullet 3 on page 106:** the EFP will likely allow us to realize that but would be nice to continue looking at that to get a nicer time series for Appendix A; UTILITY IS TO HAVE A 5 YEAR TIME SERIES; Worthwhile to test diff rates in NPT and PT whether they are significant; evaluate differential realized rates for stat significant, i.e., is the trend random chance or is there some difference meaningfully? By coverage rates realized on NPT (hypothesis of gaming going on in NPT through example scenario: When I carry observers, am I more likely to choose a PT trip as opposed to NPT; *FMAC supports maintaining a single trawl gear stratum (i.e., NPT and PTR in a single stratum). In addition, FMAC recommends 1) carrying forward the performance metrics on NPT and PT through the next two Annual Reports (to carry through the time series) and 2) evaluating whether the differential realized observed rates between NPT and PT are statistically significant.*
- **Bullet 4 on 106:** 15% hurdle; this group is on record that existing gap analysis does not have all utility for hitting G1 or G2; the new gap analysis does hit those; fine with this for another year but would like to continue to refine gap analysis based on approach from fee analysis; Second = results of biological data work from the NMFS Stock Assessment Subgroup are important and will develop over the next 12 months; also, the Annual Report for 2018 shows underselection due to low effort; trawl was 50% lower than anticipated; 2019 draft ADP was similar; in October, how will fishing effort be determined in Draft ADP; payers of the Fee need notice as early as possible if they may come up short; *FMAC supports continuing to allocate observer deployment using a 15% hurdle plus optimization based on discarded groundfish, Pacific Halibut PSC, and Chinook Salmon PSC for the 2020 ADP, until such time that the updated gap analysis from the fee analysis and the Plan Team's review of biological samples needed for stock assessments are available to consider in the future.*

ODDS

- **Bullet 5 on page 106:** important to add caveat that it needs to be done in conjunction with industry; *FMAC supports continued recommendation to address temporal bias (inherited*

trips) in ODDS. Recommend FMAC/industry input prior to changes to ODDS to address this issue. Providers count as industry

- **Bullet 1 on page 107: no comment**

Performance Metrics on Page 107: *FMAC supports continued recommendation on how to revise the 6 trip (bias) metrics to be more relevant for management and have proposed changes be reviewed by the partial coverage subgroup before implementation.* FMAC continues to recommend revising metrics (it is really important); FMAC supports having proposed changes be reviewed by the partial coverage Subgroup; FMAC also supports consistent metrics for trawl and fixed gear EM, recognizing the potentially different purposes of each of these initiatives, and welcome agency involvement in that (especially given future changes in EM funding grants and contracts);

- Deployment versus EM: in future Annual Reports, please evaluate cost and performance for EM deployment separate from cost and perf metrics for EM data review
- Helpful if minutes reflect that this year that would have reflected 1500 sea days; if deployed days had been projected in 2018 fully loaded costs would have been [ask for brief summary of this point from DAN via email]
- Field service is fleet responsibility: meeting perf metrics and that costs; review as separate is important because it is not fleet responsibility; in trawl the audit amount is important as separate because it is not yet determined; good to know what exact costs went into each cell

EM SELECTION POOL

- Bullet 2 on page 107: support
- Bullet 3 on page 107: support
- Bullet 4 on page 107: especially highlight this one to provide overall data quality and feedback for field services in a timely fashion; impacts on achieving perf metrics, feedback and CAS

Dockside Monitoring and Tendering

- Bullet 5 on page 107: support
- Bullet 6 on page 107: need ADP to assume EFP will go in place with a dockside monitoring program and an ODDS change, in time for October

No Selection Pool

- Bullet 1 on page 108: no comment

General Comment on the Annual Report Structure, Esp. “Yes” and “No” Statements

- *FMAC supports providing context around summary slides in the annual report presentation (or include take-aways of the real issues that NMFS/OCS thinks are worth working on).*

- issue = yes and no is all that a lot of the public looks at and those make it look like the program is not meeting our needs; either we should move away from yes and no or include much more information right with the “no”s;
- FMAC should think about summary statement; clear rec to provide supporting context around summary slides; the report can be misconstrued; trying to highlight priority areas for Council and agency; last year summary slides broke out stat sig and not;
- the exec summary and just the slides are what the general public looks at: that is not clear in the exec summary or the slides for the general public; a lot of the public uses the annual report to get at bycatch and what else is going on; this is where much of the public is thinking they will get CAS and fleet information
- **The agency could highlight which things are a concern for the agency at this time or not in creation of caveats**

Annual report or other:

- In future annual reports, the FMAC recommends including an evaluation of cost of field service/deployment metrics for EM separate from EM data review costs. (*or Dan’s sent language*)
- FMAC recommends NMFS create similar metrics for measuring costs across fixed gear EM and trawl EM.

In minutes somewhere:

- Highlight that in 2020 ADP we will see a simulation of reducing the human coverage on the pelagic trawl fleet via the EFP and how that will change rates on the resulting strata (including NPT) covered by human observers.
- FMAC suggests more realistically estimating effort for draft 2020 ADP. The understanding is the draft ADP will use 2018 effort, and the final (Dec 2019) ADP will use 2019 effort through September and then project forward for Oct – Dec (using ratio from previous years).
- FMAC is concerned about the time lag for fixed gear EM data review experienced in 2018 was too long (~60 days, compared to ~8 days in 2017), which impacts the ability of the program to function.