
From: Shannon Fitzgerald <Shannon.Fitzgerald@noaa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 1:26 PM
To: Kim Rivera
Cc: Mike Ford; Kerim Aydin
Subject: Re: Fwd: STAL risk assessment for west coast groundfish fisheries

Hi Mike --

Yes, Ed and Kim are right on. Seabird bycatch estimated from observer samples on trawl vessels are an underestimate of total seabird mortality, due to interactions with net monitoring devices (third wires typically), trawl warp cables (the thick ones that go to the trawl doors), and net wings and intermediate. We have a lot of ad hoc information where observers noted when they happened to see an additional mortality, which led to a multi-year special project study where observers systematically recorded which haulbacks they watched, and which ones had bird mortality. We are working on that paper now, but the additional mortalities exceeded the sample mortalities. We have since incorporated the ability to note these mortalities in our electronic monitoring system. In Alaska, we have not recorded a BFAL bycatch event for the trawl fishery yet, either from direct samples or from the special project information, but Laysan albatross are not uncommon. You do have BFAL bycatch events in the West Coast hake fishery (I have a couple birds in our freezer right now), and I know at least one was recovered from a third wire.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks
Shannon
206-526-4553

On 8/23/2011 1:28 PM, Kim Rivera wrote:

> Hi Mike,
> I'm not sure if Shannon has responded, but yes, this is the point I
> was trying to make in an earlier email.....in the Alaska fisheries
> we've had albatross taken in trawl at the 3rd wire; or birds
> interacting with trawl warps or cables would not be accounted for in
> the trawl sampling methodology; as I understand, we have not arrived
> at a means to estimate any catch of birds that occurs by
> cables/warps/3rd wires.....thus, current estimates (based on cod -end
> sampling) would be underestimates.
>
> thx, Kim

> On 8/23/2011 8:29 AM, Mike Ford wrote:

>> Shannon,
>>
>> Thanks very much for reviewing, especially on such short notice. We
>> will edit accordingly.
>> As an aside, BFAL are also taking in WC hake catcher/processor
>> fisheries, albeit at a fairly low rate. In discussing this with Ed
>> Melvin, he suggested that the take in these fisheries may be
>> underestimated because the observers are stationed in the processing
>> area and are only documenting birds that are actually captured and

>> brought on board and would not, in general, observe any interactions
>> with the cables. Any thoughts on this?
>>
>> -Mike
>>
>>
>> Shannon Fitzgerald wrote:
>>> Hi Kim, Melanie, and Mike --
>>>
>>> Thanks for the chance to take a quick look at this document. Very
>>> nicely done! It provides an excellent review of the NW Fisheries
>>> and interactions with the species in question.
>>>
>>> I do have one specific comment however -- we have intentionally not
>>> included any expansion factors for potential drop-offs in any of our
>>> estimates. We simply have no way of knowing what that rate is for
>>> demersal longline fisheries. I think the following statement, found
>>> at the bottom of page 45 (where the drop-off discussion takes place)
>>> should be edited or deleted:
>>>
>>> " It is probable that a significant portion (27 to 45%) of albatross
>>> mortality is undetected even with 100% observer coverage (Ward et
>>> al. 2004, Gilman et al. 2005)."
>>>
>>> It is not at all probable, and this is a statement that has no facts
>>> relevant to the demersal longline fishery to support it. The Gilman
>>> study was done in the pelagic fishery and actually states within the
>>> paper that the same methods could not be applied to demersal fisheries.
>>> However, rather than change the entire analysis, one could state
>>> that drop-off rates are unknown for demersal fisheries, so that in
>>> this analysis, NMFS is applying a rate from another study in another
>>> fishery in order to take a biologically conservative approach to the
>>> fishery interaction analysis.
>>>
>>> Thanks, and I'm in through Thursday if you need to have a
>>> discussion on this. I would prefer that a precedent not be set for
>>> drop-off rates applied to demersal longline fisheries from a science
>>> standpoint. I can be reached at (206) 526 -4553 if there are any
>>> questions.
>>>
>>> Shannon
>>>
>>> On 8/19/2011 12:29 PM, Kim Rivera wrote:
>>>> Hi Melanie and Shannon,
>>>> I wanted to share this with you too. I think you're both familiar
>>>> with the situation in NWR/NWFSC....a recent STAL
>>>> take.....Region/Center working toward a section 7 consultation with
>>>> FWS. Mike Ford has asked for input from folks.....note they are on
>>>> a very tight time schedule. I'm sharing with you in AKR/SF and
>>>> AFSC because of your familiarity and involvement with AKR section 7
>>>> consultations with FWS.
>>>> If you have any time or interest , could you take a quick review and

>>>> offer any comments directly to Mike? I think the best way
>>>> NWR/NWFSC can benefit from our eyes to this is our general
>>>> perspective of the types of information we typically provide in our
>>>> consultation documents to FWS. So I wouldn't expect you to review
>>>> the NW doc and make editorial comments on specific detailsbut
>>>> rather, take a look at the table of contents, are there any pieces
>>>> they might be 'missing', could benefit from adding? that type of
>>>> thing.

>>>>

>>>> Melanie, I did check with Glenn last night, he was fine with me
>>>> checking with you on this.

>>>>

>>>> Shannon, have tried calling.....

>>>>

>>>> and I'm leaving on a jet plane.....2 min

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> thanks much!

>>>>

>>>> Kim

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>> Subject: STAL risk assessment for west coast groundfish fisheries

>>>> Date: Thu, 18 Aug 2011 17:48:16 -0700

>>>> From: Mike Ford <Mike.Ford@noaa.gov>

>>>> To: Lisa Ballance <Lisa.Ballance@noaa.gov>, Chris Yates

>>>> <Chris.Yates@noaa.gov>, Kim Rivera <Kim.Rivera@noaa.gov>, Frank

>>>> Parrish <Frank.Parrish@noaa.gov>, Lisa Van Atta

>>>> <Alecia.VanAtta@noaa.gov>, Kaja Brix <Kaja.Brix@noaa.gov>

>>>> CC: Steve Copps <Steve.Copps@noaa.gov>, Michelle McClure

>>>> <Michelle.Mcclure@noaa.gov>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Dear PRD colleagues --

>>>>

>>>> Some of my staff and I been working with Steve Copps at NWR/SFD to

>>>> help them evaluate the risk west coast groundfish on ESA -listed

>>>> seabirds, turtles, marine mammals and fish. The seabird component

>>>> of this has recently been accelerated due to concerns about the

>>>> short-tailed albatross mortality that occurred last April off the

>>>> Oregon coast.

>>>> Attached is the current draft of the seabird component of the risk

>>>> assessment (minus marbled murrelets, which is still in progress).

>>>> Under the current schedule, this draft will be submitted to the

>>>> PFMC at the end of next week, as a draft report. Steve is

>>>> preparing a BA for submission to the FWS at the same time.

>>>> I realize this is a very short time line, but I wanted to make sure

>>>> you know of this report before it was submitted the PFMC

>>>> considering that short-tailed albatross occurs in all four of the

>>>> Pacific regions. Our report is largely modeled after a recent

>>>> assessment by the Pacific Islands region. If you or your staff

>>>> wish to send me any comments on the report, particularly if you see
>>>> any enormous red flags, that would welcome, but not expected given
>>>> the late date.

>>>>
>>>> Thanks,
>>>> Mike
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>