Tab B, No. 8



Gulf of Mexico Headboat Collaborative (HBC) Pilot Program



Southeast Region



Biloxi, MS March-April 2015

Overview

- Two-year allocation-based program for red snapper and gag
 - 100% catch accountability
 - 17-19 vessels across the Gulf
- Monitoring
 - VMS, hail-out, hail-ins
 - Approved landing locations
 - Trip level reporting



Overview

- NMFS distributed quota to HBC Manager
- HBC manager determined how to distribute to vessels





HBC Tag system

- Developed and managed by HBC participants
- Seton Tyvek tag (weather-proof and tear-proof)
- Color coded for species
- Crew responsible for filling out tags:
 - Vessel name
 - Customer name
 - Date
- Tags attached to fish, stringer, or filet bag

| GULF HEADBOAT | VESSEL NAME: |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| COLLABORATIVE EXEMPTED FISHING | CUSTOMER NAME: |
| PERMIT (EFP) PERMIT NO | DATE: |
| 13-3ENU-UZ | GAG GROUPER # 0001 |



Quota Landed





| 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 3,024 fish | 1,768 fish | 54,907 fish | 47,111 fish |
| 50.3% fish | 29.8% fish | 98.9% fish | 84.9% fish |
| 22,087 lb gw | 15,659 lb gw | 274,443 lb ww | 252,407lb ww |
| 51.3% lb gw | 37.5% lb gw | 95.8% lb ww | 89.8% lb ww |



HBC Trips

| | 2014 | 2015 |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|
| Total trips | 3,140 | 3,544 |
| Trips landing HBC species | 60% | 51% |
| Trips landing red snapper | 41% | 38% |
| Trips landing gag | 22% | 16% |
| Half-day trips | 35% | 36% |
| ³ ∕₄ day trips | 19% | 18% |
| Full day trips | 42% | 42% |
| Multi-day trips | 4% | 4% |



Trip Level Information





Fish landed per month





Converting Fish to Pounds

- Pre-season conversion
 - Annual conversion: Prior to the start of the program
 <u>across all months by region</u>
- In-season conversion
 - Monthly conversion: Current year's dockside sampling for HBC vessels per month by region
 - Updated every 15-30 days
- Annual differences
 - Red snapper -3.3% to 5.5% (-12% to 21% monthly)
 - Gag 1.1% to 23.2%(-8.6% to 57.5% monthly)



In-season average weights

| Region | 2014 Red snapper | 2015 Red snapper |
|-----------|------------------|------------------|
| AL | 5.2 (4.6 – 6.4) | 5.8 (4.5 – 7.3) |
| FL Pan | 4.4 (3.9 – 5.1) | 4.8 (3.7 – 6.0) |
| FL Pen | 6.2 (2.2 – 13.2) | 6.9 (2.7 – 9.5) |
| ТΧ | 5.4 (3.9 – 7.5) | 5.4 (4.3 – 8.8) |
| Gulf-wide | 5.0 (2.2 – 13.2) | 5.4 (2.7 – 9.5) |

| Region | 2014 Gag | 2015 Gag |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|
| AL | 11.8 (11.4 – 14.6) | 9.6 (8.4 – 10.1) |
| FL Pan | 10.4 (6.0 – 14.6) | 15.1 (11.9 -23.7) |
| FL Pen | 7.1 (5.6 – 9.1) | 8.4 (6.5 – 16.2) |
| TX | 14.5 (NA) | 16.95 (NA) |
| Gulf-wide | 7.3 (5.6 – 14.6) | 8.8 (6.5 – 23.7) |



Allocation transfers

- Transfers between vessels
- Four different transfer reasons

| Transfer Reason | 2014 | 2015 |
|------------------------|------|------|
| No comment | 13 | 12 |
| Bartered trade | 6 | 2 |
| Sale to another vessel | 5 | 6 |
| Gift | 7 | 3 |

• 68-70% transfers within the same region



Allocation transfers

| Year | Accounts transferring | Transfers | Fish transferred |
|------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| 2014 | 11 | 28 | 3,288 (6% of quota) |
| 2015 | 10 | 19 | 3,008 (5% of quota) |

| Year | Accounts transferring | Transfers | Fish transferred |
|------|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 2014 | 2 | 3 | 49 (<1% of quota) |
| 2015 | 3 | 4 | 106 (2% of quota) |



Trip Validation





Landing Validation

- 30 trips with discrepancies, all red snapper
 - 2014 = 22 trips; 2015 = 8 trips
 - Typically 1-2 fish off hail-in count (max = 6)
 - Captains under-counted 33 fish & over-counted 14 fish
- All discrepancies corrected in IFQ system
- Discrepancies occurred due to:
 - Unfamiliarity with software
 - Mixing of same day trips
 - Transposing numbers

- Identifying species wrong
- Selecting wrong species
- Miscounting



Reporting Compliance

- VMS integral to tracking compliance; validated when a vessel left port
- 8% of trips missed submitting a hail-out (74% tech. errors)
- 7% of trips missed hail-ins (71% tech. errors)
- 4% of e-Logs submitted late
 - Due to technical glitches, new captains unaware of more stringent daily reporting requirement, or forgetfulness

| | 2014 | 2015 |
|------------------|----------|-----------|
| Missing hail-out | 177 (6%) | 331 (9%) |
| Missing hail-in | 154 (5%) | 337 (10%) |
| Late e-logs | 62 (2%) | 212 (6%) |



Lessons learned – Harvest

- Trips made year round
 - Both species harvested in every month
- Near real-time landings accounting
 - High reporting compliance
- Allocation transfers allowed for flexibility
 - Allowed transfer of fish to area needed



Lessons learned – System

- Learning curve for new software
 - New captains/mates need to learn the system
- Vessel owners relied on HBV managers for account balance, did not often check their own accounts
- One system should be used for landings
 - Lag time for data transmission
 - Two system increased monitoring/audit time
 - Corrections had to be made in both system



Lessons learned – VMS

- Good working relationship with the vendor helped to identify and solve issues quickly
- Problems VMS lead to missing hail-outs/hail-ins
 - One accidental switch of tablets between vessels.
- Suggest alternative back-up to VMS for hail-ins
 - VMS data bottle-neck occurred, delayed or missing hail-outs/hail-ins
 - Comm. IFQ has additional hail-in phone and web based services



Lessons learned – Enforcement

- Approved Landing locations
 - Ensures site exists and is accessible
 - Allows site description in hail-in
- Tags identified participants, but not necessary for enforcement
- E-mails of hail-outs and hail-ins helpful
- Additional information on hail-out (e.g., location, expected return time) would be helpful



Lessons learned – Validations

- Hail-outs/hail-ins helpful, predict work schedule
- Catch validation needed, but aiming for 20% may be adequate
 - Current staff may not be able to validate at 20% for all charter/headboats
 - Consideration for seasonal increases in trips
- HBC project improved relationships between agents
 and captains



Lessons learned – Validations

- In-season weights
 - Can be different from pre-season weights
 - Regional differences
 - Number of samples collected important
- Weights vs fish for allocation
 - Fish easier to count
 - In-season weights needed to convert to pounds
 - Mechanism to account for regional differences
 - E.g., Convert to fish only when allocation transferred to the vessel account. Transfers between shareholder accounts in pounds.



Questions?

